



Al-Ajraamul-Mujrimeen min al-Mukaffireen wal Irhaabiyeen

*The Crime of the Criminals from among the people of
takfeer and the terrorists:*

*A Reply to those upon the millah of revolt and takfeer from that which opposed the way of
the salaf in the issues of emaan and kufr:*

*Also addresses a reply to Abu Hudhayfah's "SalafiPublications Refutation" and to the
Administators at AHYA.org*

*below is takhreej taken from a multiplicity of sources some of them being from calltoislam,
Shaykh Ahmad Fareed, fatwa-online, individual translations of texts, salafipublications,
troid, and other organizations and personalities who wish not their name to be disclosed*

Al-Muqadimah

Part 1: Al-Madhaahibu-Bida

chapter 1 **al-Irj'aa**

chapter 2 **Kharijiyyah**

chapter 3 **Emaan**

chapter 4 **Kufr**

Part 2: The Imaams and Scholars regarding Takfeer and the issue of Secular Laws and the ruling on the hukaam

*In this chapter then what has been brought forth are the statements of the recent Imaams
regarding the neo khawarij (kharijiyyatun assriyyah) and the recent events concerning emaan and*

kufr and ruling by other than what Allah has revealed brought forth from those who have been infected with this methodology.

I will, inshallah, bring those scholars first, who the people infected with kharijiyyah believe that they have clinged to them and their millah of revolt and unrestricted takfeer based off of outward actions. The reason for this is that by them holding on to these scholars is only by way of deception by making the common people believe that their views are actually halaal in the realm of Islam and ahlu-sunnah. So because of this action many have become deceived. Another point is that they take the words of these scholars that have ambiguity in them or have not been explained and use them in their appearent state just as the they do with certain texts only to attribute to them in front of the people they give dawah to that many of the scholars are upon their views and those who don't are actually murj'ee.

chapter 5 [The Issue of Secular Laws](#)

chapter 6 [Takfeer](#)

chapter 7 [Salaah and its relation to emaan and takfeer of its negation or not](#)

chapter 8 [Istihlaal and the Hukaam](#)

chapter 9 [How is Our Attitude Towards the Rulers And the Salaf who performed Khurooj](#)

chapter 10 [Disapproval of the Imaams in speaking and incitement against the Rule](#)

Chapter 11 [What is Clear and Evident Kufr and Ijtihad](#)

chapter 12 [The Conditions for Takfeer](#)

Part 3: Terrorism (Irhaab) and relieving ahlu-sunnah from it and the false claims of the khawaarij of our times

chapter 13 [How the Khawarij understand the verse in Suraah al Ma'idah](#)

chapter 14 [In Defense of the Jordainian Masha'ikh](#)

chapter 15 [Is terror A Part of Islam](#)

chapter 16 [Is Extremism Part of the Religion](#)

chapter 17 [The Rationale of Those who Flung to Revolution](#)

chapter 18 [The Takfeer of Imaam Bin Baz](#)

chapter 19 [The Issue of Politics and its position with regards the people of Islam](#)

chapter 20 [Haakimiyyah \(The Sole Rule of Allah\)](#)

chapter 21 [The Ulema of Takfeer & Revolutions](#)

chapter 22 [We Should Not Call Them Khawarij](#)

chapter 23 *The Madaakhilah*

chapter 24 *Was Sayyid Qutb responsible for Neo Terrorism*

Conclusion

Part 1: Al-Madhaahibu-Bida

Chapter 1 al-Irj'aa

Madhaab al-Murji'a

Irj'aa linguistically has been defined as hoping, postpone, delay which would denote procrastination or to adjourn.

Islamically this term was applied to a group from the muslims in the issue of Uthmaan and Ali, radhiyallahu anhum, in which they did not take a side (in the issue) and so this denoted them as delaying on taking a position. So it was attributed to them that they had irj'aa on the issue. So them, as a group, were the first to become the murj'iah (those who had irj'aa)

In the shari'ah, then irj'aa is a concept, a belief in of itself, which means that actions are not connected to emaan (faith). So for those who held this concept, then this meant for them that actions was completely severed and had absolutely nothing to do with emaan hence a faasiq (sinner), mujrim (criminal, wrongdoer) were equal and on par with the zaahid (abstemious), noble and righteous person. So this meant that the worst muslim ever to exist in the ummah of Muhammad (salallahu alaihi wa salam) would be equal in faith with the best man after the prophet (salallahu alaihi wa salam) who was Abu Bakr as-Sadeeq (radhiyallahu anhu).

There are differing levels of irj'aa from the original murjiah to the jahmiyyah who went further than the murjiah and said the emaan is also restricted and confined to knowledge of Allah and so no one can become kaafir except through ignorance of Allah. So from the words of Ibn Abil-Izz he declared Jahm to be a kaafir and stated that based off of Jahm's own words, since they were the most ignorant about Allah and had no knowledge about Him, he was therefore a kaafir.

So in essence, Irj'aa was the idea of separating amaal (actions) of the limbs to be connected with emaan (faith) in the heart. The lightest off irj'aa was the declaration that emaan consist of faith in the heart and speech of the tongue, which is the position of Imaam Abu Haneefah, and is the only issue where he departed from the rest of the aimah in that it also consists of actions of the limbs.

Later on I will inshallah, contrast this very concept of irj'aa and add it to the takfeeri accusation of what irj'aa is upon ahlu-sunnah and we will see the wide variance between the two and the illmatic oppression of the takfeeris for stating one of the most reprehensible and repugnant slanders against ahlu-sunnah that has emanated from them as of yet.

Alamaah Saalih al-Fawzaan ibn Fawzaan stated

The Murji'ah are of four types:

1: Those who say that eemaan is merely knowledge (ma'rifah), even if this is not accompanied by testification (tasdeeq).

This is the statement of the Jahmiyyah.

This is the most evil and the ugliest of statements. It is in fact disbelief (kufr) in Allah Azza wa Jall, because the mushrikoon from the early times, and Pharaoh (Firawn), and Haamaan and Qaaroon and (even) Iblees all acknowledged (the existence) of Allaah, Azza wa Jall, in their hearts. However because they did not state this on their tongues, nor testify to this in their hearts, nor act upon it with their limbs, then this knowledge did not benefit them.

2: Those who say that eemaan is testification in the heart only.

This is the statement of the Ashaa'irah (the Ash'arees).

This is also a false statement since the disbelievers (kuffaar) testify in their hearts, they know that the Quraan is True and that the Messenger (sal Allaahu alaihi wa sallam) is True, and the Jews and Christians know that.

Those to whom We gave the Scripture (Jews and Christians) recognise him (Muhammad sal Allaahu alaihi wa sallam) as they recognise their sons; but verily, a party of them conceal the truth while they know it – [i.e. the qualities of Muhammad sal Allaahu alaihi wa sallam which are written in the Tawraat and the Injeel]. (Surah Al Baqarah: 146)

And they testify to it in their hearts.

Allaah Ta'aala says regarding the Mushrikoon: We know indeed the grief which their words cause you (O Muhammad sal Allaahu alaihi wa sallam); it is not you that they deny but it is the Ayaat of Allaah that the Dhaalimoon (polytheists and wrongdoers) deny. (Surah Al An'aam: 33)

So these people did not state upon their tongues nor did they act with their limbs, yet they did testify in their hearts – so they did not become people of eemaan (mu'minoon).

3: The statement of those who are the direct opposite of the Ashaa'irah - and they are the Karaamiyah. Those who say that eemaan is statement on the tongue even if the person does not truly believe in his heart.

Without doubt, this is a false statement since the hypocrites (munaafiqoon) – those who are in the lowest depths of the Fire – say “We bear witness that laa ilaaha ill Allaah and that Muhammad rasool ullaah’ with their tongues and they act (accordingly) with their limbs, but they do not truly believe in that nor do they testify to it in their hearts.

This is just as Allaah Ta'aala says: When the hypocrites come to you (O Muhammad sal Allaahu alaihi wa sallam) they say: 'We bear witness that you are indeed the Messenger of Allaah'. And Allaah knows that you are indeed His Messenger and Allaah bears witness that the hypocrites are liars indeed. They have made their oaths a screen (for their hypocrisy). In this way they hinder (men) from the Path of Allaah. Verily, evil is what they used to do. (Surah Al Munaafiqoon: 1-2)

And He says, Subhaanahu wa ta'aala: They say with their tongues what is not in their hearts. (Surah Al Fath: 11)

4: The statement of the murji'ah al fuqahaa, and they are the lightest of the groups in terms of irjaa' - those who say that eemaan is belief (i'tiqaad) in the heart and statement upon the tongue, but action does not enter into it.

[This is the statement of the Murji'ah al-Fuqahaa and this is a statement which is also incorrect since there is no eemaan without action.](#)" Masaa'il fil Eemaan p18, 19

It also becomes necessary to enlighten the reader on the following as later on we will see the claims of people of takfeer in their baseless accusation for the people of the sunnah that they are murji'aa and have irj'aa

Imaam al-Barbaharee has said

[Whoever says that 'eemaan is speech and action, it increases and decreases' has left irj'aa, all of it, both its beginning and its end"](#) Sharhu-Sunnah p.132

Also the Imaam of the Believers **Ahmad Ibn Hanbal** was asked about the one who says 'eemaan increases and decreases' he said ["Such a one is free from Irj'aa"](#) [al-Mukhtaar fi Usoolu-Sunnah of Ibn al-Banna]

Chapter 2 Kharijiyyah

Madhaab of the Khawaarij

Kharaja linguistically means to leave off, to separate from, disassociate or to go out. So this was attributed to the group of Muslims that were with Ali radhiyallahu anhu who were responsible for the death of Uthmaan ibn Affan radhiyallahu anhu. So after their lack of satisfaction with Ali radhiyallahu anhu, then they left him. They separated themselves from the sahabah which will be brought later as more perspective to the bayaan.

Kharajiyyah is not a concept, but rather a belief, which opposes the belief of the sahabah in that they see it permissible to unrestrictedly perform takfeer upon muslims irregardless of whether the conditions for such actions (that warrant takfeer) were met. And this is the position of ahlu-sunnah, but by this view by unanimous agreement, the modern day khawaarij view this particular view of ahlu-sunnah to be of that of the murji'ah. In a way this resembles the views of the haddadiyyah that has occurred in our times in which they view rifq (gentleness) to be nothing but tamyee (to soften or liquefy the truth in order to accommodate the people of innovation). This will be addressed later on inshallah.

So kharijiyyah is to take all the issues pertaining to the rule of Allah and all the texts that pertain to identifying what nullifies or negates emaan in Allah, and making all of it, general and not conditional, to be general and unrestricted for all and anyone who fall into that which they viewed which negated one's Islam. This, in of itself, is an innovated belief not found with the sahabah nor the tabi'een who followed them.

What strengthened this innovated belief in current times is another innovated concept called haakimiyyah which will be discussed later on inshallah.

Conclusion of this is that both of these innovative beliefs and concepts affected one issue, which is the issue of emaan. It is this issue (emaan) that much of what is brought forth is what is discussed.

Here is an excerpt of the Urdunee mashaykh about the khawarij and statements that nullify the accusation of irj'aa.

“Khaarijism is a deviant sect whose position is evil and false and they are outside of the methodology of *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* Even though we do not consider them disbelievers, their apostasy has been narrated by some of the scholars of the Salaf.(1)

1: Although they hold the view of the majority of the salaf of this nation and Ibn Taymiyyah concerning the khawarij not to be kuffar others from the salaf did view them to be as such, and a present day scholar who does view them to be from the khawarij is Alaamah Saalih al-Fawzaan.

In relation to the Murji'ites, they represent the opposite end [of the spectrum]. However, both proceed from the same deviant original principle; [the belief] that *eemaan* is **indivisible**. On the basis of that [corrupt origin] they deviated and formed separate sects. Consequently, any deficiency in [*eemaan*] – according to the Khaarijites – represented disbelief as, in their view, sin totally erases and completely nullifies *eemaan*. This was in contrast to the Murji'ites who held that the existence of any sin would not have a negative effect on *eemaan* by decreasing it; likewise, the existence of any act of obedience would not cause its increase.

The previously mentioned detailed explanation regarding the issue of ruling according to what Allaah revealed is the correct way of the Salaf – and the path of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah*. Whoever deviates from it by going beyond it agrees with the Khaarijites and whoever falls short of it agrees with the Murji'ites.(2)

Regarding the faith of the Khaarijites, **Ibn Taymiyyah said:**

“The proof that the Companions did not declare the Khaarijites disbelievers is that they offered prayers behind them. ‘Abdullaah ibn ‘Umar and other Companions, for example, prayed behind Najdah [ibn ‘Aamir] al-Harooree (d. 686 – leader of the Najdite sect of the Khaarijites). They discussed with them various issues, gave them their opinions on religious matters put to them, and addressed them as a Muslim addresses another Muslim. ‘Abdullaah ibn ‘Abbaas, for example, would answer the questions which Najdah al-Harooree sent to him. Al-Bukhaaree has recorded the *hadeeth* which Najdah has related... This was the practice of Muslims throughout the ages; they did not consider them apostates like those against whom Aboo Bakr declared war. They did this, even though the Prophet (r) had commanded to fight them, as is reported in authentic *hadeeths*. The *hadeeth* reported by Aboo Umaamah and collected by at-Tirmithee that they are the worst people under the sky to be killed and that the men whom they kill are the best men [*Sunan Abu Dawud*, vol. 3, p. 1334, no. 4747 and authenticated in *Saheeh Sunan Abee Daawood*, vol. 3, pp. 903-4, no. 3987]

All of this means that they are more harmful to Muslims than others. And it is true that they have done greater harm to Muslims than the Jews and Christians. They were zealous to kill any Muslim who did not agree with them, since they believed that it was quite lawful for them to take his life and property or kill his children, for he was a *kaafir* in their eyes. They considered it an act of devotion, as they were immersed in ignorance and heresy.” (*Ibn Taymiyyah Expounds on Islam*, p. 555, from *al-Fataawaa*, vol. 3, pp. 354-5)

2: By declaring all Muslims who rule by other than Allaah's law disbelievers, regardless of their circumstances and beliefs, one enters the excesses of the Khaarijites and by denying that Muslims who rule by other than Allaah's law are disbelievers, regardless of their circumstances and beliefs, one enters the pitfall of the Murji'ites. So by this then this denotes that by default there are conditions and fulfilments required by the ruler to carry out and those who have knowledge have to have these conditions in their knowledge by way of judgement in order to arrive to that which is certain in order for any ruling whatsoever to be meted out and implemented.

chapter 3 Emaan

Understanding of Emaan (faith)

Emaan (Faith)

Emaan comprises speech and action. It increases and decreases. The salaf had dealt in depth in this topic and here is what they have laid down.

Al-Hafidh Ibn Hajr said

“So the salaf say ‘emaan is aqeedah in the heart, statement of the tongue, and actions of the limbs.”

Stated by **the Alamaah, al-Muhadith, the Muhaqiq Shaykh AbdulQadr Arna’oot** rahimahullah

“From the `aqeedah (beliefs) of the righteous predecessors is their saying: Eemaan is a saying of the tongue, an action by the limbs and a strong belief in the heart. Eemaan increases with obedience to Allaah and decreases with disobedience to Allaah.

So eemaan in speech is of two types. 1.the speech of the heart and 2. speech of the tongue

Emaan in action is of three types. 1. Actions of the heart, 2. actions of the tongue, and 3. actions of the limbs.

Speech of the tongue is This refers to the tongue's confirmation of what the heart contains. In other words the tongue professes what the heart contains. When a person says with his tongue; "I testify that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah, alone without any partners and I testify that Muhammad is His servant and messenger" then he is confirming what is in his heart. So note how the 'speech of the tongue' still relates to knowledge.

As for speech of the heart then This actually refers to the belief of the heart with respect to Allaah and the other pillars of eemaan (such as the Angels, Books, Messengers, Qadr, the Last Day etc.). In other words it refers to the knowledge that the heart contains and its firm belief in this knowledge. So this would include Tawheed and its two categories of Ruboobiyyah and Asmaa was-Sifaat because both of these are related to knowledge.

As for eemaan of action then the first category is action of the heart. This occurs through feelings of the heart such as love, submission, reliance, hope, fear etc. So the speech of the heart is knowledge and beliefs. So the action of the heart is from an emotional standpoint. Example of this is that one knows (with his heart) that Allah is one. This is

emaan in speech of the heart. And you may find that same person hating the one who uttered speech that opposed this. This action of hating was the action of the heart.

Emaan of actions of the tongue refers to actions like dhikr, making istighfaar, and enjoining the good and forbidding the evil.

Emaan of actions of the limbs comprise of outward actions like performing all that is wajib and abstaining from that which is haraam.

Emaan creases and decreases: Emaan increases with obedience to Allah and performing all the wajibaat, and superogatory, and increases through acts of righteousness, and emaan decreases through acts of disobedience to Allah and doing what is haraam and not performing all the obligatory duties.

Imaam Al-Laalikaa'ee (d. 418H) reports in his Sharh Usool I'tiqaad Ahl is-Sunnah (5/958) that Abdur-Razzaaq (as-San'aanee) said:

"I met sixty two Shaikhs, amongst them were: Ma'mar, al-Awzaa'ee, ath-Thawree, al-Waleed bin Muhammad al-Qurashee, Yazeed ibn as-Saa'ib, Hamaad bin Salamah, Hamaad bin Zaid, Sufyaan bin Uyainah, Shu'ayb bin Harb, Wakee' bin al-Jarraah, Maalik bin Anas, Ibn Abee Laylaa, Isma'eel bin Ayyaash, al-Waleed ibn Muslim and those I have not named, all of them saying: "Faith consists of speech and action, it increases and decreases."

Another report coming from Imaam al-Lalikaa'ee is in his Sharh Usool I'tiqaad Ahl is-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah (5/959) that Uqbah bin Alqamah said: "I asked al-Awzaa'ee about emaan, can it increase? He replied; 'Yes until it becomes like the mountains.' I said: Can it decrease? He said: 'Yes, even until nothing remains of it.'"

Emaan has both an asl (foundation), and furoo (branches)

Stated by the Imaam Muhammad ibn Naasir al-Marwazi that

“And we say: that Emaan has an asl (foundation). If even an atoms weight is removed from it, the appellation of emaan will be removed altogether (i.e. the whole of emaan will be gone). And from whoever this is not removed, the appellation of emaan will remain with him. However, after this it increases, adding emaan on top of his emaan. Then if there is any decrease in what is additional to this foundation (asl), the actual foundation does not decrease, what which is affirmation (iqraar) that Allah is the truth and what He says is the truth. This is because any deficiency with respect to this is actually shakk (doubt which is one of the pillars of kufr al-akbaar and presense of it in the heart negates emaan) about Allah, is He true or not true? And this is like the example of a date palm tree that has branches and leaves. Every time a branch falls form it, the appellation of the “tree” remains for it, however after this decreas it is in a state other than what it was before of perfection, but without its naming changing. It is a tree that is deficient in its branches, and other trees are more perfect than it sicne they are complete. And Alla the Mighty and Majestic said ‘The example of a good word is like a good tree whose foundation is firmly established and whose branches reach up to the heaven’ to the end of the verse.”

So here our salaf had defined the nature of emaan as having both a base (asl) and furoo (branch matters).

The revival of this belief was witnessed in Shaykhul-Islam's words regarding this issue. **Ibn Taymiyyah** said in Majmoo al-Fatwaa (7/324-325)

“However we say that eman has an asl (foundation) and far (branch), and the opposite of emaan is kufr, in every meaning of the word. The foundation of emaan is iqraar (affirmation) and tasdeeq (attestation) and it's far is ikmaal (completion, perfection) of action with the heart and body.

The opposite of iqraar and tasdeeq is kufr in Allah and in what He said, and abandoning tasdeeq in Him in what he said.

And the opposite of emaan that is action- and which is not iqraar- is kufr, but not the kufr in Allah which expels from the religion, but the kufr of the wastage, neglect of the actions (tadyee al-amaal)

Also the Imaam Ibn Mandah stated after mentioning the groups of the murjia, he said “And Ahlu-Sunnah wa Jama'ah said: emaan is all of the acts of obedience, those of the heart, tongue and all of the limbs, and it has a foundation (asl) and a brach (far). Its foundation is knowledge of Allah and attestation (tasdeeq) of Him and of what ever came from Him (revelation) by the heart and the tongue along with submission, love of Him, Fear of Him, reverence of Him and abandoning pride, arrogance and resistance. So if a person brings this foundation, then he has entered into emaan and the name of emaan is applied to him and the rulings of pertaining to it come into effect concerning him. And then such a person cannot have perfected his emaan until he acts upon the branches. And the branches are what are made obligatory upon him, or the avoidance of forbidden matters. [al-Emaan (1/331)]

Again the revered Imaam Muhammad ibn Jareer at-Tabari said in his quotation of the madhaab of ahlu-sunah on emaan

“So some of them said, ‘emaan is the knowledge (marifa) of the heart, affirmation (iqraar) with the tongue, and the action of the limbs. Whoever brought two of these but did not bring a third, then it is not permissible for it to be said about him that he is a believer. (Now check this out) However it is said to him, ‘If the two matters that he brought are the knowledge of the heart and the affirmation of the tongue, and yet he was neglectful in his actions, then he is a muslim’. And some others who hold onto this saying have said ‘If this is the case then we say that he is a believer in Allah and his messenger, but we do not call him a believer in the absolute sense’. And some others who are also upon the same view said, ‘If this is the case then it is said to him ‘Muslim’, and it is not said ‘beleiver’, unless the exception (istithnaa) is made such that it is said, ‘He is a believer if Allah wills’ [Tafseer fi Ma'alimu-deen (188-189)]

Again the revival of this understanding was laid by **al-Albanee** when he said

“What we have understood from the book and the sunnah and the statements of the Imaams from the Sahaba and the Tabi'een and the Imaams who have witnessed them is

that whatever exceeds the actions of the heart and passes it to what it has to do with the actions of the body (amaal), then it is a condition of the completeness and not a condition of it's existence (of emaan)

Now, there has appeared an argument among certain muslims who do not ascribe to this millah of revolt and takfeer, however they criticised the legality of usool and furoo under the banner that this division of the masa'il was the invention of the mutazila and that Shaykhul-Islam has mentioned the baselessness of usool and furoo. Here is the text of Shaykhul-Islam and it shall be analyzed.

لئاسم يه عورف لئاسمو داق ت عالا لئاسم يه لوصل لئاسم : لاق نإف
هبر يار له ملسو هيلع هللا يلىص دمحم يفسان لالعزانتف : هل ليقي . لمعل
يناعم نم ريثك يفو ؟ لصفأ يلع مأ يلع نم لصفأ نامثع نأ يفو ؟ ال مأ
الو ةيملع لئاسم
شخاوف لئاسم
يه : لوصل لئاسم
نم ريثك و ةي عطق لمعل لئاسم نم ريثك : ال ليقي ةي عطق لئاسم لئاسم
روم لئاسم نم وه ةي نط و ةي عطق لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم
نمك هل عطاق لئاسم
ال لجر دنعو . هنم هدارم نقيتو ملسو هيلع هللا يلىص لوسر لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم
هتوبث مدعل و اهاي ص نلا غولب مدعل ةي عطق نوكت نأ نع ال صف ةي نط نوكت
يبن لئاسم
مريثي نوقرح أف تم ان اذ { } : هله ال لاق يذ لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم
هللا يبن ذعيل يلع هللا ردي نئ لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم
ذخ ام درب رحبل او هنم ذخ ام درب رحبل هللا رمأف . ني ملع لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم
اذهف { هل هللا رفغ بر اي كتي شخ لاق ؟ تعنص ام يلع ك لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم
اذ هيلع هللا ردي ال هن او دوعي ال هن انظ لب داعم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم
هل هللا رفغ و ك لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم لئاسم

So, if he said the Usool are the issues of belief and the Furoo are the works, it is said to him: People differed on Muhammad PBUH did he see GOD or not? Or was Uthman better than Ali or the other way around? and in many of the meanings of the Qur'an? or in hadeeths that are debated. All are issues of belief and no one claims Kufr in them. As for the prayer and the fasting and the pilgrimage and making wine haram, leaving them makes one kafir even though they are practical and not belief issues. And if he said: The usool are the things that are Qatii=certain, it was said no for many of the issues of works are Qatii, while many of the issues of knowledge are not. And the Qatii and the Thanii=doubtful for Furoo are additional matters for a particular matter can be Qatii to a person because he had the proof as in he heard it from the prophet and knew the purpose of it, while for another the matter is not even thanni for he had not received the whole statement, or he had no proof of it's authenticity or he could not get the right message from it.

And then there is also the argument that is used to strengthen what Shaykhul-Islam said in light of their understanding about the hadeeth of the man who had his body cremated here is the hadeeth.

If I die then burn me and cut me into pieces and throw me at the sea. Because if GOD was able to get me then HE will torture me torture that no man had seen. So GOD ordered the land and the sea to put the man back together and then GOD asked the man: Why did you do this? The man said I feared you my lord, and GOD forgave him. So here, the man doubted the ability of GOD, but he thought that GOD will not be able to get him and GOD forgave him.

As for Shaykhul-Islam's statement. It must be understood in light of all of his stances taken in this issue to look separate statements that may seem contradictory to what is understood. So here this statement of Ibn taymiyyah contradicts (apparently) what he said about usool and furoo. So one needs to question what was the motive or the issues that was recurring when he was speaking about this.

As for his statement about belief, he was not referring to the usoolu-sittah of aqeedah as we commonly know when we refer to aqeedah. He used the issue in regards to belief "people differed over whether Muihammad saw Allah", and "in the meanings of the quraan (tafseer) and the hadeeths, and whether uthman was better than Ali. These matters do not enter anything of the usoolu-sittah of our way, they are a matter that relates to, but is not a fundamental part. In regards to tafseer it is known how the aimah differed in this regard. However the differing shurooh of many of the versus on are really on different subjects. Although tafseer is one of the fundamentals of Islam, knowing the tafseer of the ayaah about the miraj is not like the level of knowing the tafseer of let say ayaatu-kursi. This is also attested to by other statements of his where he says about the unanimous stance of the believers and the Imaams on certain issues by which there is no khilaaf about.

As for the actions that he was speaking of they are divided into two matters that is being addressed by what we know of his works.

the first is istihlaal

So here it is. Here he says leaving the salaah and the hajja , etc, makes one a kaafir. This is differed upon by other Imaams who said the leaving of salaah is only kufr doona kufr. Yet all of them, including Shaykhul-Islam mentioned that the kufr can only be definite if he believes in his heart that it is halaal (istihlaal) in leaving these matters of the amaal. Example is Gehghis Khan. He believed that Hajj was not waajib even though he received the proof. This according to the explanation of Ibn Taymiyyah and every other muslim that ever existed understood that he became a kaafir due to this one preexisting matter.

The second matter that puts this contradictory statement in line with his established belief is that Ibn Taymiyyah gave his explanation of the hadeeth being used to support this

unintended notion that some of these people received by Ibn Taymiyyah. He says about the hadeeth of the man who had his body cremated

"So this man thought that Allah (ta'ala) would not be able to take hold of him if he did this - so he thought that He would not be able to resurrect him - and **both denying the power of Allah the Most High, and denying the resurrection of the bodies, even if they are dispersed - are Kufr**. But he along with **his belief in Allah and His orders and out of fear of Him - being ignorant of that and astray and mistaken in that thought - then Allah forgave him for that**. And the hadeeth clearly shows that he hoped that Allah would not resurrect him if he did that - **and that is at the very least doubting the Resurrection and that is Kufr if the Prophet proof is established against one who denies and he would then be judged a Kaafir** - and would clearly show his lack of belief in Allah. And those who explain away his saying "If Allah takes hold of me " to mean : "If Allah deals with me harshly" - then this is incorrect and twisting of the words - because he ordered that he be burnt and dispersed in order to avoid being united and resurrected... and if he affirmed Allah's power over him then he would not have done that as it would have been pointless." Majmoo' al-Fataawaa (11/409)

so here, this statement alone repells both the notions of these people who brought up this argument which would seem to be a view of tammayyu or tamyee and repels the false masinations of the heretical takfeeris.

And lastly I would like to bring forth a statement of Ibn Taymiyyah that locks this argument in place from the viewpoint of the people who disregard the concepts of usool and furoo. He said

["And as for whatever a person ascribes to the shariah that is not from it, such as the fabricated ahadeeth, or interpolating \(ta'awwul\) the texts in a way that opposes the desired intent of Allah, and other such things, then this is a form of tabdeel \(altering and or changing\). Thus it is obligatory to differentiate between the revealed legislation \(ash-shar' al-munazzal\), the interpreted legislation \(ash-shar' al-mu'awwal\), and the altered legislation \(ash-shar' al-mubaddal\), just as it is to be differentiated between the creational reality and the commanded religious reality and also between that which the Book and the Sunnah give evidence to and that in which \(a person's\) feelings and impulses are sufficed with"](#) (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 11/265)

Since Ibn Taymiyya was known for his sharpness and keenness of his statements and action, one also must understand that since he had kept these views in mind (about munazzal, mu'awwal and mubaddal) one can easily see that in regards to the argument brought forth by Ibn Taymiyyah in regards to the leaving of usool and furoo that had no basis, it was in reference to either ash-shar' al-mu'awwal or mubaddal, and mostly likely he was keeping in mind the shar of mu'awwal. Example of this is how the mufasssireen differed, as he said, with regard to if Muhammad salallahu alaihi wa salam saw Allah or not, which would fall under mu'awwal but no one differs lets say in the ruling of eating pork, or khammar, or the idle speech and laghw, which would fall under munazzal.

Hence, not understanding the differentiation of this as he noted resulted in certain people who had agreed that the classification of usool and furoo to be invalid.

And lastly if using the excuse that usool and furoo was an innovation of the mutazilah, then the reply to that is that this act of innovation has not, nor has it ever been deemed by any authority in the religion to be bidatun-shar'i. So from this aspect, then this innovation was like the innovation of the quraan being written on a mushaf or the ascription to the salaf, or the development of usool and mustalah of tafseer and hadeeth

chapter 4 Kufr

Understanding of Disbeleif (Kufr)

Kufr is of two types

As for kufr then it is of two types. The first is major kufr and the second is minor kufr.

The following is an extraction from **Ibnul-Qayyim's** Madarij us-Salikin from which he said

“And as for kufr it is of two types:

Kufr akbar (major kufr) and kufr asghar (minor kufr).

So kufr akbar - this necessitates eternity in the Hellfire.

And the (kufr) asghar: Necessitates the fulfilment of the threat (of Hellfire) without eternally abiding in it. As occurs in the saying of the Exalted - and it used to be from what was recited and then it was abrogated :

"And do not detest/hate your fathers, for that is disbelief from you"

and his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) saying in the hadeeth:

"There are two matters in my ummah, by which (my) Ummah falls into kufr: Reviling the genealogy and wailing/lamenting (over the dead)"

And his saying in the Sunan:

"Whoever comes to a women from her anus has disbelieved in what was revealed upon Muhammad" and in another hadeeth: "Whoever comes to a sorcerer or a diviner and believes in what he says has disbelieved in what Allaah revealed upon Muhammad"

and his saying

"Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another".

And this is the explanation of Ibn 'Abbaas and the generality of the Companions regarding the speech of Allaah:

And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers (5:44)

Ibn Abbaas said: "It is not the kufr that takes one out of the religion. Rather when he does it then it is [an act of] disbelief, and he is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah and the Last Day" and **Taawoos** said the same and **Ataa** said: "It is disbelief less than disbelief, oppression less than oppression and rebellion less than rebellion"

And amongst them are those who interpreted the verse to mean the one who abandons the rule of Allaah while opposing and rejecting it (jahidan lahu) and this is the saying of **Ikrimah!** And this is a defective saying, since just the mere denial (juhud) of it is disbelief, regardless of whether he ruled by it or not. (3)

And amongst them are those who explained it to mean abandoning ruling by all of what Allaah revealed, he said, and who enters into this the judgement of Tawhid and Islam! This is the interpretation of Abdul-Aziz al-Kinani, and this too is far from what is correct!! Since the threat (contained in the verse) is for the negation of ruling by the revealed legislation, and this can apply to abandoning all of the legislation or just some of it.

And amongst them are those who explained it to mean to rule in opposition to the text, deliberately, without being ignorant of it and nor due to error in understanding or interpreting it. Al-Baghawee quoted this from the scholars generally.

3: This should be ample proof right here that rebellion should not occur even if the common people believed the ruler to be a kaafir. That is because if it was the correct methodology to incur a rebellion by judging the outside actions of the ruler in not ruling by the rule of Allah, then the opposite of this would also have to apply in that if the ruler does rule by the rule of Allah and indeed it is known that this was not his desire and denied it with his heart, then his condition is the same as the first in that rebelling him would be obligatory and his removal of power would be as such according to this methodology.

And amongst them are those explained to refer to the Ahl ul-Kitaab. And this is the saying of **Qataadah, Dahhaak** and others. And this is far (from what is correct) - and it is in opposition to the apparent wording - so it is not to be inclined towards.

And amongst them are those who explained it to mean the kufr that takes one out of the religion!

And what is correct is that judging by other than what Allaah has revealed is both types of kufr (disbelief) - kufr asghar (the minor disbelief) and kufr akbar (the major disbelief) - **and [which of the two it is] depends on the condition of the ruler. If he believes in the obligation of judging by what Allaah has revealed in this situation but turned away from it out of disobedience - and while acknowledging that he is deserving of punishment then this is kufr asghar (4).** And if he (i'taqada) believes that it is not obligatory and that he has a choice in the matter, along with his firm belief that it is the judgement of Allaah - then this is kufr akbar - and if he was ignorant in the matter or made an error then he is one who errs (mukhtee') and his ruling is as the same for those who err (i.e. one reward).

And the intent here is: That sins, all of them are of the minor form of kufr (kufr asghar). For they are the opposite of gratefulness - which is to act in obedience to Allaah. And the striving (of a person), either it constitutes gratefulness (shukr) or disbelief (kufr), or a third matter which is neither this or that (i.e. gratefulness or disbelief), and Allaah knows best.

Another point of weight and importance in this matter is that which is derived from certain hadeeths (5) which is Leave that which makes you doubt for that which doesn't make you doubt."(Saheeh Sunan an-Nasaa'ee, vol. 3, p. 525, no. 5727.) So that which is applied from this issue is that "what has been established by certainty can only have it removed by certainty" which would only denote that "Whoever's Islam is established by certainty, can only have it removed with certainty"

4: So here Ibnul-Qayyim demonstrates his position by saying that if the ruler *believes* (and this is *emaan* of the heart in knowledge and if he professes it with his tongue, then it would be *emaan* in the heart of action, regardless if he does not act with it from the limbs) which only shows that this denotes that the ruler himself who fell under this is not a kaafir even though this is kufr asghaar. And this is the main view of ahlu-sunnah wal-jam'ah, unfortunately, those who took the madhaab of the khawarij have viewed this to be irj-aa which automatically makes the claim nullified since the source view is from that which is incorrect.

5: this is what has strength in this area since this issue is dealing specifically in reference to a person's Islam in which the right of defense should be met out until the time of the revealing (of that which is most certain and clear: meaning that it has been undebatably proven that the one in question is indeed a kaafir).

Below is an extract from a very serious knowledge based discussion put forth by al-Urdoonee mashaykh from which the treatise itself received much praise and agreement from all of the ulema of the mamlika of saoodiyyah.

It was stated

“Not every statement or act described by texts as *kufr* (disbelief) is major disbelief which ejects one out of the fold of Islaam, as there are two types of disbelief: minor and major. Thus the ruling on these statements and deeds should only be according to the methodology of the scholars of *Ahlu-Sunnah* and their rules.

It is not permissible to pass the judgment of disbelief on any Muslim except those whose disbelief is clearly and explicitly indicated by the Qur’aan and the Sunnah. Doubts and suspicions are not sufficient in this matter.

There may exist in the Qur’aan and Sunnah texts which may be understood to mean that certain statements, acts or beliefs are equivalent to disbelief. However, no one specifically can be declared a disbeliever unless clear evidence is presented to him: by fulfilling the conditions of knowledge, intent and choice and removal of obstacles which are the opposite of these.”

So to clarify the last matter it was brought forth that even the obstacle have to be removed in which the following was stated in explanation of above, “Ignorance, accident and force are excuses mentioned in the Sunnah: “Error, forgetfulness and what is forced are removed as sins from my nation.” (*Sahih Al-Bukhari*, vol.7, p.147, no.194) (6)

6: As for this then, what should be noted is that many things from a political standpoint can happen suddenly and unimaginably since the emergence of political espionage and deception is not only rampant, but an actual pillar or foundation for kuffaric imperialism. Much of this is known from both muslims and non muslim, but the scope of how great it is, is to great to even imagine and summarize. And so for this then a tactic used by the kuffar is in imaginary subordainance from their non allies and from the muslim perspective “their enemies”. And what can be imagined is that which results in submission to their ways and certain laws that must be obeyed by countries outside of their territory. The focus of this is that in current times it is easy for the kuffar to adopt tactics of submission and dominance from their counterparts and these countries cannot escape whatsoever either due to power (not enough), low income, arms, etc. So especially in these times it should not be excluded from the mind of the muslim who claims Islam that there can be indeed a ruler in any one of our countries secretly withheld to foreign dominance of the kuffar and any opposition could possibly bring more chaos and havoc to the already shocked and dismantled Muslim world today. And if this is not realized by the ummah then Allah’s refuge is sought

Imaam 'Abdul Lateef Ibn 'Abdur Rahman Ibn Hasan aalush-Shaykh:

"Disbelief is of two types: disbelief in action and disbelief in obstinancy and denial. It - that is disbelief in denial - is to disbelieve in what the Messenger (*sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) is known to have come with from Allaah by denying it and obstinantly refusing it, whether it concerns the Names of the Lord of His Attributes and His Actions and His Rulings whose origin is His *Tawheed*, and the worship of Him alone without any associate with Him." *Usool Wa Dawaabit Fit-Takfeer* (p. 36)

Al-Amaal (the actions: of the limbs)

Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali, rahimahullah, said in explanation of the prophet, salallahu alaihi wa salam, "And then a group of people will be taken out from the fire who had not done any good whatsoever", he said, 'And what is meant by his saying, 'who had not done any good whatsoever' is the actions of the limbs, even though they have the foundation (asl) of tawheed with them" and it was said by him again "this proves that those whom Allah will remove through his mercy, without any intercession from anybody else from the creation, are the people of tawheed who had not done a single deed of goodness with their limbs" in at-Takhweek Min an-Naar)

Shaykhul-Islam in Majmua al-Fatwa says concerning this issue

"However we say that emaan has an asl (foundation) and far (branch), and the opposite of emaan is kufr, in every meaning of the word. The foundation of emaan is iqraar (affirmation) and tasdeeq (attestation) and it's far is ikmaal (completion, perfection) of action with the heart and body.

The opposite of iqraar and tasdeeq is kufr in Allah and in what He said, and abandoning tasdeeq in Him in what he said.

And the opposite of emaan that is action- and which is not iqraar- is kufr, but not the kufr in Allah which expels from the religion, but the kufr of the wastage, neglect of the actions (tadyee al-amaal)

It is clear here, that all actions, whether by heart or by body is apparently the furoo or the branch matters of emaan and kufr and is not the base foundation for emaan. And the utterance of this is not tantamount to irj'aa nor does it come close to it.

It is strange how Shaykhul-Islam stated exactly what Imaam al-Albanee stated concerning emaan yet, the khawarij in our era who accuse him of irj'aa do not accuse Ibn taymiyyah for stating the exact same usool. Compare the following of Muhamamd Naasiru-Deen al-Albanee with what Shaykhul-Islam has said about emaan and its relation to amaal

Shaykhul-Islam Naasiru-Deen al-Albanee said

“What we have understood from the book and the sunnah and the statements of the Imaams from the Sahaba and the Tabi’een and the Imaams who have witnessed them is that whatever exceeds the actions of the heart and passes it to what it has to do with the actions of the body (amaal), then it is a condition of the completeness and not a condition of it’s existence (of emaan)

Not much is stated here in this subject for the fact that even the opposer would accept this. This is because the point of the matter is in trying to make plain the reality that some people just simply don’t meet the criteria for anyone to justify the absence of imaan. So the difference is in kaafir or not. The opposer and user of hawaa says kaafir, absolutely without any tafsil in it whatsoever. Ahlu-sunnah say, no, until all the necessary conditions are met, so by this condition is how they charge ahlu-sunnah with irj’aa which will be clarified later on inshallah.

Part 2: The Imaams and Scholars regarding Takfeer and the issue of Secular Laws and the ruling on the hukaam

chapter 5 The Issue of Secular Laws

I have also added the statements of the same Imaams regarding the issue of ruling by secular laws and contrasted them with their (the Imaams) beliefs in the issue of emaan and kufr to lock in place what was general which the takfeeris of the era have used to promote in the general sense and left off the clear stances of the scholars concerning emaan and kufr

- **Shaykh Abdul-Azeez ar-Rajihee** was asked the following

“This person asks about the shari’ah ruling concerning the ruler who rules by French secular laws alongside the knowledge that he claims Islam, Salaah, Saum, and makes Hajj. So what is to be said about him”

the Shaykh Answers *“When he believes in (their) permissibility (al-I’tiqaadul-jawaaz), when he believes that the judgement by the french laws is permissible, then he is a kaffir. When he believes that it is permissible for him (to do that).*

As for when he does not believe this, or he has doubt, then it is necessary for the proof to be established against him.

And some of the people of knowledge have held that when he alters the religion in all of the affairs of the state, then he is a kaafir, because he has changed the religion, and al-Hafidh Ibn Katheer rahimahullah has gone to this in his tafseer, and also Shaykh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem rahimahullah, in his treatise ‘Tahkeemul-Qaaaneen’. So when he changes the religion, the whole of it, from head to heal, in all of the affairs of the state, in everything, not part of it, then he is a kaafir, because he has altered the religion.

And then some others have said that is it necessary for the proof to be established against him, for he could be ignorant or have some doubt. Our respected Shaykh Abdul-Azeez Bin Baz rahimahullah chose this view.”

- **Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibraheem aalu-Shaykh-** said concerning secular laws

"... The fifth, and it is the greatest and the most encompassing and the clearest opposition of the Shari'ah and stubbornness in the face of its laws and insulting to Allah and His Messenger and opposing the courts of the Shari'ah on their roots and branches and their types and their appearances and judgements and implementations the references and their applications. So just like the courts of the Shari'ah there are references, all of them returning back to the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger like that, these courts have references, which are laws that are assembled from many legislations and

laws like the laws of France and America and England and other laws and from the *Metha'hib* of some of the innovators who claim to be under the Shari'ah.

And these courts are now fully operational in the settlements of Islaam, people entering them one after another, their rulers judge upon them with what opposes the Sunnah and the Book with the rules of that law and they impose that on them and approve it for them. So what Kufr is there beyond this Kufr and what nullification of the *Shahaadah* of *Muhammadar Rasool-Allah* is there beyond this nullification?!

– "Tah'keem Al-Qawaneen"

Exoneration and clarity upon our shaykh is a must for us since he was one of the main scholars who those who opposed the methodology laid down in this risalaa actually hijacked his words to mean that which he did not intend in order to justify the incorrect position they have concerning takfeer and revolt.

This is the saying from the Shaykh in a fatwa he gave puts everything in its correct context fatwa (1/80) 9/1/1385 hijrah
Then, the Imaam, the fountain of Knowledge Muhamamd ibn Ibraheem has clarified this issue above with the following

“And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of ‘Muhammad is the messenger of Allah’ is by judging to his shari’ah and confining oneself to that while rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allah sent no authority. And the one who judges by them (secular laws) or refers to them for judgment while believing in the correctness of that or the permissibility in it, then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that without belief in their correctness and regarding it permissible to judge by them, then he is a kaafir with the kufr of action, which does not eject from the religion” [Fatwa 1/80] 1385 hijri

Subhaanallah. So by this fatwa from him then is this a statement of irj’aa? No. It is what all the imams were upon. Anything less than this would be falling into irj’aa and any more to this or changing the intent to be specific to all rulers and applying the ayah and statements to be general without tafseel is to fall into kharijiyyah.

However, if that is insufficient to clearly lay down is stance laid out in this risala, then here is another burhan by which only the lame could possibly deny

الله هُم حَر - مَرِي هَارِبًا نَب دَم حَم خِي ش ل ل ا ق و : -

هَي ل ع ه ل ل ا ي ل ص ه ل و س ر ة ن س و ي ل ا ع ت ه ل ل ا ب ا ت ك ا ه ر و ت س د ة ي ع ر ش ه ل ل ا د م ح ب ا ن ت م ر و ك ح ف " م ل س و ه ب ح ص و ه ل ا ي ل ع و "

Our goverment , all praise is due to Allah judges by the constitution of the book of Allah the Most High and the sunnah of the prophet (salallahu alaihi wa ala alihi wa sahabihi wa salam)

(12/341) مرېه ارب | نب دمحم خي ش ل ا ي و ات ف

Imaam Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem clearly did not view the king of his time to be kaafir, whom the takfeeris view to be so and ignoantly use him as a proof for their position.

Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan exonerates the Shaykh Muhmmad ibn Ibraheem in the following.

It was asked “Someone has understood from your words in ‘Kitaabu-Tawheed’, which are your comments, with regards to the issue of al-Haakimiyyah and ruling by other than what Allah had revealed. So they have understood from them (his words) that (by the act alone) you perform specific takfeer of a specific ruler who does not judge by what Allah has revealed. And then they applied (this understanding) to the rulers of the gulf states’

So the first action emanating from the shaykh was that he laughs. So he says ‘It is due to hawaa....words unclear, there is no ambiguity in themwords unclear. The distinction that is mentioned (in the beginning of that chapter) relates to them (gulf rulers). And it was then said after that, that the one who banishes the shari’ah **entirely** and puts another law in it’s place, that this indicates that he views the secular law to be better than the shari’ah, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir (emphasis given). This is in the same book itself, however they (these people upon he millah of revolt and takfeer) only take according to their own understanding of it and what is of benefit to them, yet they abandon the rest of the words. If they had read the words from the beginning, the matter would have been clear (to them).

So it was asked ‘And the statement of Shaykh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is (understood) in the same way?’

Shaykh Fawzaan said “yes, it is the same. His words mean that the one who abolishes the shari’ah and puts in its place another law, then this indicates that he considers this law to be better than the shari’ah. And whoever considers this law to be better than the shari’ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.”

So here is the speech of the people of takfeer and revolt as they use the proofs of Ibn taymiyyah in his speech regarding the unjustified millah that they are upon. So he said

"And it is known by necessity in the Deen of the Muslims and by the agreement of all the Muslims that whoever follows a Shari'ah other than the Shari'ah of Muhammad then he is a disbeliever in some of the Book. “Kaafir” and it is like the Kufr of the one who believes in some of the Book and and disbelieves in some of the Book."

–"Majmoo al-Fataawa", Vol. 28/ 524

So the Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah says in Majmoo Fatawaa (7/324-325)

“However we say that eman has an asl (foundation) and far (branch), and the opposite of emaan is kufr, in every meaning of the word. The foundation of emaan is iqraar (affirmation) and tasdeeq (attestation) and it’s far is ikmaal (completion, perfection) of action with the heart and body.

The opposite of iqraar and tasdeeq is kufr in Allah and in what He said, and abandoning tasdeeq in Him in what he said.(1)

He also says regarding the issue of the hukaam the following which is very important as **al-Izz** noted the mandation of this knowledge on every muslim so he says

"When a person makes *halaal* something that is agreed upon to be prohibited or he prohibits something that is agreed upon to be *halaal* or when he alters the Revealed Law that is agreed upon, he becomes an apostate disbeliever by agreement of the *fuqahaa*. The likes of this has been revealed in His statement...

"And whoever does not rule by what Allaah revealed, then these are the disbelievers." [Sooratul Maa`idah 5:44]

That is to say that he makes ruling by other than what Allaah revealed *halaal*." *Mujmal I'tqaadus Salaf* (3/267)

Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah also said:

"There is nothing wrong in holding that whoever does not believe in the obligation of ruling by what Allaah revealed upon His Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) to be a disbeliever. So whoever holds it *halaal* to rule between the people by what he sees as justice without following what Allaah revealed, then he is a disbeliever..."

He has also noted that:

"So many of the people accept Islaam, but despite this they do not rule except by the customs of their neighbours who command them to follow. **So if they know that it is not permissible to rule except by that which Allaah revealed, then they are not bound to that** (meaning bound to the previous usool of takfeer of the one who rules by other than what Allah revealed). **Rather if they make it *halaal* to rule by other than what Allaah revealed, then they are disbelievers, except if they are ignorant like those whose case has preceded.**" *Minhaajus Sunnah* (5/131)

Imaam Ibn Abil 'Izz al-Hanafee said:

"So here is a matter that is obligatory to comprehend, and it is that the rule by other than what Allaah revealed can be disbelief that expels one from the Religion and it can be a sin: major or minor. It can be disbelief that is either figurative or minor disbelief and that is according to the condition of the ruler. So if he believes that Ruling by what Allaah revealed is not obligatory or that he has an option in it or if he undervalues it along with certainty that it is the rule of Allaah, then this is major disbelief.

If he believes in the obligation of ruling by what Allaah revealed and he knows of it in this event, but he forgoes it - along with knowledge that it is worthy of being

implemented - then he is a sinner and he is called a disbeliever with figurative disbelief, or with minor disbelief." Sharhul 'Aqeedatit-Tahaawiyyah (p. 323-324)

Imaam al-Qurtubee said in his *tafseer*:

"Ibn 'Abbaas and Mujaahid said: 'Whoever does not judge by what Allaah revealed in rejection of the *Qur`aan*, and in denial of the statement of the Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*), then he is a disbeliever". This statement is taken from *al-Jaami' li Ahkaamul Qur`aan* (6/188)

'Allaamah Muhammad al-Ameen ash-Shanqeetee commented upon this statement of Imaam al-Qurtubee:

"So disbelief is either disbelief less than disbelief (*kufr doona kufr*), or it can be that one sees it to be permissible or he intends to deny the Judgements of Allaah and reject them despite knowledge of them. As for the one who rules by other than what Allaah revealed and he knows that it is a crime, and that the one who does it is impudent - and he only does it due to his desires - then he is from those Muslims who sin."

Then he said:

"Know that the liberating position in this research is that... whoever does not rule by what Allaah revealed in opposition to the Messengers, and he has nullified the Judgements of Allaah, then his transgression and his corruption and his disbelief - all of it - is disbelief that takes one out of the Religion. Whoever does not rule by what Allaah revealed, believing that he is perpetrating a prohibited action, the doer of which is foul - then his disbelief and his transgression and his corruption does not take him outside the Religion." *Adwaa`ul Bayaan* (2/104)

Ibn al-Arabi al-Malikee said

"If he rules with (the rules he brought from himself) holding that they are from Allah, then that is tabdeel of the rule of Allah and necessitates kufr and if he ruled by them due to a desire and out of obedience, then that is a sin and upon the principle of ahlu-sunah regarding the forgiveness of the sinners, he will be able to reach forgiveness" (*Ahkaam ul-Quraan* 2/642)

Shaykhul Islaam Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul Wahhaab said:

"We do not declare a person to be a disbeliever, except by what all of the scholars have gathered upon, and it is the two testimonies (*shahaadataan*)." *Durarus-Sunniyyah* (1/70)

al-Imaam 'Abdul Lateef Ibn 'Abdur Rahman Ibn Hasan aalush-Shaykh said:

"So the Shaykh ('Abdul Wahhaab) - may Allaah have mercy upon - did not declare a person to be a disbeliever except one who disbelieved in Allaah and His Messenger; and the *Ummah* is united upon this *takfeer*." *Usool Wa Dawaabit Fit-Takfeer* (p. 15)

Imaam Abdur-Rahman Bin Naasr as-S'adi said

"So ruling by other than what Allaah revealed is from the actions of the people of disbelief and it can be disbelief that expels one from the Religion (and here is the condition) if one believes that it is *halaal*." Tayseeru-Kareemu-Rahman

Again **al-Imaam Shaykhul-Islam Muhamamd ibn Abdul-Wahhab** was asked regarding takfeer

He was asked concerning that for which he fights, and upon what does he make takfeer of a person. He replied

"The 5 pillars of Islam. The first of them (by which he disbelieves) is the two testimonies of faith, then the remaining four pillars. However, if he affirms their obligation but abandons them out of neglect, then even though we fight him in order to make him act upon them, we do not declare him being a disbeliever by mere abandonment of them. The scholars have differed about the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer out of laziness, without willful denial, juhood. So we do not perform takfeer on account of anything except what all of the scholars united upon, and that is the two testimonies of faith. [ad-Durar as-Sunniyyah 1/102]

Imaam Ibnul Jawzee said:

"The decisive speech is that whoever does not rule by what Allaah revealed in denial of it and he knows that Allaah revealed it - as the Jews did - then he is a disbeliever. **Whoever does not rule by it due to an inclination towards his desires - without denial of it - then he is a transgressor and a sinner.**" *Zaadul Maseer* (2/366)

Shaikh Muhammad al-Ghunaymaan was asked:

"The one who leaves the Hukm by what Allah revealed; if he makes the general judgements with the fabricated laws, does he disbelieve? And is there a difference between that and the one who judges with the Shari'ah but then he opposes the Shari'ah in some of the matters due to desire or bribery or other than that?"

So he answered, "Yes, it is *Waajib* to differentiate between them. There is a difference between the one who throws away the Hukm of Allah, *jala-wa'ala* and replaces it with the judgements with the laws and the judgement of mankind. This is Kufr, which takes one outside the Milla of Islaam. But the one who is *Multazim* (i. e. religiously committed) upon the Deen of Islaam except that he is disobedient and a *Thaalim* by following his desires in some of the *Ah'kaam* and goes after a benefit from the Dunya, while accepting that he is *Thaalim* with this, then this is not Kufr, which takes you out of the Milla. And whoever sees the Hukm with the laws to be equal to the Hukm of the Shara' and makes it Halaal, then he also disbelieves with the Kufr that takes one outside the Milla, even if it is in one instance."

- "Mujaalit Al-Mishkaat", Vol. 4/ 247

Al-Imaamu-Haafidh Ibn Hazm al-Andaloosee, the one strong against the murji'aa, and one who is not murji stated

He (the Messenger) did not declare a kaafir one who abandoned action, but he declared a kaafir the one who abandoned the kalima (testimony of faith). This is because the Messenger of Allah salallahu alaihi wa salam made the judgement of kufr upon the one who refused to make the saying (testimony), even if he knew of its correctness in his heart. And he also judged that the one who knew with his heart and pronounced with the tongue to be removed from the fire, even if he did not do a single deed of goodness” [as-Durrah Fima Yajib Itiqaaduhu (337)]

Likewise the Imaam of the Sunnah al-Haafidh Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali stated in explanation of the saying of the Messenger of Allah “**And then a group of people will be taken out from the fire who had not done any good whatsoever**’, so he said ‘And what is meant by his saying, ‘who had not done any good whatsoever’ is the actions of the limbs, even though they have the foundation (asl) of tawheed with them” [at-Takhweef Min an-Naar (255)]

al-Haafidh Ibnul-Qayyim al-Jauziyyah said about emaan and kufr

And what is correct is that judging by other than what Allaah has revealed is both types of kufr (disbelief) - kufr asghar (the minor disbelief) and kufr akbar (the major disbelief) - **and [which of the two it is] depends on the condition of the ruler. If he believes in the obligation of judging by what Allaah has revealed in this situation but turned away from it out of disobedience - and while acknowledging that he is deserving of punishment then this is kufr asghar**. And if he (i'taqada) believes that it is not obligatory and that he has a choice in the matter, along with his firm belief that it is the judgement of Allaah - then this is kufr akbar - and if he was ignorant in the matter or made an error then he is one who errs (mukhtee') and his ruling is as the same for those who err (i.e. one reward).

And the intent here is: That sins, all of them are of the minor form of kufr (kufr asghar). For they are the opposite of gratefulness - which is to act in obedience to Allaah. And the striving (of a person), either it constitutes gratefulness (shukr) or disbelief (kufr), or a third matter which is neither this or that (i.e gratefulness or disbelief), and Allaah knows best.

Al-'Allaamah Muhammad Rasheed Ridhaa said about the *ayaatul hukm*:

"As for its apparent sense, then no one from the famous *Imaams* of *fiqh* ever spoke of it, rather not a single person ever spoke of it. So verily its apparent sense represents anyone who has ruled by other than what Allaah revealed, regardless of the rule that was other than what Allaah revealed. This does not make anyone from among the Muslims a disbeliever... *Tafseerul Manaar* (6/604)

It is clear from the above that these Imaam have clarified that the abandonment of actions does not constitute kufr that negates emaan in the heart, as they understood perfectly well the principle that emaan has an asl and furoo, and the action of the limbs are form the furoo matters of emaan and not its asl.

Compare, oh reader, these statements of the wise Imaams, those who have not been infected with irj'aa and then compare this to the statement of the miskeen asghaar named Faalih bin Naafi al-Harbi, the deviant who left the manhaj in jarh and t'adeel and in this issue of emaan and kufr in which a phone call from the brothers at sahab.net took place whereby this fallen shaykh Faalih had said the following

“the belief that the one who leaves all actions of the limbs is still muslim is the kalaam of the murji;ah!!!!”

Masakeen wallahi masakeen

I am not at all surprised, as the Imaam of the sunnah has spoke in the matter by which he clarified that the khawarij tend to this accusation against ahlu-sunnah wal jama'ah.

It is to clear, and to open for there to even be an opposition to the previous statements of the Imaams and scholars of the sunnah regarding this issue about the reality of kufr inherent upon the doer of it. It is clear in light of the above that all the Imaams that have spoken understood the reality that kufr that is committed by the one who ruled by other than what Allah has revealed must be in the realm of itiqaad (believed in) by the one in question in order for the warrant of takfeer to be issued upon such a one. Anything that falls short of his understanding does not lead to the warrant of takfeer on the rulers, nor is it based on the beliefs of the salaf, nor is it the prophetic manhaj.

The amazing matter regarding this is that these people, those infected with this heresy do not consider the very statements of the scholars that they follow who had refuted the very beliefs they hold regarding the takfeer of the rulers, to be irj'aa, ySet the affirmer of this creed among the commoners and certain scholars they attribute irj'aa to them, and the worst of their affair is that they accuse them with an irj'aa which is worse than the ijr'aa of Jahm ibn Safwaan.

chapter 6 Takfeer

Masaa'il (issues) pertaining to takfeer (excommunication: excommunicating muslims to be non muslims) and its proper interpretation and implementaion

In the topic of this chapter, takfeer, there are two positions regarding it. As for the first, is unrestricted takfeer and the second is conditional takfeer. So takfeer in Islam is something that is established and practiced and is known to ahlu-sunnah that this arena or affair is left to those of ahlu-ilm or the people of knowledge and hadeeth. Those who hold this methodology base their proofs from the imams of the salaf, the sahaba, and the present day scholars who follow their way. This methodology, unfortunately, is not taken or even considered a sunnah and believed as a bida for those who hold the other path which is unrestricted takfeer. In the sense of unrestricted takfeer, then what ahlu-sunnah mean by this is takfeer of the rulers. This is because there is really little to no deviation between ahlu-sunnah and the present day people of takfeer until the issue of the rulers come up. It is from this standpoint that the people of takfeer and revolt hold no principles of takfeer concerning the rulers whereas ahlu-sunnah does have conditions for such an important matter of the religion.

So as for describing both types then first is unrestricted takfeer. And in this there is not much to explain (since it is unconditional) except that when it comes to the rulers then if they do not rule by what Allah has revealed in totality and abolish some parts of the shariah or replace it or add on even one law outside of the shariah then they are disbelievers in truth outside the fold of Islam and there is no ikhtilaaf in this and the one who holds that there is conditions to it is a murji. Basically they hold this to be major kufr and minor kufr is not in this topic.

However, here are the statements of the aimah of this nation of ahlu-sunnah that such a belief is not to be the way of the salaf in this regard and such a belief actually coincided with the belief of the khawarij of the days of old.

Imaam Abu Ja'afar at-Tahaawee said in *Mushkilul Aathaar* (4/228)

"No man can be a disbeliever when he is a Muslim and submits to and confesses Islaam. So likewise, his apostasy does not come about except by denial of Islaam."

What the Imaam Abu Jaffar at-Tahawee has affirmed as is known to the ulema in regards to fiqh is that "whatever was established by certainty can only be removed by certainty".

And this is why we find the ulema like Shaykh Hussein Alauwaish, Shaykh Saleem, and Shaykh Ali al-Halabee stating in their bayaan in the issue of disbelief where they said

“It is not permissible to pass the judgment of disbelief on any Muslim except those whose disbelief is clearly and explicitly indicated by the Qur’aan and the Sunnah. Doubts and suspicions are not sufficient in this matter.

There may exist in the Qur’aan and Sunnah texts which may be understood to mean that certain statements, acts or beliefs are equivalent to disbelief. However, no one specifically can be declared a disbeliever unless clear evidence is presented to him: by fulfilling the conditions of knowledge, intent and choice and removal of obstacles which are the opposite of these.”

So to clarify the last matter it was brought forth that even the obstacle have to be removed in which the following was stated in explanation of above, “Ignorance, accident and force are excuses mentioned in the Sunnah: “Error, forgetfulness and what is forced are removed as sins from my nation.” (*Sahih Al-Bukhari*, vol.7, p.147, no.194) (6)”

Imaam Abu Hayyaan al-Andaloosee described the way of the *Khawaarij* concerning the *aayatul hukm* when he said:

"So the *Khawaarij* seek to prove with this *aayah* that everyone who disobeys Allaah is a disbeliever! They say: 'It is a text showing that everyone who does not rule by what Allaah revealed is a disbeliever and everyone who sins, indeed he rules by other than what Allaah revealed. So it is incumbent that he be a disbeliever.'" [*Bahr al-Muheet* (3/493)]

Takfeer does not come from the avenue of opinion, emotions, or ones reasoning

This issue in and of itself does not constitute a large proportion of the methodology of those who taken the path of takfeer, as they tend to use ayah and hadeth to justify their takfeer, no matter how general and non specific in nature these texts are. So I will limit my evidence on this to a few passages just in case there are some remnants of people among this group of muslims who tend to this notion of takfeer can be done on the grounds of the above (emotion, reasoning and opinion)

The principle with ahlu-sunnah is “No one is declared a kafir except those who have been declared such by Allah and His Messenger (S).

In meaning, this principle is that kufr, the negation of emaan, only lies in that which Allah has clarified in his book to what indicates disbelief, and what His Messenger have

described as disbelief. So whoever falls into them, and believes in them after apparent clarification regarding whatever issue in question, then, and only then, does the warrant of takfeer actually take affect upon the one in question. From this aspect there are two people who deviate concerning this

1. The people of the negation of takfeer. Such a people totally negate the concept of takfeer to the point that there is no takfeer upon the one whom takfeer is ought to be pronounced at. This is represented as the irj'aa of the Jahmiyyah, but is not stated in principle by these people. This people are existent in our times and they are few in number and have no one from ahlul-ilm that supports their view. This is because there is no basis for their idea. To them, the issues of shirk and kufr that a muslim does fall into as was revealed by the two sources that negate iman are matters that they reject due to their rejection of the performance of takfeer in the absolute sense. However these people are not the ones in question in this risalaah.
2. The people of Takfeer. Not only do they accept the implications of disbelief in the quraan and sunnah, they fall into two errors concerning this.
 - A. they rely on general statements of Allah and his messenger and the general statements made by the salaf and the Imaams to support their specific stances of rebellion against the rulers and the takfeer of them and the takfeer those who do not perform the takfeer with them.
 - B. The second error is their also relying on their preconceived notions of the actions that emanate from the rulers and certain muslims and their reasoning behind what they hold to be an action that negates islam like the kaba'ir (major sins)

And so we have the statements of the Imaams to clarify

Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said:

"This is the opposite of what some people say, like Abu Ishaq al-Isfaraaynee and those who follow him; they say, 'We do not make takfeer of anyone except for those who make takfeer of us' But labelling one with disbelief is not their right, it is Allah's right. People do not have the right to lie about those who lie about them, nor to commit fornication with the women of those who have committed fornication with their women. Even if a man is raped by another man he doesn't have the right to rape him in retaliation... because these are offenses against Allah (T). Even if a Christian slanders our Prophet (S), it is not allowed for us to slander al-Masih, and if the Rawafid [make takfeer of Abu Bakr and Umar, it is not right for us to make takfeer of 'Ali ...](#)" Manhaj as-Sunnah 5:244

In another place he said:

"Similarly, the people of knowledge and the Sunnah do not make takfeer of those who oppose them even if their opposition comes in the form of takfeer of them, for one's disbelief is determined by the shari'ah. People do not have the right to punish with it as revenge. Just like if someone lies about you or fornicates with your women, it is not your

right to lie about him and fornicate with his wife, because lying and fornication is among the forbidden things, due to Allah's right to determine them as such, and similarly takfeer is Allah's right, so takfeer is not applied to one unless it was applied to him by Allah or His Messenger (S)" Ar-Radd 'alal al-Bakri p.257

Al-Qurafi said:

"A matter is not determined to be kufr by reason, rather it is a legislated matter of the shari'ah. So if the shari'ah says about a matter, 'It is kufr' then it is kufr, and it is the same whether it is a thing written or stated." Tahtheeb al-Furuuq 4:158

Al Imaam al-Ghazali said:

"Kufr is a shari'ah ruling like enslavement and freedom etc. It makes blood lawful and warrants eternity in the Fire. It is determined by the shari'ah so its realization is either by a text, or by qiyaas concluding from what occurred in the texts." Faysal at-Tafriqah bayn ul- Islam wa-Zinadiqah 128.

Ibn al-Wazir said:

"Takfeer is based purely upon what has been revealed, there is no room for the use of reason in determining it, and the evidences for kufr can be established only by revelation alone, and there is no dispute over this" A1-Awasim wal-Qawasim 4:178.

Shaykh al-Alamaah Muhammad ibnu-Saalih Ibn 'Uthaymin was asked the following Question: Are the people of ta'weel (misleading interpretation) considered disbelievers or just fasiqs6 ?

Answer: "To apply the judgement of disbelief and fusuq is not for us, rather it is for Allah (T) and His Messenger (S). It is a judgement of the shari'ah based upon the Book and the Sunnah. So it is necessary that its application is affirmed. None is considered a disbeliever or a fasiq without proof from the Book and the Sunnah for his disbelief or fisq.

The rule for one who appears to be a true Muslim is that his Islam and its fidelity remains until it has been determined by proof from the shari'ah that this has ceased. It is not allowed to indulge in declaring him a disbeliever or a fasiq because this may result in one of the two following grave dangers:

1. Forging a lie against Allah (T) by judging and sentencing another with the description (kaafir) that he labelled him with.
 2. What he accused his brother with may return to him if his brother was in fact innocent of it. In Sahih Muslim it is reported that 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (R) said that the Prophet (S) said: "When a man calls his brother a kafir it surely comes back to one of them"
- So accordingly, before judging a Muslim to be a kafir or a fasiq, it is necessary to be sure of two matters:

1. The Book and the Sunnah prove that these statements or actions necessitate a declaration of kufr or fisq.
2. The judgement is applied to the individual who said or did the act, only when the conditions of takfeer and declaring one a faasiq truly apply to him, and all obstacles are removed.

One of the most important conditions is that the offender is aware of the violation which made him a kafir or fasiq, as Allah (T) said: "Whoever contends with the Messenger (S) after the guidance has been made clear to him and he follows other than the way of the believers, We shall leave him in the path he has chosen and land him in Hell. What an evil refuge" [An-Nisa' 4:115]

And: "And Allah does not allow a people to stray, after He has guided them, until He makes what they should avoid clear to them" [At-Tawbah 9:115] Al- Qawaa'id al-Muthlaa fee Sifa at Allaah wa Asmaa'hil-Husna 88-89

chapter 7 *Salaah and its relation to emaan and takfeer of its negation or not*

The Salaah and its relation to the base of Emaan and what the Aimah of the Salaf and the Khalaf who followed them have viewed on it

This issue at hand, is very important and intergral to the whole understanding on the issues of emaan and kufr and the issue that is being discussed in this risalaa as this issue is one of the back bones to both emaan and kufr and the issue of takfeer and the khilaaf (difference) between the people of the sunnah and the people of takfeer (Jama'ah-ta-Takfeer)

Stated by the Imaam Abu Fadl al-Abbass Ibn Mansoor as-Saksakee

The Imaam said some words regarding the people of the sunnah (ahlu-sunnah wal jama'ah) who are the people of truth, sunnah, adl (just balanced) and upright, he stated concerning them

“And every sect has called them with a name that is not in agreement with the true reality, out of envy of them and as a fabrication against them. And they ascribed to them (ahlu-sunnah) that which they did not hold as their doctrine. So the qadariyyah labeled them “al-Mujbirah”, the Murjia called them “Shakkaakiyyah” (Doubters). The raafidha called them “an-Naasibah”, the Jahmiyyah called them “al-Mushabbihah” (Anthropomorphists just because they hold the attributes of Allah in their apparent meaning while they negated them). The Ashariyyah called them “al-Mujassimah”. The Ghaaliyyah called them the “Hashawiyyah (worthless ones). The Baatiniyyah called them the “Muswaddah”.

The Mansooriyyah (a sect of the khawarij), and the associates of Abdullah Ibn Zayd, labeled them as Murji'ah due to their saying (Ahlu-sunnah Imaams) that the one who abandons the prayers, without rejecting it's obligation, is a muslim based upon the correct view in the madhaab. And they (al-Mansooriyyah) say that this saying of their's (the saying of Ahlu-sunnah) leads to the saying that emaan is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them. Rather they are the firqat al-Hadiyyah al-Mahdiyyah (the guiding and guided sect) and its creed is the correct creed and the clear emaan (faith), that with which the quraan was revealed and which has coe in the sunnah, and that which the Ulema of the Ummah form ahlu-sunnah wal Jama'ah have agreed upon” [al-Burhaan Fi Ma'rifat Aqa'idi Ahlil-Adyaan (65-66)]

Khilaaf (difference) concerning the matters of the one who leaves the salaah and whether such a one becomes a kaafir or not.

It is no doubt that the people under discussion in this issue consider the one who leaves the salaah (does not perform it) even if they believe in its mandation is still a kaafir without question.

The correct matter, in reality, unlike what these people say, is that in this issue, there is khilaaf **within** ahlu-sunnah and their Imaams, and to make this a matter of abandonment and enmity or to the leading of takfeer for the one who opposes is not only baseless and incorrect, it is also against the action of the aimah of the salaf who also differed on this and there is no where in their difference that lead them to make tabd'ee (declare an innovator) or takfeer for the one who differs.

It is pertinent to mention that the scholars from among the sunnah who consider that the leaving of the salaah constitutes negation of Islam in the person are first and foremost Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Yahya Ibn Ma'een, and from the later scholars, Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen, Abdur-Rahman al-Ghudayaan, and our shaykh Imaam Muqbil bin Hadee al-Wadi'ee and many others.

When it was asked to **Imaam Muqbil** this is what happened.

Question: Is the person who abandons the prayer (As-Salaah) considered a disbeliever?

Answer: The person who abandons the prayer is considered a disbeliever (Kaafir) due to what Al-Imaam Ahmad reported in his Musnad and also Muslim in his Saheeh, from Jaabir (Radhiyallaahu 'anhu) who related from the Prophet (Sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam) that he said, "There is nothing between the servant (of Allaah) and disbelief (Al-Kufr) or polytheism (Ash-Shirk) except the prayer (As-Salaah)." It is also due to what Aboo Dawood reported in his Sunan from Buraydah (Radhiyallaahu 'anhu) that he said that the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam) said, "The covenant that stands between us (the Muslims) and them (the disbelievers) is the prayer (As-Salaah), so whoever abandons it then indeed he has disbelieved." And the Lord of Might says in His Noble Book, "So there succeeded them successors who lost (i.e. neglected) the prayer (As-Salaah) and followed the lusts, so they will meet with misguidance (i.e they will be astray)."

Therefore, the correct view among the statements of the people of knowledge is that the person who abandons the prayer is considered a disbeliever (Kaafir), regardless of whether he abandoned it due to rejecting its obligation or if he abandoned it without rejecting its obligation. This is the opinion of Al-Imaam Ahmad bin Hanbal and it is also the opinion **of a group** among the companions. Rather, Abu Muhammad ibn Hazm mentioned a group among them (who held this view) and then he said, "I do not know anyone who disagreed with these companions."

Notice, oh reader, how the Shaykh specifically stated that a group among the companions had believed this, not all of them. I will show you this light of belief and understanding between the people of truth and the people of falsehood.

And the following is a list of those who hold the opposite of this idea.

when **Hudhaifah ibn al-Yamaan** - one of the foremost of those Companions - replied to Silah ibn Zafir who was about to understand the matter in the same way as Ahmad, so he said : "Laa ilaaha illallaah' will not benefit them if they do not know what is Prayer," so Hudhaifah replied after turning away from him : "O Silah it will save them from the Fire" three times. So this is a clear statement from Hudhaifah (radiiallaahu anhu) that the one who abandons Prayer - and likewise the other pillars of Islaam - is not a Kaafir, rather he is a Muslim who will be saved from remaining eternally in the Fire."

It is also quoted from Imaam as-Sakhawee rahimahullah who after mentioning the ahaadeeth about the Kufr of one who abandons Prayer, who says : "But all of this is taken at face value with regard to one who abandons it whilst denying its obligation after having grown up amongst the Muslims - since in that case he will be a Kaafir and an apostate by ijmaa' of the Muslims - so he either returns to Islaam or is killed - but as for the one who abandons it without valid excuse but out of laziness whilst still believing in its obligation then what is correct and clearly stated by the majority failing to pray a Prayer in its essential time - such as leaving Zuhr until the sun sets, or Maghrib until the sun rises - then his repentance is sought just as the repentance of the apostate is sought - then if he does not repent he is executed, then he is washed, prayed over and buried in a Muslim graveyard - and the rest of the rulings applicable to Muslims apply to him and application of the term `kufr' to him is explained to be due to the fact that he shares with the Kaaafir in some rulings with regard to action, this explanation is in order to harmonize between these texts and the texts such as what is authentic from him (sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam) that he said : There are five Prayers which Allaah prescribed... if He wishes He punishes him and if He wishes He forgives him and he also said : He who dies knowing that none has the right to be worshipped but Allaah enters Paradise Therefore the Muslims have not ceased to give inheritance to and to inherit from those who abandon Prayer. And if he were a Kaafir then he would not be forgiven and would not inherit or be inherited from." Al-Fataawaa al-Hadeethiyyah (2/84)

Shaikh Sulaimaan ibn 'Abdullaah said :

"And because that is the ijmaa' of the Muslims because we do not know of any time when a person who abandoned Prayer was not washed and prayed over, nor whose inheritance was prevented - even though those who abandon Prayer are many - whereas if he were a Kaafir then these rulings would apply - and as for the preceding ahaadeeth then they are to be taken as a sever warning and as describing their condition as being similar to the Kaafirs - not that it is to be taken literally - such as his (sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam)saying : Abusing a Muslim is open sin and fighting him is Kufr and He who swears by other than Allaah has committed Shirk etc Al-Muwaffiq said : "And this is the most correct of the two sayings."

Haashiyatul-Muqni' (1/95-96)

Yet it is imperative to know, oh brothers, those of you who have disdain or just mere opposition of Imaam al-Albanee for his views, by which it may have been distorted

throughout the kalaam of the mutakalimeen (takfeeris in this case) that he rahimahullah said the following.

"And there is a fine point here which I have rarely seen pointed out or noticed so it is essential to point it out and explain it, so I say : That the one who abandons Prayer out of laziness is judged a Muslim as long as there is nothing to reveal the secrets of his heart or indicate that and he dies before repentance is sought from him - as is the case these days - but if he is given the choice between death and between repentance and returning to regular Prayer, but he chooses death then in this case he dies a Kaafir. Shaikhul-Islam said : And when a man refuses to pray even if he is to be killed then he will not be inwardly agreeing to the obligation of Prayer nor one who establishes it - and he is a Kaafir by agreement of the Muslims as is shown by the many reports from the Companions that such a one is a Kaafir - and as is shown by the authentic texts." Abbreviated from `as-Saheehah' (1/117) and the saying of the Shaikul-Islam is quoted from `Majmoo'ul-Fataawaa' (2/48)

I do wish to mention the variance between the beliefs and understanding of the people of the sunnah with regards to his difference and cast this light upon the dark and twisted hizbiyyah of the takfeeri kharijyaatun asriyyah.

All of the Imaams of the muslims, from the salaf and the khalaf among the later day scholars such as in our time have agreed and understood that in this issue (the abandoning of salaah) there exist a clear khilaaf (difference) by which both sides or stances are within the fold of ahlu-sunnah. This means, that according to the Imaams, those who hold their views and those who hold the opposite fall within the fold of ahlu-sunnah. The 2 opinions are

1. The leaving of the salaah negates emaan in the heart whether he believes in the permissibility of leaving it in his heart, or not.
2. The leaving of the salaah does not negate emaan until the person who does it believes in its permissibility

So in both stances, which ever of the two stances both constitute a view that resides within the fundamentals of ahlu-sunnah wal jama'ah. So this means, in reality, that whoever differs in these two issues, then enmity and disassociation cannot occur nor can there be rivalry among the adherents to these two opinions. Unfortunately, there is one group who have opposed this asl (that enmity cannot be made off of this basis within ahlu-sunnah) and this group is no doubt the people of takfeer and revolt. They hold that whoever holds the second opinion is among the murji'aa and some of them consider those who hold this view to be a kaafir. Indeed our salaf were not upon this nor those who followed their light and Allah's refuge is ought from the dhalaah (misguidance) of these fantasies amongst these people of hawaa.

chapter 8 Istihlaal and the Hukaam

In this issue, it is also necessary to know that within ahlu-sunnah, just like the above difference, there are also two positions that the ulema hold in regard to the one who actually does rule by other than what Allah has revealed.

1. The first stance is that some of the scholars of ahlu-sunnah hold in this matter is that the person who does this is automatically by default believing that his action is permissible and therefore a kaafir. Among those who propagated this view is Alamaah Saalih al-Fawzan, Abdur-Rahman al-Ghudayaan, Abdur-Rahman al-Ajlaan, Saalih al-Atrim, Ibn Uthaymeen and others. But even among these some of these notables differ within themselves in this issue by which some like Fawzaan and Uthaymeen hold that this is the case of the one who completely changes the shariah or overrides the majority of the shariah and not those whom merely implemented some laws that opposed the shariah.
2. The second position according to the majority of the ulema (note: the majority does not always necessitate the matter of it being the truth, but is closely related to it) is that they say that the actions of ruling by other than Allah do not speak for what is in the heart, like the first group. So by this they hold that belief (itiqaad) in its permissibility must be held within the heart after the truth had been conveyed to him in order for the warrant of takfeer to be upon him. Amongst the Imams of our time with this view is Albanee, Bin Baz, Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbadd and others.

So it is good oh reader, to know that there is a text coming from Muhamamd ibn Saalih al-Uthaymeen rahimahullah which clarifies this difference and shows the reality of the two and how the issue should be viewed, which I see that it (his statement) actually reconciled both of the issues to be one, which I am in full agreement with.

Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen said

"Istihlaal is that a person believes that something that Allaah has made unlawful is lawful. As for Istihlaal of action, then we need to observe: If this Istihlaal (is related to something) that expels from the religion then a person becomes a disbeliever and apostate by it. So for example, if a person worked with usury (i.e. took or gave usury) without believing in its lawfulness, yet he persists in working with it, then such a one does not become a disbeliever because he did not declare it to be lawful. However, if he said, "Usury is lawful" and he intends by this the usury that Allaah has declared unlawful, then he becomes a disbeliever, since he is a denier (mukaddhib) of Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). So in this circumstance, Istihlaal would be that of action and also that of belief, with his heart. However, the Istihlaal in action, we need to look at the action itself, is it something which in and of itself, expels from the religion or not? And it is known that consuming interest does not make a person a disbeliever, rather it is one of the major sins. However, if a person prostrated to an idol, then he becomes a disbeliever. Why? Because this act itself expels from the religion. This is the principle, however it is necessary for us to observe another condition, and this is that the person

who made something lawful (by istihlaal) is not excused due to ignorance, for if he is excused due to ignorance, then he does not become a disbeliever." Liqaa Baab al-Maftoo (no. 1200)

So in light of the above we get that there are indeed certain actions which due nullify emaan even without istihlaal belief in the heart. Example of this would be like someone reviling the messenger or urinating on the quraan or prostrating to an idle, and this is of course taking into consideration the removal of obstacles like one being forced to do it, ignorance, and or being majnoon (insane or not functional in the brain). So once the removal of the obstacles has taken place and a person is found to do this, then such a one becomes a kaafir outright and repentance is sought from him or else the had punishment would definitely fall upon him. But other matters by which does not negate Islam from the actions, then it is necessary to couple this non negation to belief in its permissibility.

The Hukaam (Rulers)

This is the heart of the matter in which deviation is witnessed in the area of action as opposed to speech. It is here in this topic that two three people split into hizbiyyeen. Of the three hizb only one remains upon the truth, the hizbullah, ahlu-sunnah wal-hadeeth wal-athaar. The other two who split in action in this regard are the murji'a and the khawarij. It is also nessecary for the reader if one does not know or has not reflected that both of these (khawarij, murji'a) are of two extremes. On one hand the khawarij in ghuloo in open rejection of the rulers of the past and present based off of major mistakes in sin and transgression and the main issue of using judgements outside of the bounds of Allah in which many of the hukaam (rulers) have fallen into from the days of old and into this day. And the murji'a are those who have total leniency or what is described as tamayyu of those who commit actions of disbelief, sin, and transgression from amongst the muslimeen. What one will notice is that those upon one extreme from the murjia will call those who are not khawarij and the people of the balanced path as khariji. This trend however is not common at all especially in the present day. People of irj'aa, by the grace of Allah, have been uprooted and exposed and their supporters are at a minimal due to many factors and mainly due to Shaykhul-Islam Ibnul-Tamiyyah and the ulema after him. What has become an enormity of a matter and that which is abundant is the methodologies of the khawarij of old revived by people who have developed an eradication of the usool and conditions of emaan. So these people are not entirely khawarij as the Muhadith of the era Alamaah Muhammad Naasiru-Deen al-Albanee has commented concerning Takfeeri groups amongst the ikhwaan, but they have many of the innovated principles and methodologies that were inherent in the khawarij. And so this group of extreme will accuse those who are upon the middle and straight path as murji and a loyalists to the rulers and other such accusations. So between these two groups ahlu-sunnah has to deal with them both and al-hamdulillah, Allah has eased the people of the sunnah's trial by there being minimal amounts of people of irja and that which affected the muslim world in the past and so ahlu-sunnah's main focus are those infected with the disease of unrestricted takfeer and revolt against governments.

It is seemed from the statements of the people of takfeer is that the conditions of state of the ruler is somehow different than every other muslim on earth. They have a different approach and methodology with how they implement takfeer and Islam when it comes to the rulers and the average Muslim which is truly deception based of the quraan and sunnah. There are examples of this and I will demonstrate a couple.

1. By there treatment of kufr and eman and the rulers then it seems that the actions of the ruler is explicitly the belief in the heart of the ruler meaning that the rulers action is their belief and since this is the case then whatever action that they do constitutes kufu-akbar or major disbelief . The reason why this is a major deception is that ahlu-sunnah has always said from the beginning that actions of the limbs is a reflection of the heart but not what the heart contains. If this was so then whoever did an evil deed of disbelief is a kaafir and whoever did a deed of virtue has his disbelief removed and eman placed back in his heart. The salaf of this nation believed that eman consist of belief in the heart speech of the tongue and action of the limbs. Action is appearent as well as the speech of the tongue but what cannot be seen is the heart. It is for this reason that much of the salaf said that kufr that removes one from the religion, then that is to be accompanied with belief in the heart (in disbelief). So if they did deeds of disbelief then what makes the doer of the deed a kaafir is his belief in such an action to be from the allowed matters. The opposite is also true. No one becomes a muslim except by belief in the heart. All the actions of the limbs in implementing islam and the speech of the tongue in engaging in the types of speech such as dhikr etc then the one who does this cannot be considered a muslim in truth except that along with these two there exists emaan or belief in the heart for that which he practices from the limbs and that which he says from the tongue. If everyone understands this then wal-hamdulillah. If not and they negate this then they are actually believing that there is no such thing as munafiqeen (hypocrites). This is because the munafiqeen are those who implement Islam by the actions of the limbs and the saying of the tongue, but their belief in it in the heart is void of eman in it, therefore because of the negation belief in the heart then they will be in the lowest depts of the fire. So there is no problem in this regard between ahlu-sunnah and the people of takfeer and modern day khariji methodologies which resembles greatly to the khawarij of old.
2. The other deception employed by modern day people of unrestricted takfeer and revolt is their understanding of the versus in suratul-Ma'idah regarding ruling by other than Allah.

Allah subhanahu wa ta'ala says in the quraan and the meaning of which is derived

“And whosoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, such are the kaafireen”
(5:44)

So the noble shaykh rahemahullah **Abdul-Salaam bin Burjiss** gave a lecture regarding this topic and from it he gave tafseer on it and explained the topic briefly yet thoroughly and amongst those things which he stated is

“So the one who reflects on these great versus and looks at them in light of what the language of the Arabs and the language of the Quran necessitate and require, he will find that they are general in their application to two entities.

The first; That they are general for all muslims, regardless of whatever they are rulers or those who are ruled over. So these versus include the overall ruler, the qaadi, the teacher, the owner of a house, the wife and so on. The evidence of this generality is taken from the verse itself and also from the narrations that have been reported from the salaf may Allah be pleased with them all in explanation of this verse. For the statements of the saying of Allah, the Sublime and the Most High; “And Whoever” gives evidence to the generality (meaning includes all people). And this particule “man” is one of the words that indicates generality in the view of the people of knowledge, since it is one of the nouns (ismu-shart) and so therefore it refers to all those being addressed.

And whoever restricts it to the ruler only has fallen into a very big error.

As for the generality of its application to the second entity, then that is its application to all of the rules and laws of Allah, the Most High and Sublime. Therefore, every ruling, whether it is small or large, is for Allah and is included in this verse, due to its generality.”

According to this anything that is not from Islam also falls under the ruling of this ayaa and whosoever goes beyond that should also be subjected to this verse. This includes shirk, bida, and ruling. So whoever adopts a methodology not understood by the prophet salallahu alaihi wa salam, the sahaba radhiyallah anhu, or the next to generations of those who followed them rahimullah then they also fall under this verse. That means innovated concepts such as unrestricted takfeer also is included in this verse due to it being a judgement by other than what Allah has revealed. So if ahlu-sunnah were to adopt the methodologies of their enemies from the modern day takfeeriyyeen then they would have to perform takfeer of them as well. Certainly Allah’s refuge is sought from such an abominable manhaj.

To further prove to the reader the truth of what the Shaykh Abdu-Salaam spoke of here is some proof from the Imaam and Muhadith Muhammad Naasiru-Deen al-Albaanee rahimahullah

Shaikh Muhammad Naasiruddeen al-Albaanee was asked, “Our Shaikh, may Allaah bless you, the scholars of the Salaf, may Allaah have mercy upon them, mention that Tawheed is of three types: ‘ar-Ruboobiyyah,’ ‘al-Uloohiyyah’ and ‘al-Asmaa was-Sifaat,’ so is it correct for us to say that there is a fourth Tawheed that is ‘Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah’ or ‘Tawheed of Judgement?’ So he replied:

“‘Al-Haakimiyyah’ is a branch of the branches of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, and those who focus their attention upon this newly invented saying in the present age use it as a weapon not to teach the Muslims the Tawheed that all of the Prophets and Messengers came with, but rather as a political weapon. So if you wish I will establish for you what I have just said, even though this question has repeatedly been answered by me, many times - or if you wish we will continue upon our topic.

I have said in similar circumstances, as support for what I have just said, that usage of the word ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ is part of the political da’wah that is particular to some of the parties present today; and I will mention here something that occurred between myself and someone who gave the khutbah in one of the mosques of Damascus. So on the day of Jumu’ah he gave a khutbah which was all about judgement being for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. But this person made an error with regard to a matter of fiqh. So after he had finished the prayer I went forward to him and gave him ‘salaam,’ and said to him, ‘O my brother, you did so and so, and that is contrary to the Sunnah.’ So he said to me, ‘I am a Hanafee, and the Hanafee madhhab says what I have done.’ So I said, **‘Subhaanallaah! You have given khutbah that judgement is just for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, but you only use this word to attack those rulers whom you think are Unbelievers because they do not rule according to the Islamic Sharee’ah. But you have forgotten about yourselves - that Allaah’s judgement covers every Muslim.** So why, when I say to you that the Messenger did so and so, why do you say, ‘But my madhhab is such and such.’ Then you have contradicted that which you call the people to.’

So if it were not for the fact that they use this saying as a tool for political propaganda of theirs, then we would say, ‘This is our merchandise that has been returned to us.’

Taken from ‘al-Muslimoon,’ no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

So you can see from the shaykh’s words that the understanding of the ayah about ruling other than Allah is general and that every muslim falls under it whether ruler or ruled thus affirming with what the first Shaykh said rahimahullah

Here are some more statements of the Imaams

The great eminent Shaykh al-Imaam al-Barbaharee said in Sharhu-Sunnah "Whoever rebels against a Muslim ruler is one of the Khawaarij, has caused dissent within the Muslims, has contradicted the narrations and has died the death of the days of ignorance."

chapter 9 How is Our Attitude Towards the Rulers And the Salaf who performed Khurooj

How Do we Understand the Actions of some of the Salaf in Advising the Ruler Publicly?
Question:

It was asked to the noble Shaykh al-Alamaah Zayd ibn Hadee al-Madkhalee the following

Noble Shaykh, how do we reconcile between the statement of the Prophet (sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam), "Whosoever desires to advise the ruler, then let him not do so publicly," to the end of the hadeeth, and between the action of some of the Scholars of the Salaf in opposing the rulers publicly, such as Sa'eed Ibn Jubayr (d.95H), al-'Izz Ibn 'Abdus-Salaam (d.660H) and other than them. And may Allaah reward you with goodness.

Answer:

Firstly: With regards to the advise that is specific to the rulers of the Muslims whom Allaah has obligated upon their constituents that they obey them, respect them and supplicate for them privately and in public, as long as they offer the Prayer and keep the streets safe and carry out the prescribed punishments. So there is advice for them and there is enjoinder and prohibition for them in accordance with whatever is appropriate for their situation, their reality and their position. And this is what is indicated by the hadeeth. As for what has emanated from the two that have been mentioned by the questioner, then it does not amount to evidence that every person who desires to enjoin and prohibit can traverse the path of these two – rahimahumallaah. So the incidents that occurred from Sa'eed Ibn Jubayr (d.95H) and from al-'Izz Ibn 'Abdus-Salaam (d.660H), then the questioner does not know about the causes and the surrounding conditions that initially led them to advise openly.

Secondly: Let us suppose that the advice occurred publicly from the two aforementioned ones. However, the Prophet (sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam) said, "then let him not do so publicly." Which of the two statements has more right to be followed: the statement of the infallible Prophet (sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam), and it is an authentic hadeeth, or the statement of an individual itjihad from one of the people of al-ijtihad who erred?! So he will not be excluded from a reward if Allaah so wills, and he will be forgiven for the error. So this principle is, "When there has come a hadeeth, or there has come a text from the generality of the Book of Allaah and the Sunnah of the Prophet (sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam), and there has also come a statement from some of the Scholars opposing this text, then precedence is to be given to the confirmed text from Allaah and the confirmed text from the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam) and we seek an excuse for the one who is from the people of al-ijtihad and has opposed the text." As for the one who is not from the people of al-ijtihad, but he puts himself forward and boldly becomes involved along with a group of mujtahideen whilst he has not mastered the formative

elements of al-ijtihad, then this one has committed a crime against himself and he has committed a crime against other than himself. And the extent of this crime could be restricted or it could be unrestricted.

So the point of this is that there is no contradiction or conflict between the action of two individuals and the statement of the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam), "So do not do so publicly, but take him by his hand and take him into privacy. So if he accepts his advice, then he has achieved his objective. And if he refuses, then he has offered that which was upon him." [1]

We praise Allaah the Mighty and Majestic that this is the correct path which the Scholars of the Salaf and their followers in every time from amongst the times agreed with due to their knowledge and understanding of the proofs in every topic from amongst the topics of knowledge and action. And this is a great blessing and it is from the justice of the Salafee manhaj. So he is devoid of this blessing and he is not successful with it, because he has not sought it truthfully and he has not traversed its paths. So it is upon us to strive hard in attaining knowledge, understanding and information and to take from the Scholars who have firm, sagacious and correct understandings. And we must abandon the affair of these ijtihaadaat which are only from the aspect of interpretations and from the aspect of deceptions. That is because the student in middle school, high school, or at the university level has no right to speak with ijtihaad, until he firmly plants his feet in the knowledge, takes from the Scholars and comes to know the limits of ijtihaad. Then, once the people of authority have testified that he is from amongst the people of al-ijtihad, then he may speak concerning the issues in which ijtihaad is correct. If not, then no.

Footnotes:

[1]: Hasan: Related by Ahmad (3/403) and Ibn Abee 'Aasim in Kitaabus-Sunnah (2/251). It was declared hasan by al-Albaanee in Dhilaalul-Jannah fee Takhreejis-Sunnah (no. 1096). Taken from al-'Iqdul-Munaddadil-Jadeed (p. 83-85).

This reality is what has been mentioned by the Imaam of ahlu-sunnah, **Shaykhul-Islam Abul-Abbass Taqi-u-Deen Ahmad ibn Taymiyyah** when he said

["For verily Allah the Exalted sent His Messenger for the attainment of the benefits and perfection of them, and for the negation of the harmful things and their reduction. And when one of the khaleefahs took authority, such as Zaid and Abdul-Maalik and al-Mansoor and others, then either it was said; 'It is obligatory to prevent him from this authority and to fight him until someone else is given authrotiy'- as is held by those who consider it rightful to use the sword.](#)

And this view is corrupt, for a corruption in this is greater than the benefit. And there is hardly anyone who revolted against a leader with authority except that what arose from this action of evil, was actually greater than whatever good came frm it, such as those who rebelled against Yazeed in Madeenah, or like Ibn al-Ash'at who revolted against Abdul-Maalik in Iraaq, or like Ibn Mihlaab also, who revolted against his son in

Khurasan, and like those who revolted against al-Mansoor in Madeena and Basrah, and the likes of them.

And their goal is that they are victorious or they are defeated, then their rule ceases, and so they do not have any end result. For Abdullah ibn Ali and Abu Muslim, they are the ones who killed a great number of people, and both of them were killed by al-Mansoor. And as for the people of al-Harrah (in Madeenah) and Ibnul Ash'at and Ibn Mihlaab, and others, then they were defeated, and their associates were also defeated. So they never established the deen and nor did they allow the dunya to remain.

And Alla the exalted does not order something on account of which rectification of the deen and the dunya is not attained even if the one who does that is from the awliyya of Allah, the muttaqeen and from the people of jannah. And they are not more Superior than Aisha and Talha and Zubair and others, they did not praise what they fell into of fighting, and the likes of these are greater in rank and position in the sight of Allah and better in intention than other than them from among the successive generations.

And Hasan al-Basri used to say "Indeed Hajja is a punishment of Allah, so do not repel the punishment of Allah with your hands, but you must with humility and submission

And the greatest of Muslims from the salaf used to forbid revolting and fighting in the times of fitan, such as Abdullah ibn Umar, Sa'eed ibnu-Mussayyib, Ali ibn Hasan and others, and all of them forbade it, during the year of al-harrah with the revolt of Yazeed, and Hasan al-Basri and Mujahid and others forbade from revolt during the fitan of Ibnul-Ash'at. And it is for this reason that it is firmly established with ahlus-sunnah to abandon fighting in times of fitan (tribulation) due to the authentic ahadeeth that are established from the prophet, and they began to mention this matter in the course of their works on aqeedah, and they would command with sabr (patience) towards the oppression of the leaders, and the abandonment of fighting against them even if a fair portion of the people of knowledge fought against them during the fitan.

And whoever reflects upon the authentic narrations that are established from the Messenger of Allah sallallahu alaihi wa salam concerning this issue, and also considers with consideration of those with insight and deep knowledge, will know that that which the prophetic mutoon (texts) have come with is from the best of affairs. And for this reason, when Husayn radhiyallahu anhu desired to revolt against the people of Iraaq, they wrote many letters to him, as has been indicated by ahlul-ilm such as Ibn Umar, Ibn Abbass, Abu Bakr ibn Abdur-Rahman ibnul-Harith ibn Hishaam that he should not revolt, and their overwhelming belief was that he would be killed and they were actually desiring to give sincere advice to him, and were seeking what was beneficial and better for him and for the muslims in general and Allah and His messenger, indeed, they only command with rectitude and not with corrupt (fassad). However, the opinion can sometimes be correct and can sometimes be wrong

So it has become clear that the correct affair was that they had said, and there was not to be found in the revolt any rectification or benefit for the deen and nor for the dunya.

Rather, those oppressive wrong doers were able to overcome the grandson of the Messenger of Allah until they killed him, as a shaheed. And in his revolt and his fighting was such corruption and mischief that would not have happened if he had remained in his own town.

For whatever he intended of the attainment of good and repelling evil, then nothing for it occurred. Rather, only evil increases by his revolt and his fighting, and the goodness ceased on account of that. And that was also the cause of a great deal of evil, and the killing of Husayn itself was what brought about the fitan, just as the killing of Uthmaan was from that which brought about fitaan.

And all of this is what explains that whatever the prophet has commanded of sabr towards the tyranny of the rulers and the abandonment of fighting against them and revolting against them, that this is of the most beneficial and rectifying of affairs, in both this life and the next, and that whoever opposes this deliberately, or due to an error, then no rectification is attained by this action, rather only corruption.

And for this reason the prophet praised Hasan by saying “Indeed, this son of mine is a leader and Allah will bring about reconciliation through him between the two great factions from among the Muslims”. But he did not praise anyone on account of fighting in the time of fitan, and nor on account of rebelling against the leaders, nor on account of withholding from the obedience, or separating from the jama’ah.

And the hadeeth of the prophet established in the saheeh, all of them imply this and this explains that the reconciliation between the two parties was praised and was loved by Allah and His Messenger, and that what was done by al-Hasan in bringing this about was from the greatest of his qualities and his rank, on account of which the prophet praised him. And if fighting had been mandated or even recommended, and the prophet never praised anyone for the abandonment of that which is obligatory or recommended, and for this reason the prophet did not praise anyone on account of what happened of the fighting on the day of Harrah, and whatever happened in Makkah in the besieging of Ibn Zubayr, and what happened in the fitnah of Ibnul-Ash’at and Ibn Mihalab and other fitan. Rather it has been successively narrated from him that he commanded fighting the khawarij, the rebels (vigilantes), those whom the Amiru-Mumineen fought against, Ali Ibn Abi Taalib at Nahrawaan, after they had revolted against him at Haroorah. For the narrations from the prophet were in abundance concerning fighting against them (the khawarij), and when Ali fought against them, he rejoiced with fighting against them, and he also narrated the hadeeth concerning them, and the companions also agreed upon fighting them.

And similarly Ahlul-ilm after them, this fighting (against the khawarij) was not like the fighting of the people of the Camel and Siffin and other than them, from the matters in which no text of ijmaa has come, and neither any praise of the noble ones who entered into it. Rather, they were remorseful about it, and also returned from it.

And this hadeeth (about Hasan) is from the signs of the prophethood of Muhammad, when he mentioned about Hasan whatever he mentioned, and praised him for what he praised

him for. So whatever he mentioned and whatever he praised was in agreement with the truth that actually occurred after more than 30 years after he said this, and this very thing is the actual wisdom of the legislator (Muhammad) was attempting to bring about and nurture in his prohibition of revolting against the rulers, and he taught abandonment of fighting in times of fitnah, even if those who fell into this considered that their intent is to enjoin the good and forbid the evil.

And actually this angle (of intending the good and forbidding evil) that the khawarij made lawful the use of the sword against the people of the qiblah, until they killed Ali and others from the Muslims. Similarly, those who agreed with them in revolting against the rulers, with the sword, in general terms, such as the Mutazilah, Zaydiyyah, and the fuqahaa and others, such as those who revolted alongside Muhammad ibn Abdillah ibn Abdullah ibn Hasan al-Husayn, and his brother Ibrahim ibn Abdullah and others for the people of the religion are from the likes of these (those who revolted), but they err from two angles

1: that what they consider to be from the deen is not actually from the deen, such as the viewpoint of the khawarij and other than them from the people of desires. For they believe in an opinion that is an error and an innovation, and they fight the people over it. Rather, they declare as kuffar those who oppose them. Hence, they become errant in their opinion and also in fighting those who oppose them, or making takfeeri of them and cursing them. And this is the condition of the people of desires in general, such as the Jahmiyyah who called the people to the rejection of the realities of the Beautiful and Lofty Names of Allah and His Attributes. They say; Indeed He (Allah) does not have speech except the speech which He created in others (besides Himself) and that He will not be seen, and other such things. And they also put the people to trial, when some of the rulers inclined towards them (the jahmiyyah), and so they would punish whoever oppose them in their opinion, either with death, or with imprisonment, or with the banishment and prevention of sustenance. And the Jahmiyyah did this on more than one occasion, and Allah supports His believing servants against them.

And the raafidha (Shia) are more evil than them, when they gain authority, for they are loyal to the kuffar and aid them, and they show enmity towards all those from the Muslims who do not agree with their viewpoint. Similarly, those who have something within them of innovations, either the innovation of the hulooliyyah or the bida of the negators of the attributes or those who exaggerate in affirmation of the attributes, or the innovation of the Qadariyyah, or that of irj'aa, or other than that. You will find them believing in corrupt beliefs, and then declare as a disbeliever or curse whoever opposed him. And the khawarij renegades are the Imaams of all of these in making takfeer of ahlu-sunnah wal-jama'ah and fighting them.

2: The one who fights based upon his belief in the viewpoint to which he calls the one who opposes the Sunnah and the Jama'ah, such as the people of the Camel, and Siffen, and al-Harrah, and al-Jamajim and others. However, he thinks that the desired rectification and benefit will be attained by way of this fighting, but this fighting attains no such thing, rather, the corruption and harm becomes greater, much more than what it

was initially. And then what the legislator (the prophet) actually indicates and directs towards (of ture rectitude) finally becomes clear to them at the end of their affair.

And for that which is desirable to be known is t hat the causes of these fitan are actually mixed. For certain states and conditions come over the hearts that prevent them form knowing the truth and desiring it, and thus they resemble the state of jaahiliyya. Since in Jaahiliyyah there was no knowledge of the truth and nor the desiring of it. And then Islam came with beneficial knowledge and the righteous action, which is the knowledge of the truth, and desiring it.

So it is agreed that some of the rulers commit oppression by way of monopoly, control, and then the souls do not show patience over his oppression. And it is not possible for them to repel his oppression except by what is even greater corruption than it (the oppression of the rebeller). However for the sake of the love of a person, so that his due legal right can be given, and that oppression can be repelled from him, he does not look at the general corruption, and mischief that would rise on account of his action. And for this reason the prophet said “Indeed, you will face hardship, so have patience until you meet me at the Hawd”, and it is likewise established in the saheeh that he said ‘Upon the Muslim is to hear and obey, in times of difficulty and in ease, in the disliked things and in likable things and when preference is given to other than him

For the prophet ordered the muslims that they should remain patient when they are controlled in oppression and that they should obey those who in charge of their affairs, even if they give preference to themselves over them, and that they should not contend for authority. And many of those who revolted against the authority, or vast majority of them, then they revolted so that they may contend with them (for authority), alongside their misappropriation, monopoly, over them, so they did not show patience upon this, and the one who fights remains thinking that he is only fighting him so that there is no more fitna and so that the deen, all of it is for Allah, yet the greatest of that which actually motivated him was seeking portion either of leadership or wealth.

Just as Allah the Exalted has said

“If they are given a portion thereof (of alms), they are pleased, but if they are not given thereof, then behold, they are enraged” (9:58)

and in the Saheeh from the prophet that he said ‘There are thee whom Allah will not speak to, nor look at on the Day of Judgement, nor will He purify them, and they will have a tomenting punishment, a man who gives the pledge of allegiance to the leader and he does not do so except for the sake of the world, if he is given from it, he is pleased, and if he is prevented from it he is enraged.

And he ordered having patience upon their misappropriatin, and prohibited fighting against them, and contending with them for authority, alongside their oppression. Because the corruption, mischief that arises from fighting during fintha, is greater than the corruption in the oppression of those in authority. Thus, the lighter of the two wvils is not to be removed by the greater of the two. And whoever reflects upon the quraan and the

sunnah that is established from the messenger and considers it will find it to be in agreement with what he finds his own soul” [Manhaju-Sunnah 4/527]

It becomes clear here, that no matter how many proofs, how many dala'il that the takfeeris of our era present from Shaykhul-Islam, they can never escape the reality of two

1. he in no way, shape, or form does not condone or even hold permissible the rebelling against the rulers, oppressor or not
2. he points to the clear ijma that it is not allowed and points to the fact that we do not use the stance of the Imaams and the sahaba who erred in this as a proof to act upon it and that the weight of the messenger is given precedence over them.

This is why when Saalih al-Fawzaan was asked concerning the usage of the people of takfeer on the proofs of some of the salaf had performed this act, he replied with the following

This speech is totally baseless and rubbish. The Muslims have never ceased to cling to hearing and obeying (the rulers), even if some differences occurred in some periods of time. However the majority of the Muslims have stuck to hearing and obeying. And if there occurred from some of them differences or errors, then they would reject it. And Saeed bin Jubayr (may Allaah have mercy upon him) was from imaams of the Taabi'een and he was unjustly killed, and even if he did rebel then this is something that is not agreed with. Al-Ijaabaat al-Muhimmah fee Mashaakil il-Mudlahimmah

chapter 10 Disapproval of the Imaams in speaking and incitement against the Rule

The reality of the rulers and the disapproval of the Imaams of ahlu-sunnah on the speaking and incitement against the rule

It is important here for everyone to know of this matter. On top of this, it is also a must that everyone understands this issue in the correct format. There are two matters to this. They are

1. open correction against the ruler and
2. enticing the people to revolt and opposition to them

The reason I wish to clarify this is due to a fundamental difference in this issue, which I see that neither side of the people of extremism from among those hardliners of Rabe'e bin Hade'e (explained later) and the people of takfeer and revolt. When this issue is addressed to the people in fanatical following with Shaykh Rabe'e hafidhahullah, they do not see these two points above. They consider both points to be one in the same. Unfortunately the disease of the takeeris do not make it any better and far more worse than the first group. And that is that they also do not see a difference between the two, hence when these people read some of the works of the salaf in this regard, they automatically translate it in their minds that they can openly rebel and revolt and make takfeer of them for an action that they had seen them do or say. So it is necessary to bring both issues from the statements of the Imaams of the sunnah themselves in order to bring baseerah into this issue so that both groups, especially those targeted in this risalah can see that there is a fundamental difference between the two actions and the people of adl and sunnah are those who are balanced between the two. So the first I bring al-Albaanee in this matter

Imaamul Albaani was asked in his taped interview with ihyaa' u-turaath the following question

”some claim that advising the ruler secretly will destroy the religious obligation of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil and they use as proof abu sa'eed akhudree's position towards 'abdul-malik ibn marwaan when he began with the khutbah before the salaah in al'eid so we ask your eminence to make clear to us the manhaj of the salaf in advising the ruler.

Answer”: what is found the risaalah is sufficient in this topic but I say concerning the hadeeth of abu sa'eed this is an exception to the ruler and that is because he made inkaar

openly so if the ruler contradicts the sharee'ah publicly then he is to be criticized publicly and this doesn't oppose the sharee'ah"

It is also attributed to Hasan al-Basri the following

"3 types of people have no gheebah (meaning that it is permissible to backbite them)

1-The open sinner (faasiqun mujaahir)

2-the innovator (almubtadi'

3-the tyrannical ruler (al-haakimul-jaa'ir) and this athar was attributed to al-Awzaaa'ee

But I was not able to get takhreej of this athar.

Again it is also attributed to Shaykh Muqbil the following

"Why is everyone who speaks about the rulers automatically become labelled as a Suroori? Or kharijee?"

1-this is due to hawa or jahl because in no book that talks about the deviant sects does it mention that those who openly criticize the ruler are khawaarijj or that it is an attribute of the khawaarijj. As for their lies and deception in claiming that this was the manhaj of a group from the khawaarijj called "al-qa'adeeyyah" They claim that their bid'ah was the public criticism of the ruler and that this was khurooj with the tongue and this is a big lie and a deception. What is affirmed is that the qa'adeeyyah never revolted with the sword themselves but they incited others to revolt with the sword and this was their bid'ah and not merely speaking out against the ruler due to an open sin or bid'ah! I challenge these jahalah to bring me where it says that merely speaking out was their bid'ah! Again no takhreej available

Hear is another source from Imaam Muqbil bin Hadee

Q: Shaykh, is talking about the rulers from above the Mimbars or during public lessons from the Manhaj of the righteous Salaf?

A: All praise be to Allaah, and may Allaah's blessing and peace be upon our Prophet Muhammad, and upon his followers and Companions. And I testify the none deserves worship except Allaah, and I testify that Muhammad is His slave and Messenger. To proceed,

Allaah Azza wa Jall says in his Noble Book (translated) {Let there arise from you a group inviting to good, enjoining good and forbidding evil, and they are the successful} (Soorat Aali-'Imraan v. 104)

And it has been established from the Hadeeth of Taariq bin Shehaab, that the Prophet Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam said "The best Jihaad is (to say) a statement of truth to a tyrant ruler." (Saheeh al-Jaami' #1100) "To" (Arabic: 'Ind, with) does not necessitate secrecy nor that he be alone with the ruler.

Regarding the Hadeeth "Whoever has advice for a ruler, then let him advise him secretly or privately". The Asl (base or root) of this Hadeeth is in Saheeh Muslim and the above addition was not mentioned in the Asl. Its Asl in Saheeh Muslim says "Whoever hurts the people will be hurt" or close to this meaning, and this addition was not mentioned. Thus

it is necessary to examine the addition. So whoever thinks it to be equal in strength to those who did not mention it, then it is an acceptable addition. Or if its reporters are equal in number to those who did not mention it, then it is an acceptable addition. But if it is a disparaged addition, then it is considered Shaadhah (odd and unacceptable). And this addition is from the last type, so it is a disparage addition and considered Shaadhah.

What is left to mention is there is a difference between criticizing and denouncing on the Mimbar the ruler's faults and between encouraging the people to revolt against him. Calling to revolt is not permissible unless we see clear cut open Kufr, as in the Hadeeth of 'Ubaada bin as-Saamit, Radiyallaahu Ta'aalaa 'Anh, he said "We gave a pledge to Allaah's Messenger, Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam, to listen and obey in our times of activeness and tiredness, our times of difficulty and ease, and not to fight against the ruler unless we see open Kufr that we have proof from Allaah for. And to say the truth wherever we might be for Allaah, not fearing the blame of the blamers" (al-Bukhaaree and Muslim) Where ever we may be (Shaykh Muqbil repeated the last part, to emphasize the truth may be said in public if needed)

And the Prophet, Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam, ordered Aboo Dharr to say the truth even if it was bitter. Ahmad reported this in his Musnad.

Just as he ordered him to say the truth even if its bitter, he also ordered him to hear and obey even if an ethiopian slave was placed in authority over him. So Aboo Dharr gathered and fulfilled the two commands, by saying the truth even if it was bitter, and by hearing and obeying 'Uthmaan, Radiyallaahu Ta'aalaa 'Anh.

If we see clear-cut open Kufr, does revolting become obligatory or not? Its necessary we take into consideration the condition of the Muslims. Do they have the ability to battle the (ruler's) open Kufr, or will they put themselves forward as an Udhiya (slaughter/sacrifice)? This is a matter.

And also, do they have self-sustenance or will they stretch out their hands to America and other similar governments? It will support them then leave them until their blood is spilled, and after that they will bring to rule a secularist in place of the secularist, or a communist in place of the secularist, or a ba'thee in place of the secularist, or a christian in place of the "Muslim."

Yes, it is necessary that they have self-sustenance, for the story of Hamaa's people is not distant from us. When the tyrant Ba'thee Saddaam promised to support them, and when they clashed with HafidH's forces, what my brothers, he left them and did not give them anything in support.

And also did they (the Muslims) prepare what is needed for war of strength? And it is not necessary that their strength is equal to that of the enemy, for Allaah Azza wa Jall says {And prepare against them what you are able of strength, steeds of war (or other weapons) to scare Allaah's enemy and your enemy} (Soorat al-Anfaal v. 60) What you are able.

And have they prepared what is needed for war of medical doctors and hospitals? Or will they leave the fallen and injured after the people have been attached to him?

And also, have they prepared what is needed for war of nourishment? The people are not prepared like the Companions of Allaah's Messenger, Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam, for patience upon weakness, exile, sickness, and poverty in the Madinah of Allaah's Messenger, Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam.

The people today have become accustomed to luxury, and are in need of striving their selves and getting used to just some of what the Companions were upon, Ridwaanullaahi Ta'aalaa 'Alayhim.

What my brothers? If the ruler is unreachable, and also if the ruler has ten faces, one face is communist, another face Ba'thee, another face Naasiree, another face Sunnee, another face Ikhwaanee, and what else my brothers?

lines of poetry

He turns with the glass wherever it points,
and wears for politics a thousand different suits.
So amongst the Muslims, he's counted as one,
and takes an arrow (of support) from each five of them.

And amongst the atheists, he's counted as one,
and memorizes all of Marx's lessons.

And he's like the Brits when he sees them,
And in Paris he's considered a Frenchman.

If this is his condition, and he's going to say to you "hello, we're with you" then there is nothing wrong with alerting the people of his mistakes, and say I disavow to Allaah from Fitan (tribulation), and I do not call you to revolt against the ruler.

For example there was an Egyptian Shaykh who was called Shaykh Aadam. This Egyptian Shaykh prepared his blanket in one arm, also the prison was better than the apartment that he stayed in. Thus he was ready to go to prison in ease. So he took the microphone and said to the people "Saadaat is a Kaafir!" The people praying were scared that they would be taken and arrested with him, so they rushed out of the Masjid until noone was left. So he took a megaphone to the market or the way to the market, and said "Saadaat is a Kaafir, Saadaat is a Kaafir!" (Shaykh Muqbil mentions this and the next example to show cases where someone warned against the ruler, without calling the people to revolt against the ruler).

Also, Haaj Sa'ad himself told me, that they (secret intelligence or the police) said to him during a questioning "you declare Saadaat to be a Kaafir?" He said "You did not find anyone else other than me in all Egypt that declares Saadaat to be a Kaafir? Go to the people waiting in bread lines, you'll find everyone there declares Saadaat to be a Kaafir."

Yes my brothers, the truth is the rulers ruined themselves. The truth (lines of poetry):
Whoever lowers himself, humiliation is easy for him.

Does mutilation pain the dead?

And what else, may Allaah bless you, {and whomever Allaah humiliates then none can honor him }

And (lines of poetry):

Whoever calls the people to denounce him,
Denouncing will be in truth and falsehood.

So we advise the rulers to return to Allaah Subhaanahoo wa Ta'aalaa and be true to their nations.

And I dislike a lot that me and my friend split because of the ruler, when anyway we are looked at by him like flies, we have no value in their eyes. He (my companion) says he's (the ruler) is a Kaafir, and the other says I will boycott you for Allaah because you declared him a Kaafir. The other says I will boycott you for Allaah since you did not declare the ruler a Kaafir.

No, we should not waste our time in this matter.

And I say to my brothers, the Kuwaytee youth have much spare time. Three of them passed through here, to where my brothers? They said they want to do Hijrah to Africa. Why do you want to do Hijrah to Africa? They said the Prophet, Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam, did not become victorious until after the Hijrah. So we will do Hijrah to Africa and after that return and gain victory. This is whisperings my brothers, may Allaah bless you. Some of the brothers told me they asked some Kuwaytees about the youth who do Hijrah. They said they stay in a hotel until their money runs out, and then return to Kuwait.

So I advise the Kuwaytee youth to spend their time in beneficial learning, in calling to Allaah, and to leave these whisperings and wrong thoughts. Turn to knowledge, study, sit with the scholars, memorize the Book of your Lord and some of the Sunnah of your Prophet, Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam, study the Arabic language so you can straighten your tongues, and also study 'Aqeedah.

Do not waste your lives. (One says) "the ruler is a Kaafir", and the other "No! He's a Muslim. Don't you see he prays Jumu'ah? And he says 'Laa ilaaha illallaah'. And when he is in need of Islaam he says Islaam! Islaam!" (Shaykh Muqbil said the last lines mockingly)

Don't waste your times, they only look at us like flies, we are not valued by them in the first place, so why waste our times over them?!

Work for Islaam, call to the Book of Allaah and the Sunnah of Allaah's Messenger, Sallallaahu 'Alayhi wa 'Alaa Aalihee wa Sallam, and do not encourage the people to revolt against the ruler. Islaam was never made victorious through revolutions and coups.

Refuge is sought from Allaah. [Tape: sh-Shihaab al-Haariq li 'Abdir-Rahmaan bin 'Abdil-Khaaliq]

So we know anyway that in general, the salaf at times corrected the rulers, now it is time to lock things in their place so I relay the following

The Prophet said, "If somebody sees his Muslim ruler doing something he disapproves of, he should be patient, for whoever becomes separate from the Muslim group even for a span and then dies, he will die as those who died in the Pre-Islamic period of ignorance (as rebellious sinners). (See Bukhari Hadith No. 176 and 177)

Allah's Messenger said, "You should listen to and obey, your ruler even if he was an Ethiopian (black) slave whose head looks like a raisin."

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: "Three things are the roots of faith: to refrain from (killing) a person who utters, "There is no god but Allah" and not to declare him unbeliever whatever sin he commits, and not to excommunicate him from Islam for his any action; and jihad will be performed continuously since the day Allah sent me as a prophet until the day the last member of my community will fight with the Dajjal (Antichrist). The tyranny of any tyrant and the justice of any just (ruler) will not invalidate it. One must have faith in Divine decree." (Sunan Abu Dawud)

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: Striving in the path of Allah (jihad) is incumbent on you along with every ruler, whether he is pious or impious; the prayer is obligatory on you behind every believer, pious or impious, even if he commits grave sins; the (funeral) prayer is incumbent upon every Muslim, pious and impious, even if he commits major sins. (Abu Dawud)

Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him) said: There are three things on account of which no rancour enters a Muslim's heart: the sincerity of an action for Allah's sake, being obedient to the rulers and adhering to their main body (jama'ah), for their prayers encompass them who are behind them (ei. Those whom they rule over). (reported by Ahmed in al-Musnad 4/80-82 and 83, Sunan at-Tirmidhi no.2657, Jami'ul Usool 1/265 and Mama'uz-Zawaa'id, 1/137-9)

In Tareekh al-Kabeer of Imaam Al-Bukhari

who reports from Abu Jamrah as-Dubayi'ee who said, "When the news of the burning house reached me, I left for Makkah and visited Ibn Abbas (there) frequently until he recognised me and was amicable to me. Then I reviled al-Hajjaj in the presence of Ibn Abbas and he said to me, "Do not be a helper to shaitaan." (8/104)

Al-Hafidh Abul Qaasim al-Asbahaanee in at-Targheeb wat-Tarheeb 3/68

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, ", "No obedience for evil deeds, obedience is required only in what is good." (Bukhari)

The prophet (peace be upon him) said, "If one desires to advise the one with authority then he should not do so openly. Rather he should take him by the hand and take him into seclusion (and then advise him). And if he accepts from him (the advice) then (he has achieved his objective), and if not then he has fulfilled that which was a duty upon him" (Recorded by Ahmed 3/403 and Ibn Abee Aasim 2/521, with an authentic chain of narration. And Sheikh Muhammed Nasirudeen al-Albaani (hafidhallah) declared it saheeh in Zilaalil-Jannah fee Takhreejis-Sunni, 5/229)

Ash-Shaykh al-Imaam Abdul-Lateef ibn Abdur-Rahman ibn Hasan Aali- Sheikh After explaining the incident with al-Hajjaj bin Yusuf and Az-Zubair.....

"So along with all of the conduct of the leading scholars, such as al-Awza'ee, Maalik, Al-Layth ibn Sa'ad and A'taa ibn Rabaah with those kings is not hidden from the one who has a share in knowledge and realisation. And then the next generation of the people of Knowledge such as Ahmed ibn Hanbal, Muhammed ibn Isma'eel (al-Bukhari), Muhammed Idris as-Shafiee, Ahmed ibn Nooh, Ishaaq ibn Raahawaih and their brothers....their occurred in their time what occurred from the kings of the great innovations and the denial of the Sifaat and they were called to affirm these things and were put to trial by the kings and whoever was killed was killed, such as Ahmed ibn Nasr. But along with all of this it is not known that a single one of them raised his hand against obedience (to those kings) and that he saw it fit to attack them....." ad-Durr as-Sunniyyah fil Ajwibbatun-Najdiyyah, 7/177-178)

Imam al-Barbahari said .

"When you see a man making a supplication against the ruler (sultaan) then know that he is a person of desires. And when you hear a man making a supplication for the ruler, for his recitification, then know that he is a person of the Sunnah, If Allah the Exalted wills. Fudayl ibn Iyyad says, "If I had a supplication (that would be answered) I would not make it except for the Ruler." So we have been commanded that we supplicate for them, for their rectification, and we have not been commanded to make a supplication against them, even if they oppress and commit injustice, and this is because their oppression and injustice is against themselves but their rectification is for them and for the Muslims." Tabaqaatul-Hanaabilah 2/36

It is also reported form him that he said

"And that we do not contend with or attempt to take away the command from those assigned with it (i.e., the rulers) due to the saying of the Messenger: "There are three things towards which the heart of a Muslim never shows hatred or rancour:

1. Making ones action sincerely for the sake of Allaah,
2. Giving obedience to the rulers (wulatul-amr) and

3. Sticking to the group (jamaa'ah) for verily, their supplication encompasses those who are behind them (i.e. those whom they rule over)."

This is confirmed in His saying:

"O you who believe! Obey Allaah and obey the Messenger, and those of you (Muslims) who are in authority". [an-Nisaa (4):59]

And that the sword is not to be raised against (any of) the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam).

And al-Fudayl said, "If I had a supplication that would be answered, I would not make it except for the leader (imaam) because when the leader becomes righteous, the towns and servants become safe and secure."

Ibn al-Mubaarak said (in reference to the above saying of al-Fudayl), "O teacher of goodness, who would show boldness towards this besides you?"

Imaam as-Shawkaani (raheemahullah)said

"It is desirable for the one to whom a mistake of the leader appears in certain matters that he advises him but does not openly rebuke him in front of all the people to see. Rather it should be done, as reported in the hadeeth –by the hand in seclusion to advise him...and he should not humiliate the Sultaan of Allah. And we have seen already said in the beginning of the book of Siyar that it is not permissible to revolt against the leaders even if they reach (excessive) levels of oppression, as long as they establish the prayer and no manifest disbelief appears from them. However it is necessary for the follower that he follow the leader in obedience to Allah and he disobeys him in what entails disobedience to Allah, for verily there is no obedience to creation in disobedience to the Creator." As-Sailal-Jarrarr, 4/556

And the eminent Imaam al-Alamaah Fadheelatush-Shaykh al-Haafidh al-Hakimee was asked

Question :

What is wajib upon us regarding the people who are in authority over us or the Hukaam (Rulers)?

So the shaykh goes on to say the following

Wishing them well, its explanation is that they are supported regarding the truth, they are followed and obeyed. That they be advised with softness, they are prayed behind, jiidah should be performed with them, they should be given the zakah and charity, having patience on some of their minor impressions and injustice, weapons are not raised against them up until the open kufr is apparent from them. They are not pushed into deceit by fabricated lies and supplications be performed for them for the sake of guidance and rectification.

Question

What are the proofs?

Answer :

Allaah says,

“O you who believe obey Allaah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) and those of you who are in authority.” [Soorah an-Nisaa (4):59]

The Messenger of Allaah (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) said,

“Hear and obey even if he is a slave” [SAHEEH. Bukhaaree (no’s 693, 696, 7142), Ibn Maajah (no.2760), Bayhaqee in as-Sunan al-Kubraa (8/155) and Musnad Ahmad in his Musnad (6/403)]

The Messenger of Allaah (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) also said,

“Whoever sees something disliked from the ameer, he should have patience with it because whoever separates from the jamaa’ah by a hand span and if he died he would die the death of Jaahiliyyah.” [AGREED UPON. On the authority of Ibn Abbaas (Ra). Bukhaaree (no’s 7053, 7054, 7143), Muslim (no’s 55, 56) and Ahmad in his Musnad (1/275, 297, 310)]

It is the saying of Ubaadah ibn as-Saamit who said,

The Messenger of Allaah (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) called us and we gave him the pledge of allegiance, from the pledge of allegiance was obeying him in both situations of happiness and sorrow, hardship and ease and in precedence over us and we do not take the kingdom of the ruler except when we see open disbelief for which he has no proof from Allaah.” [SAHEEH. Bukhaaree (no 7052), Muslim (no’s 41, 42), Nasaa’ee (no’s 4153, 4154), Ibn Maajah (no.2766), Ahmad (3/144, 5/316).

It is another saying of the Apostle of Allaah (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam),

“It is obligatory upon every Muslim to obey that which he likes and dislikes except when he is commanded to sin, then it is obligatory upon the believer not to hear or obey.” [AGREED UPON. On the authority of Ibn Umar (Ra). Bukhaaree (no.2955, 7144), Muslim (no.38), Tirmidhee (no.1707), Ibn Maajah (no.2864), Abu Dawood (no.2626), Nasaa’ee (no.4206)]

In another place he (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) said,

“There is obedience only in the good.” [AGREED UPON. On the authority of Alee (Ra). Bukhaaree (no’s 4340, 7175, 7257), Muslim (no’s 39, 40), Abu Dawood (no.2625), Nasaa’ee (no.4205), Ahmad (1/82, 94, 124)]

In another place he (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) said,

“Even if he strikes your back and takes your wealth, then still hear and obey.”[SAHEEH. On the authority of Hudhaifah (radiAllaahu ‘anhu) which is a part of a lengthier hadeeth. Muslim (no.52). Another hadeeth with similar meaning has been reported by Ubaadah as-Saamit by Ibn Hibbaan (no.4547).]

In another place he (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) said,

“Whoever withdrew his hand from obedience, then will meet Allaah on the day of judgement in the condition that he will have no proof nor an excuse and whoever dies without the allegiance to the ameer round his neck, then he dies the death of Jaahiliyyah.” [SAHEEH. On the authority of Ibn Umar (Ra). Muslim (no58), Haakim (1/77, 117) who authenticated it according to the conditions of the two Shaikhs and Dhahabee agreed. Imaam Al-Albaanee (rahimahullaah) also authenticated in As-Saheehah (no.984) and in Saheeh al-Jaam’e (no.6105)]

In another place he (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) said,

“Whosoever wishes to divide the affair of this ummah into pieces when the ummah is united, then kill him with a sword even if he is a person.” [HADEETH SAHEEH. On the authority of Arfajah. Muslim (no.59, 60), Abu Dawood in As-Sunnah, the chapter of killing the Khawaarij (no.4762), Nasaa’ee (4020, 4023) and Ahmad (4/261, 341, 5/24).]

In another place he (sal-Allaahu ‘alayhe wa sallam) said,

“There will be such leaders of the jamaa’ah you will recognise and you will abandon their bad actions, and whoever dislikes their actions will be worse... and whoever rejects them will be protected. But whoever remains pleased with them and follows them, the people asked, “Shall we fight such people?” He said, “No! Up until they establish the prayer.” [HADEETH SAHEEH. On the authority of Umm Salamah (radiAllaahu ‘anhaa). Muslim (no.62, 63, 64), Abu Dawood in As-Sunnah, the chapter of killing the Khawaarij (no.4760), Tirmidhee (no.2265), and Ahmad (6/295, 302, 305, 321)]

All these ahadeeth are mentioned in the six most authentic books of hadeeth.

A’laam as-Sunnah al-Manthoorah al-Ei’tiqaad at-Tae’fatun-Naajiyatal Mansoorah

Al-Imaamu-Zaahid, Fadheelatu-Shaykh al-Alamaah Abu Zakariyyah an-Nawawee rahimahullah said regarding this very issue the following

"And as for revolt - meaning against the rulers - and fighting them, then it is haraam by unanimous agreement (ijmaa') of the Muslims, even if they are sinful oppressors. And the hadeeth are abundantly overwhelming with the meaning that I have mentioned. And Ahl us-Sunnah are united that the ruler is not to be removed, on account of his sinfulness.

As for the angle that has been mentioned in some of the books of fiqh of some of our associates, that he is to be removed, and which is quoted from the Mu'tazilah, then this is an error on behalf of the one who says it and is in opposition to the Ijmaa'. And the Scholars have said, that the reason for the absence of his removal and the forbiddance of revolting against him, is due to what arises from that of tribulations, and shedding of blood, and also corruption that is evident. Hence, the harm from his removal is greater than from him remaining in place."

also **Imaam Muqbil** states in his Tarjuman

"We love the governments in accordance to what they have of goodness, and we hate them for what they have of evil. **And we do not permit revolting against them, except if we have seen clear disbelief from them about which we have a proof from Allaah, with the condition that we are capable of that, and that there not be any civil strife between the Muslims and their opponents.** Since the rulers portray those who revolt against them as spies causing corruption. And thereupon, other conditions come in, refer to our other books. And the most dreadful of governments is the Communist government of Aden. May Allaah hasten its downfall and purify the Islaamic countries from it"

Chapter 11 **What is Clear and Evident Kufr and Ijtihad**

This is a grand question by which all muslims should ask themselves and find the answer with the people of knowledge regarding it. So my first proof, I will bring the Alamaah Muhammad ibn Abdillah aj-Jibreem as my first proof only to show that the very scholars that the takfeeris use in their evidence to justify their deviance in the matters of takfeer, actually have a contrary opinion to what is clear and open evident kufr.

- **Shaykh Muhammad ibn Abdillah ibn Jibreem** stated

“It is known that al-kufr al-bawah (clear kufr, evident) is an open and outward mater, such as when the ruler actually abolishes the teachings of Islam or we see him, for example, destroying masaajid or he fights the people in the masaajid or he abolishes the shari’ah courts or the religious lessons or we see him burning copies of the quraan or that he orders them to be burt and he promotes and assist the books of misguidance, the books of the nasaara and the likes of them, and he spreads them and makes reading hem to be binding or we see him erecting things that are worshiped besides Allah like idols and the likes. This is the clear and evident kufr.

As for the matters in which ijtihaad enters into, then we have alluded to one of these types last night. And this is what the majority of the rules are upon, from that which is called “judgement by the secular laws”, such as these, overwhelmingly, the affair pertaining to them is that they consider benefit in them, but they did not abolish the shari’ah with absolute abolishment, such that they do not judge with anything from it at all. Since Allah said ‘And whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed then they are the kaafireen’, so the likes of these, they have this angle of approach, then we do not speak of their kufr, but we consider them to be in error, in this ijtihaad which involves changing something from the legislation, even if it was by the path of ijtihaad. So for example, their permitting zinaa (in action, not just belief) when it is with the consent of both parties, and likes their abandonment, or the abolition of the hudood, the punishment for stealing, or the punishment of slander, or the punishment of drinking alcohol, or permitting alcohol and announcing the selling of alcohol and whatever resembles that. Then there is no doubt that this is great sin, however their could be, for example, excuses for them, those in which they consider themselves to be justified. So for example, they excuse themselves from this by saying that in their land they have the people who are not muslim, and so being harsh on them will provoke them to leave. So when they have an angle of approach, then Allah will reckon them, but, in any case, there is no doubt that if we judged by the shar’iah and implemented it’s teachings, there would be sufficiency in this and much good.” From a cassette titled “Sharh Lum’uat il-I’tiqaad #7”, Tasjeelaat at-Taqwaa, Riyadh

So this in of itself is a blow upon those who relied upon the shaykh hafdhahullah as a proof for their incorrect justification of performing takfeer of the muslim rulers in our times.

Al-Alamaah af-Fadheelatu-Shaykh Abdul-Muhsin ibn Hammad al-Abbadd

Was asked during a lesson of his on Sharh Sunan Abi Dawood the following “Is Istibdaal (replacing) the Islamic Sharee’ah with the secular laws (qawaneen al-wad’iyyah) kufr in and of itself or does it require Istihlaal (making halaal) of the heart of belief (itiqaad) in its permissibility? And is there is a difference between ruling by other than what Allah has revealed in one instance, and between making the secular laws as general legislation (tashree’an aamaan), while one believes that this is not permitted?”

So the shaykh replied

“It is clear that there is no difference between ruling in a matter, or ten or a hundred, or a thousand, or less, or greater than that. There is no difference as long as a person considers himself to be in error, that he is doing what is evil (munkar), and that he is committing disobedience, and that he is fearful of sin, so this is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr or Kufr al-Asghar). And as for the Istihlaal, even if it was only in one matter, so he makes it lawful to judge by other than what Allah has revealed, and considers it to be lawful, then this is kufr (kufr al-akbaar, that which expels from the religion)”

Again I present another statement from **Imaam Muqbil Bin Hadee al-Wadi’ee**

He was asked in a lecture by kuwaitee students of knowledge about this issue and he said “and there is a difference between standing up and making inkaar of the rulers actions and between enciting the people to revolt against him for the latter is not permissible until we see clear kufr(kufrun bawaah)”Tuhfatul-Mujeeb pg-164

Ijtihad

One of the common and relied upon excuses for such stances as these is the issue that ijtihaad, or so called ijtihaad, played a role in this. In reality or technically speaking there is. But the issue goes further than this.

To acquaint those who may not know this word or what it implies then the word ijtihaad is to strive at reaching something. This is also with the Shar’I definition as well except that there is another addition which is to strive at attaining the right judgement by the deduction of the evidences from the book of Allah, the sunnah of the Messenger and from the ijma of the salaf (predecessors). So the one who performs t his is called the mujtahid. However this rank is not achieved easily, in fact many scholars do not achieve this rank. Actually technically speaking, the age of a bonifide mujtahid has ceased. The last of Imaams who had attained the rank were the likes of Ibn Abdul-Wahhab, Shawkanee, Siddeeq Hasan Khan, and quote possibly as admitted by the major scholars of our era, Imaam al-Albanee, but even he, Albanee, has said outright, “there is no such thing as an absolute mujtahid” meaning that in our times there is no one who could be considered to

even reach the ankles of those of the likes of The four Imaams, Bukharee, Muslim, Abdur-Rahman bin Mahdi, Daraqutni or even Nawawee, Ibn Rajab or Ibn Hajr.

But, nevertheless, considering the positions of our time, then those whom have attained the rank of authorities in the religion have been regarded as mujtahideen but not like on par with the mujtahid Imaams of the past.

Now in this issue, we come to the affair of the ijtihaad of the major scholars in recent times (within the past 2 centuries)

One of the doubts raised is that the Imaams of the sunnah have differed over this issue of revolt and and takfeer and even irhaab (terror; obviously within the past decade)

Example of this is when people bring forth evidence that Muhammad ibn Ibraheem wrote letters openly to the rulers, and that Shawkaneer had openly addressed the rulers. There has even occurred where al-Albanee allowed the suicide bombings under strict conditions (and not the conditions we are in now).

So what is said in reply is this. We would like to follow what is certainty. This doubt being raised, is a doubt that has always been raised among the deviated groups. The reason for this is that we all know the universal fact that anyone and everyone after the prophet is not infallible. This means that people are prone to error.

So from the murj'a, any one of them can claim or justify their unsubstantiated belief that emaan is only speech and tasdeeq (attestation of the heart) without action and use the stance of Imaam Abu Haneefah for this under the claim that Abu Haneefa made ijtihaad and we accept that and it is a legitimate khilaaf among ahlu-sunnah

Again, The mutassawifa from the Sufis thrive and instigate over the acclaimed tassawuf of Hasan al-Basri.

Likewise the asha'ira, and they are the worst of the three in this issue, because they had more imams who fell into their aspect than others. So they utilize the errors of the Imaams from the likes of Ibn Abdul-Barr, Nawawee, Ibn Hajr, Junayd, and many others, and hold on to the claim that many of those imams in those centuries were ashari and all of them could not have been on other than the sunnah, and use this to justify the unfounded belief (having nothing to do with the creed of the salaf) of t'aweel of the attributes of Allah in whee t'awil cannot be applied and tafweedhul-m'ana.

chapter 12 **The Conditions for Takfeer**

Reason or motive is not, was not, and will never be a condition for takfeer nor is it synonymous with qasd (intent). Meaning that whatever reason or motive of the one who made kufr is not synonymous or equal as him having the intent to do kufr.

The Shaykh that they so blindly follow, **Fawzaan** has explained

“And it is necessary that every action (of kufr) be accompanied with qasd (intent). Hence, the action of a person who forgets, or is asleep, or who is young, or is possessed, or is compelled, then it is not to be counted due to the absence of qasd. And I advise those that they learn before they speak, because speaking in the likes of these affairs is dangerous, and it requires knowledge” (al-Muntaqaa 2/9-10)

As for the guidelines pertaining to the performance of takfeer, **Alamaah Ibn Uthaymeen** explained it so ellequently in the following

“So the hukm of takfeer of a specific individual requires two matters

1. Establishing that this characteristic that he brought is what necessitates kufr (the kufr that expels from the religion) and
2. Applying the conditions of takfeer to him” (al-Qawl ul-Mufeed Ala Kitaabu Tawheed)

He also lays these very conditions out in his own Majmoo al-Fatawaa where it was asked to him

“The conditions for the judgement of takfeer of a muslim? And the judgement upon the one who did any action that is mukaffir but only in jest”

The Shaykh replied “For the judgement of the takfeer of a muslim, there are two conditions: The first, that the evidence that this matters is something that expels form the religion is established. The second, the application of the ruling upon the one who does that, in that he has knowledge of it, and that he intends it’

To further lay it out what must be present in the one who is subject to criticism of kufr has to be his intent in doing it (qasd) and his having knowledge of it.

After this measure has been taken, we then move on towards the removal of barriers

These barriers are

Jahl (ignorance)

Ikraah (compulsion which opposes intent)

T’awil (faulty interpretation of certain texts which lead him to his intent and so called knowledge)

Shubhah (misconception or doubts that one is under)

Dhulool (unmindfulness. This includes under intoxication, hypnosis, mentally fragemented)

This , all o this is the tafseel of slam, it was always like this and will continue to be like this with ahlu-sunnah. This very path that we tread upon is one matter abandoned by the people of takfeer and revolt, who after viewing one action that does not entail a nuwaqid of Islam, negates Islam for them anyway

Part 3: Terrorism (Irhaab) and relieving ahlu-sunnah from it and the false claims of the khawarij of our times

chapter 13 How the Khawarij understand the verse in Suraah al Ma'idah

The kharijite understanding of “Whoever Rules by Other than Allah” as viewed by ahlu-sunnah

Imaam Aboo Hayyaan al-Andalusee – rahimahullaah – said “The Khawaarij use this aayah as a proof to say that everyone who disobeys Allaah, then he is a disbeliever! And they say that it is a textual proof stating that everyone who rules by other than what Allaah revealed, then he is a disbeliever. And everyone who sins, then indeed he rules by other than what Allaah revealed, so it is obligatory that he be a disbeliever.’’ Bahrul-Muheet (3/493).

Alaamah Saalih al-Fawzaan gave the following fatwa

Question: Is the one who makes takfeer of the rulers and encourages the Muslims to revolt against their rulers, to be considered from the Khawaarij?

Answer:

This is the madhab of the Khawaarij. When an individual holds it permissible to revolt against the Muslim rulers, and more severe than that is to declare them to be disbelievers. This is the madhab of the Khawaarij .Al-Ijaabaat al-Muhimmah fee Mashaakil il-Mudlahimmah,

Like wise the Imaam of the Sunnah, the thorn against the Innovators Imaam al-Barbaharee, the author of Sharhu Sunnah said

"Whoever rebels against a Muslim ruler is one of the Khawaarij, has caused dissent within the Muslims, has contradicted the narrations and has died the death of the days of ignorance."

Abu Bakr al-Aajurree

"It is not fitting for the one who sees the uprising of a khaarijee who has revolted against the Imaam, whether he is just or oppressive - so this person has revolted and gathered a group behind him, has pulled out his sword and has made lawful the killing of Muslims -

it is not fitting for the one who sees this, that he becomes deceived by this person's recitation of the Qur'aan, the length of his standing in the prayer, nor his constant fasting or his good and excellent words in knowledge when (it is clear to him that) this person's way and methodology (madhhab) is that of the Khawaarij". ash-Sharee'ah (p. 28),

Ibnul-Qayyim said

"And as for Imaam Maalik, then Ibn al-Qaasim said, "I heard Maalik say, "Indeed there are a people who desire worship but squander the knowledge (being deprived of it) so they revolt against the Ummah of Muhammad with their swords. And if they had followed the knowledge, then it would have prevented them from doing that." Miftaah Daaris-Sa'aadah (1/119),

Also **Saalih al-Fawzaan** gave the following fatwa

Question:

What is the ruling regarding the one who disobeys the rulers or criticises them?

Answer:

Whoever disobeys the command of the ruler then he has disobeyed the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). As long as the ruler does not order him with sinning, then disobedience of him is the disobedience of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). Similarly if he criticises the ruler, then this is the madhab of the Khawaarij who criticise the rulers, speak about them and incite the people against them. The young rabble who rose up against Uthmaan did not do so except due to the vile Ibn Saba'. He began to speak in the gatherings and incite the people until the foolish people began to rage, and this ended in the killing of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu). And what tribulations were the Muslims thrown into due to his killing? Things that would make the hair turn grey due the killing of the Caliph and rebelling against him. Al-Ijaabaat al-Muhimmah fee Mashaakil il-Mudlahimmah

Abul-Mudhaffar as-Sam'ani said in his tafsir (2/42),

“And know that the Khawarij use this verse as evidence and they say, ‘Whoever does not rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever’ whereas Ahl us-Sunnah say such a one does not disbelieve by abandoning judgement by what Allaah has revealed.”

The author of Tafsir ul-Manar stated (6/406) stated:

“As for the apparent meaning of the verse, then none of the well-known scholars of jurisprudence, fiqh, have spoken by it, in fact not a single person has ever spoken by it.”

Al-Jassas said

“The khawarij have interpreted these verses to justify the takfeer of the one who does not rule by what Allah has revealed without willful rejection, juhood” [Ahkaamul-Quraan (2/543)]

chapter 14 [In Defense of the Jordainian Masha'ikh](#)

The Shaykh, Alaamah, Imaam Muhammad Naasiru-Deen al-Albanee was the center and vocal point with the fitnah of takfeer and between the zandiqah of irj'aa and kharijiyyah. The muhadith of the era had a difference from in opinion in the matters of those who do not perform salaah from the opinion of the Sa'oodi mashaykh from which this denoted ikhtilaaf from ahlu-sunnah since Imaam Al-Albanee and his students originate their belief in their position from the salaf just as the Sa'oodi ulema do. So from this ikhtilaaf is when those with intentions outside of the topic itself used this as an opportunity to accuse Imaam Al-Albanee of irj'aa. So in reality three differing groups emerged from this. The first was the mashaykh of Urdun, Imaam Albanee, and many from ahlu-sunnah. 2. The Sa'oodi position regarding the issue and those from ahlu-sunnah 3. Those who took the Sa'oodi position since it seemed to lean closer to their manhaj thinking that some of their statements was in support for them all the while the first two groups was a matter of ikhtilaaf from ahlu-sunnah which even caused the Lajna ad-D'aaimah to issue the ruling of banning Shaykh Ali Halabi's books in the issue of takfeer. This was due according to the opposition they had from the perspective of a difference between their proofs all originating from the salaf which entailed ikhtilaaf amongst ahlu-sunnah. The fatwa itself should not and cannot be used as a means to justify the belief that the mashaykh of Urdun have a deviance in their aqeeda in the issue itself. That is because that belief would oppose all of the ulema.

So this third group took it upon themselves to justify the position of opposition to the salaf in this matter by using the statements of the Sa'oodi ulema. So they use some of them as reference points thinking that they have a valid position and teaching the youth and those who are new to Islam and the sunnah that their position is actually a position from ahlu-sunnah. So the greatest flag that they carried was the accusation of irj'aa against ahlu-sunnah. This actual flag in due time would expose the reality of 1. their ignorance (in that no one from the people of knowledge has preceded them in this statement) and 2. their perpetual fight against ahlu-sunnah and 3. their deviance in the matter and hawaa.

So the noble Shaykh Muhammad ibn Saalih al-Uthaymeen (rahimahullah) said in a cassette called "Makaalmaat Ma'a Mashaykh ad_dawah as-Salafiyah"part 4

He said "Whoever accused Shaykh Al-Albanee of irj'aa has erred. Either he is one who doesn't know al-Albanee or he is one who does not know irj'aa. Al-Albanee is a man from ahlu-sunnah, rahimahullah, a defender of it, an Imaam in hadeeth. We do not know anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people, we ask Allah to pardon them, have jealousy in their hearts. For when (one of them) sees that a person has been met with acceptance (by the people), he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity-and those (hypocrites) who would find nothing but the striving of (the believers). So they would defame the one who gave in charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity. We know the man from his books, rahimahullah, and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is salafee in

aqeedah, of sound manhaj. However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allah on account of something that Allah did not perform takfeer of them. They claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a murji – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication. Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from”

As for the defense of the mashaykh of Jordan (ash-Shams) mainly Shaykh Ali Hasan, Shaykh Saleem al-Hilalee, Shaykh Mashoor Hasan Salman, Shaykh Muhammad Musa Nasr then this is a refutation of those who say that which is incorrect concerning the accusation of irj’aa. They say

“We say – as the People of the Sunnah say – that an act of *kufir* is *kufir* and makes the doer a *kaafir* due to it indicating internalized *kufir*. And we do not say – as the People of *Bid’ah* say – that the act of *kufir* is not *kufir* but it is evidence of *kufir*. And the difference is clear”

So the accusation of irj’aa has been uprooted since the accusation itself was that they (these mashaykh) say that actions do not effect emaan. And to go further the accusers mentioned that the proofs mentioned that was with the mashaykh were from irj’aa and not correct. So in reply here is Ibn Abil-Izz’z position when he said that “Ahlu-sunnah are united on the point that whomever Allaah calls *kaafir* they will also call *kaafir*. They say that we cannot imagine that Allaah will call *kaafir* someone who judges according to other than His revealed rules and that His Messenger would also call him a *kaafir*, but we would desist from calling him a *kaafir*... the commission of a major sin is *kufir* of action, not *kufir* of belief...” [Commentary on the Creed of At-Tahawi, p. 272]. That is, one can be a *kaafir* in action, or in a metaphorical sense, and not necessarily a *kaafir* outside of Islaam

Ash-Shaykh S’ad al-Hussein said in his personal letter to Shaykh Abdul-Azeez Aal-Ashaykh, the Mufti of Saudi Arabia and the head of al-Lajnahti Da’imah, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaykh Ali Hasan’s two books on the subject of takfeer and ruling by other than what Allah has revealed, he stated the following

As for these brothers (the Urduni Shiyookh), I have known the for around 15 years, and they by Allah, are the best of those I know, I do not say in Jordan alone, but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj, and dawah.

As for this doubt of Irj’aa which the shaytan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) havee only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the manhaj an-Nubuwwah, the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the takfeeris such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi, and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists (Rihlati Ilaa Bilaadul-Haramayn”)

chapter 15 Is terror A Part of Islam

Allah says in His book

“Oh ye who believe! Do not eat up your property among yourselves unjustly except it be a trade amongst you, by mutual consent. And do not kill yourselves (nor kill one another). Surely, Allah is Most Merciful to you. And whoever does that through aggression and injustice, We shall cast him into the fire, and that is easy for Allah” Nisa’a 29-30

This topic is one that needs clarity in its term. Terrorism is, according to the American government as mentioned by Shaykh Bilaal Phillips, “as the threat or the use of violence to advance a political cause by individuals or groups, whether acting for or in opposition to established government authority when such action are intended to shock, stun, or intimidate a target group wider than the immediate victims.”

According to what the Americans had defined as to what terrorism is, then the following, according to them, is terrorism

1. The use of violence of the political group known as the Zionists who, by the use of the intention to shock, stun, and intimidation of the original residence and the fight against the established government in Palistine which was backed by the Americans themselves. So according to their definition, they funded terrorism. So therefore, their accounts should be seized and stripped as they fund terrorism and they should be placed in boot camps like Guantanamo Bay and be tortured for their finance of terror and destruction
2. The Russian campaign against the citizens of Chechnya falls under this term terrorism as explained by the Americans. So therefore, fundamentally America should have warred with Russia for these acts of terrorism.
3. The American invasion of Vietnam by which a group of people (American government not civilians) wished to enter in on the basis of their own agenda or their political cause in a place where they were not wanted. So according to their definitions, this is terrorism and therefore every American that served in this effort in by any means is to be put in prison or executed because they aided and financed in the realm of terror according to their definition.
4. The invasion of Afghanistan, on an issue where they could not have fought due to the fact that it was a group of people that was non-existent within a government (meaning no government made an atrocity on the U.S. it was the act of some vigilantes) so on the act of commoners, they made the decision to invade a country under the beliefs that the attacker resided therein. So they stepped in a soil where they were not wanted (upon reliable sources not the media) and decided to fight against them, unfortunately the brunt or aftermath of what occurred through this was the terrorizing of the civilians and the countless atrocities done on them due to the efforts of our beloved country America under the guise “the fight against terror”
5. Their invasion of Iraq, all under a misconception, to enhance or further establish their ideological conceptions of democracy and freedom to a people who do not wish to have this fundamental background in their rule of authority, which means that they as a group (American government under the force of soldiers) decided to use the threat of force and violence to advance their political causes on a nation that they were not wanted in.

It is apparent, to anyone with a sane and sound mind, even for someone confused that the above in reality were all not only acts of terror, they were wars of terror. The most ironical reality of this matter is how they do not apply this name to those who do not fall

within the religion of Islam ,and the only person outside of Islam that they have named this (terrorist) is Timothy McVeigh.

So it is necessary that when the issue of terrorism is spoke, that all of it, is one and the same, meaning terrorism is the act of causing fear in the heart of those targeted and those not targeted which is fundamentally based on matters not established by Allah and His messenger. So therefore anything that may seem to look like this in action, but is fundamentally through the cause for Allah and His messenger like the Muslim advancement from the likes of Umar ibnul-Kattab and S'ad ibn Abi Waqqas and others on other nations is deemed as war, and Islam the correct jihad, and anything that is like this on the outset that is other than for Allah and what He has established, then it is nothing but terrorism. And it is also necessary to know that there is a hypocritical mindset coming from the same people who have initiated the so called fight against terrorism. So when we speak of terrorism we need to make clear the terrorism of who, the terrosim of these jihaadi takfeeris or the terrorism of the Americans.

This issue is great for a couple reasons. A lot has preceded regarding emaan and kufr and the issues of the rulers and the takfeer and revolt that stem from this issue are the backbone for what is now modern day terrorism and the blowing oneself up in suicide missions. But from all that has preceded, this issue is the primary element, the crux of the matter, the back bone for actual modern day terrorism and the cornerstone for all of those who apply themselves to this millah.

Al-Alamaah Saalih al-Luhaydan was asked the following

Question: How do you view, your eminence, what occurred with the attacks in the United States Of America from an Islaamic perspective?

Response: Allaah has made Islaam to forbid wrongdoing (thulm) and the Prophet (sal-Allaahu `alayhe wa sallam) stated:

((Ath-thulmu thulumaat yaum al-qiyaamah (Wrong is multiplied on the Day of Resurrection)))

And it is related in the authentic hadeeth that Allaah stated:

((Oh My slaves, I have forbidden wrong and oppression to Myself and I have made it forbidden among you therefore do not do wrong or oppress))

Therefore, attacks upon those whom have not attacked you and to kill innocent people who have committed no crime (i.e. against you) is among those things forbidden in Islaam because it does not allow the shedding of blood except for a legally justified reason and it is not permissible to shed blood in general. It is something allowed only in the case of war to kill the combatant enemy. As far as attacking even if it is to kill a perpetrator immediately, is not considered among the righteous deeds nor from the permitted acts. On the contrary it is of the detestable acts because to kill a person who has not perpetrated any crime nor done anything deserving being killed is considered of the major sins and most heinous of crimes. Accordingly that crimes which occurred in America that we witnessed its aftermath in the photographs taken through one of the media

outlets is no doubt among the most dangerous criminal acts which Islaam in no way agrees with and it is not permissible for anyone to condone. It is an abomination.

The matter in Islaam is such that one may not be treated as a criminal unless that person has attacked and therefore there may be reprisals or enmity towards him. As far as going about that in such a way that the result is taking thousands of souls of women and children and those whom are non-combatants and such then it is of the evil of acts. Reported by Okaz newspaper on Friday, 26 Jumaadaa Al-Akhirah 1422 corresponding to September 14, 2001

A reply to the outrageous and repugnant fatwa of the imbeciles of taakfeer among the mubtadiyah (innovators) of takfeer and irhaab

I will inshallah be exact and to the point regarding the total variance between the light and knowledge of the Imaams of the sunnah and the Prophetic Manhaj verse the corrupt, evil, disasterous, unfounded, emmence in darknees, bogus fatwa of the fools and bafoons of hawaa and dhalaa among them Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisee, Abu Qatadah, Abu Hamza al-Misri and others of their like

The rebel Abu Qatadan belief of killing innocent women and children= he said

"Therefore, it becomes clear that threatening the offspring and wives of the apostates with death, as done by the Armed Islamic resistance in Algeria, in order to weaken their oppression of women, prisoners and brothers, is a legislated act and there is no doubt surrounding it." (Ansaar Magazine no. 90, page. 20, 30/3/1995)

in page 12 of that same magazine is produced a fatwa of him that he said

"A fatwa of great importance about the permissibility of killing women and children to repel the danger of the killing and violation of the Ikhwaan (brothers)

The Islamic belief is what follows

In Bukhari (3014) and Muslim (1744), narrations carrying a similar wording, upon the authority of Ibn 'Umar (Radiya Allahu 'anhu) who said:

"The Messenger of Allah (Sallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam) prohibited the killing of women and children."

It is authentically reported by Malik (in Muwatta) and others, that when Abu Bakr sent the armies to Shaam he said:

"Do not kill women or children or an old aged senile person. Do not cut down fruit-bearing trees. Do not destroy an inhabited place."

Bukhari reports (3045) upon the authority of Abu Hurairah:

"Allah's Messenger (Sallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam) sent out ten spies under the command of 'Asim bin Thabit Al-Ansari, the grand-father of 'Asim bin 'Umar Al-Khattab. When they reached (a place called) Al-Hadah between 'Usfan and Mecca, their presence was made known to a sub-tribe of Hudhail called Banu Liحيان. So they sent about one hundred archers after them. The archers traced the footsteps (of the Muslims) till they found the traces of dates which they had eaten at one of their camping places. The archers said, "These dates are of Yathrib (i.e. Medina)," and went on tracing the Muslims' footsteps. When 'Asim and his companions became aware of them, they took refuge in a (high) place. But the enemy encircled them and said, "Come down and surrender. We give you a solemn promise and covenant that we will not kill anyone of you." 'Asim bin Thabit said, "O people! As for myself, I will never get down to be under the protection of an infidel. O Allah! Inform your Prophet about us." So the archers threw their arrows at them and martyred 'Asim. Three of them came down and surrendered to them, accepting their promise and covenant and they were Khubaib, Zaid bin Ad-Dathina and another man. When the archers got hold of them, they untied the strings of the arrow bows and tied their captives with them. The third man said, "This is the first proof of treachery! By Allah, I will not go with you for I follow the example of these." He meant the martyred companions. The archers dragged him and struggled with him (till they killed him). Then Khubaib and Zaid bin Ad-Dathina were taken away by them and later on they sold them as slaves in Mecca after the event of the Badr battle.

The sons of Al-Harit bin 'Amr bin Naufal bought Khubaib for he was a person who had killed (their father) Al-Hari bin 'Amr on the day (of the battle) of Badr. Khubaib remained imprisoned by them till they decided unanimously to kill him. One day Khubaib borrowed from a daughter of Al-Harith, a razor for shaving his public hair, and she lent it to him. By chance, while she was inattentive, a little son of hers went to him (i.e. Khubaib) and she saw that Khubaib had seated him on his thigh while the razor was in his hand. She was so much terrified that Khubaib noticed her fear and said, "Are you afraid that I will kill him? Never would I do such a thing." Later on (while narrating the story) she said, "By Allah, I had never seen a better captive than Khubaib. By Allah, one day I saw him eating from a bunch of grapes in his hand while he was fettered with iron chains and (at that time) there was no fruit in Mecca." She used to say, "It was food Allah had provided Khubaib with."

When they took him to Al-Hil out of Mecca sanctuary to martyr him, Khubaib requested them. "Allow me to offer a two-Rak'at prayer." They allowed him and he prayed two Rakat and then said, "By Allah! Had I not been afraid that you would think I was worried, I would have prayed more." Then he (invoked evil upon them) saying, "O Allah! Count them and kill them one by one, and do not leave anyone of them!" Then he recited: "As I am killed as a Muslim, I do not care in what way I receive my death for Allah's Sake, for this is for the Cause of Allah. If He wishes, He will bless the cut limbs of my

body." Then Abu Sarva, 'Ubqa bin Al-Harith went up to him and killed him. It was Khubaib who set the tradition of praying for any Muslim to be martyred in captivity (before he is executed). The Prophet told his companions of what had happened (to those ten spies) on the same day they were martyred. Some Quraish people, being informed of 'Asim bin Thabit's death, sent some messengers to bring a part of his body so that his death might be known for certain, for he had previously killed one of their leaders (in the battle of Badr). But Allah sent a swarm of wasps to protect the dead body of 'Asim, and they shielded him from the messengers who could not cut anything from his body."

You can clearly see how Khubaib was oppressively captured, and then on top of that he was deceived, and he also knew that he was going to be killed. Furthermore, Allah allowed him to be in the presence of one of the children of the very people that unjustly captured him.

Bearing all these factors in mind, this did not lead him to kill this child.

Ibn Hajr in fathul-Bar'ee said:

"This hadeeth proves that the covenant made with the polytheists has to be fulfilled, and the killing of their children must be avoided."

What has been reported by Ibn S'ad in At-Tabaqat (2/91), Al-Waaqidi in Al-Maghaazi (1/392-394), Ibn Hishaam in As-Seerah (2/275), Abu 'Awaanah in his Musnad (4/221-223) and Al-Bayhaqi in Dalaa'il An-Nubuwwah (4/33-34), clearly illustrates the seriousness and gravity of killing women and children; this is the story when the Prophet (Sallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam) sent some of his companions to kill Abu Raafi' Al-Yahoodi, and he was an individual who used to harm the Prophet.

Upon the authority of 'Abdullah ibn 'Ateek (Radiya Allah 'anhu) who said:

"When his wife screamed one of the men from amongst us began to lift his sword against her, but then he remembered that the Messenger of Allah prohibited killing women and he refrained his hand, if it was not for that it would have been the end of her that night."

Ibn Taymiyyah said in As-Saarim Al Maslool (2/258) after mentioning this incident:

"We only mentioned this to repel the misconception of anyone who may think that the killing of women was permissible the year of the conquest of Makkah then prohibited after that, actually the people of knowledge have no uncertainty about the fact that the killing of women has never been permissible....

Even though this woman yelled, and the evil consequences of her scream were feared, they withheld from killing her hoping that scaring her would prevent any threat she posed."

This is a story about a disbelieving woman; where the companions of the Messenger of Allah refrained from shedding her blood despite the fact that she was complicating things for them.

That is the reason why Abu 'Awaanah entitled a chapter in his Musnad (4/220) with:
"The prohibition of killing women and children in the lands of war and fighting"

And now I direct your attention to one of the most heretical statements that has yet to come from the individuals oftakfeer and revolt. So this misguided fool has said

Allah (swt) says,

"Prepare as much as you can from power (missile weaponry) and steeds of war, in order to terrify the enemy of Allah" [EMQ Anfal: 60]

Allah (swt) made it obligatory in this ayah to prepare (Al I'daad) and to terrify (Al Irhaab) the enemy of Allah. This is waajib and this ayah is qati' (clear cut) and whoever denies it's meaning is kaafir regardless of his 'interpretation' of terrorism. Allah (swt) says,

"Nobody rejects the ayat except the Kafirun." [EMQ Ankabut: 47]

The ayah mentioned Al Ijhaad, which means:

"To reject and say by the tongue: 'it is not true'."

Furthermore, Allah (swt) says,

"Who is more oppressor than the one who lies about Allah or denies the truth when it comes to him? Is there not a place in hell for the Kafirun? As for those who strive hard in our cause, we will surely guide them to our paths. Verily, Allah is with the Muhsinun." [EMQ Ankabut: 68-69]

Whoever says that Islam is free from terrorism or wants to differentiate between Islam and terrorism is committing Al Juhoud and that is Kufir Akbar – and will take them out of the fold of Islam.

The one who says 'we should fight against terrorism', he is fighting against Islam. We know very well that USA meant no one else by the term 'terrorists' but Islam and Muslims and the one who wants to avoid terrorism, is avoiding Islam.

So by default, this fool, who now is most likely what he made everyone to be (a kaafir) has made takfeer on the following

1. Allah
2. the prophet
3. the companions
4. the next two generations of righteous muslims

5. all the muslim Imaams who have adopted there way
6. and every muslim on the face of the earth now

Also he said that whoever fights against terrorism is fighting against Islam, so therefore the following are among those considered to fight Islam

1. Allah
2. the prophet
3. the companions
4. the next two generations of righteous muslims
5. all the muslim Imaams who have adopted there way
6. and every muslim on the face of the earth now

Lets look at the first ayah. The first ayah was

“Prepare as much as you can from power (missile weaponry) and steeds of war, in order to terrify the enemy of Allah” [EMQ Anfal: 60]

Allah said,

[تُرْهِبُونَ]

(to threaten), or to strike fear,

[بِهِ عَدُوَّ اللَّهِ وَعَدُوَّكُمْ]

(the enemy of Allah and your enemy), the disbelievers,

[وَأَآخِرِينَ مِنْ دُونِهِمْ]

(and others besides them), such as Bani Qurayzah, according to Mujahid, or persians, according to As-Suddi.

Muqatil bin Hayyan and `Abdur-Rahman bin Zayd bin Aslam said that this Ayah refers to hypocrites, as supported by Allah's statement,

[وَمِمَّنْ حَوْلَكُم مِّنَ الْأَعْرَابِ مُنَافِقُونَ وَمِنْ أَهْلِ الْمَدِينَةِ مَرَدُوا عَلَى النِّفَاقِ لَا تَعْلَمُهُمْ نَحْنُ نَعْلَمُهُمْ]

(And among the bedouins around you, some are hypocrites, and so are some among the people of Al-Madinah who persist in hypocrisy; you know them not, We know them.)[9:101].

Since this ayah refers to the hypocrites, then it is important that I reveal some information regarding the modern day hypocrites. These modern day hypocrites, according to Alamaah Fawzaan are those who are the likes of this individual who said this garbage, so by default whatever he is upon is to be applied on him, in that the muslims should prepare with full preparation against the likes of these takfeeris and revolutionists and strike terror in their hearts and punish them and revile them where they are and chase them out, and slaughter them as the command of the prophet, and not allowing them to remain in the land, and we should make them hidden and afraid to even speak or come out of their snake holes, and mock them, and label them, and hurt them, and execute them, and anything that they deserve from the likes of these actions.

The ayaah in question revolves around the wisdom of Allah in that during jihaad then this should be done and ahlu-sunnah fully agrees with this. We strike fear in their hearts without doubt and we should not in no way disbelieve in this ayaah. But this person of heretical hawaa decides to use his own personal conjecture on how this means which he clearly states "regardless of whether anyone has different ideas on the word(terrorism)"

So therefore to make it clear, blowing yourself up or setting up bombs in different places (muslims or non muslim) on yourself is not terror. This is called "camakase raids" by which Shaykh Uthaymeen held the opinion that they will abide in the fire forever. You see, the first to introduce this style of attack were the Japanese, and these fools copied this style but instead of plane, they use bombs, in any case, it is the same method. If what Allah describes in the Quraan is terror then everything done by these idiotic takfeeri jihaadi zindeeqs is unislamic revolt and camakase raids. This is because there is a variance between what was stated in the ayaah and the false interpretation of this takfeeri to satisfy his hawaa.

And then my misguided brother says that whoever says that Islam and terrorism is different or that terrorism is not part of islaam has committed kufr al-juhood which is kufrul-akbaar and there for outside the fold of Islam.

WHERE on earth did this come from. WHO from the Imaams has stated this claim. HOW can we find the proofs for this claim. Indeed under his false interpretation of what terrorism means then the ruling may have truth to it but again it is based under a false mascination of this takfeeri.

And he uses the proof that we know that the usa meant no one else in their harbu-irhaab except that they really meant muslims. So by this then this is his proof. Of course we know that is the case. That does not nullify the camackase raid like actions nor the unislamic revolts.

So just because the kuffar are fighting against what ahlu-sunnah says is unislamic does not make ahlu-sunnah to be in allegience with the kuffar. But of course this is where this person wishes to decieve in this hidden slogan. truly a clever tactic.

What this takfeeri calls legalized Islamic terror is actually the Islamic view on mischief. You see, the view of the khawarij and these takfeeri vigilantes is what Allah has referred to below

Verily Allah says in surratul-Baqaraah

"Verily they are the ones who make mischief, but they perceive not"

Truely this applies not only to the kuffar but to the innovated methodology of revolt harbored by these people that originated from the kuffar

"and when it is said to them: "Make not mischief on the earth," they say: "We are only peacemakers" (2:11)

So when ahlu-sunnah advise them from there foolish and fruitless endeavors (due to misplaced priorities) and advise them not to do this and that, then they (the khawarij of the era) say "we are only trying to establish the islamic state (peace) or "we beleive and are not going to abandon jihaad" and other such fantasies of their whims that pop up from the whispers of the shayateen and may Allah severe the affairs of the shayateen khubathaa.

chapter 16 Is Extremism Part of the Religion

Is extremism part of the religion and are the ways of the modern day people of takfeer and open callers to khurooj, jihad, and terrorism considered the middle way or is it extremism

Shaykh `Alee al-Faqeehee on The Ways Used By the Khawaarij To Incite the Youth

Shaykh `Alee bin Naasir al-Faqeehee explained that what is said regarding the excellence of these miracles (karaamaat), then that is amongst the ways of stirring up the youth and he also said:

Verily, the ideology of the Khawaarij which is exemplified in declaring the Islamic societies to be disbelieving (societies) has not ceased to spread, and it has its callers and those who organise for it to be spread. It is spread using these means by way of the Internet and the callers (to this ideology) spread it amongst the youth (in order) to employ their religious zeal. This is done by spreading what they claim to be miracles of the mujaahideen, and this is amongst the ways of stirring up the youth and using their zeal. It is for this reason that they approach them from the avenue of their religion, and there has come in a hadeeth of Abu Bakr for a hadeeth of `Alee bin Abee Taalib (radiyAllaahu `anhu) in description of the Khawaarij - and Ibn Hajr has related it in the explanation of the hadeeth - "Then Satan will come to them from the avenue of their religion". And this is happening today, because what is spread on the World Wide Web is from unknown (unidentified) people, not known for knowledge and nor for religion. And all of that (is done) in order to stir up the youth from the angle of their religion. The likes of this is not befitting for an intelligent person in that he turns to an unknown ignoramus (on the Internet), and such a one could be a plant (placed) by certain orientations who have goals that are enmitous to Islaam and which are not openly announced to the people. And when we notify the youth of the likes of this (affair), we do not (at the same time) reject the miracles of the Awliyaa (pious friends of Allaah), rather these affairs are established and they are from the creed of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa`ah. And we do not also reject what Islaam and the Muslims are subjected to by its enemies. These affairs are well-known, and it is obligatory upon every Muslim to do what he is able towards this. However, Jihaad in the path of Allaah has conditions and rulings, and it is the Scholars and the Jurists of the religion who explain all of that.

chapter 17 The Rationale of Those who Flung to Revolution

In this section I wish to deal with the logic (illogic) and rationale (uncommon sense) of those who have taken on this opposition to the prophetic methodology

Ibn Sa'ad said in *Tabaqaatul-Kubraa* (7/163-165):

A group of Muslims came to al-Hasan al-Basree (d.110H) seeking a verdict to rebel against al-Hajjaaj [8]. So they said, "O Aboo Sa'eed! What do you say about fighting this oppressor who has unlawfully spilt blood and unlawfully taken wealth and did this and that?" So al-Hasan said, "I hold that he should not be fought. If this is the punishment from Allah, then you will not be able to remove it with your swords. If this is a trial from Allaah, then be patient until Allaah's judgment comes, and He is the best of judges." So they left al-Hasan, disagreed with him and rebelled against al-Hajjaaj - so al-Hajjaaj killed them all.

Based on the above logic and reason of these people Hasan al-Basri comment by the following remark

"If the people had patience, when they were being tested by their unjust ruler, it will not be long before Allaah will give them a way out. However, they always rush for their swords, so they are left to their swords. By Allaah! Not even for a single day did they bring about any good."

Haafidh Khateeb al-Baghdaadee says:

"A man from the khawaarij entered upon Ma`moon, so he said: 'What is your position concerning our disagreement?' He said: 'A verse from the Book of Allaah the Exalted.' He said: 'What is it?' He said: 'His statement: "And those who do not rule by what Allaah revealed, they are the disbelievers.'" So Ma`moon said to him: 'Are you certain that it was revealed?' He said: 'Yes.' He said: 'What is your proof?' He said: 'The agreement (ijmaa') of the ummah.' So Ma`moon said to him: 'So just as you are pleased with their agreement in its revelation, then you should be pleased with their agreement (ijmaa') in its interpretation.'" *Taareekh Baghdaad* (10/186)

From among the rationale of the current people of Aqliheem khasartoom (the people who lost all intellect and reason) is the rationale of Abu Qatadah al-Filistinee. He, a Jordanian National, one who was born in the land of Islam, and lived among Muslims, due to his twisted thought pattern of judging those who go to the masjid for the salah and by which the country establishes the salaah, and the open propagation of Islam in that country, had

decided to perform takfeer of the ruler of that land and those who abide therein. So due to his misguidance, he literally traded being among the people who at least try to adhere to tawheed, The Book and Sunnah, and a place where ulema exist, and a place where the call for the salaah is made, he decided to leave all of this and trade this blessing to go to the land of utter and open kufr, the enemies of Allah, a place which is the second greatest enemy to Islam, England. He believed that those people in that land were kuffar, yet he deemed it permissible to trade what is not clear (their being muslim which is of course only to him) in leaving Jordan, and fleeing to the land of the enemies of Allah and Islam and join with them and benefit from their secular laws, may the curse of Allah be upon this fool. This is the reality of their zandiqaaah ya ayu ahlil-ikhwaa. Basically he cannot stand being around people who at the very least, claim Islam, make the salaah and other such sanctioned Islamic actions, yet he can tolerate willfully the kufr of the naajis kafiraa by which their kufr is truly atheem and everyone is erected (raised on that day) with those whom they wish to be with and Allah is Azeezul-Hakeem.

Another part of their rationale is their opposition of the actual divine laws implemented on earth. You see, their demented hallucinations lead them to proclaim with a mouth as wide as a monkey that they fight for the khilafa and that they only obey and submit to one who has established this. Of course, the people of the sunnah and the jama'ah and those outside of this have known by history alone that this is not the case. Even when there is one then they still rebel and fight and make takfeer of the ruler. Likewise anyone who even remotely implementing as much of Islam as possible is also rejected by them. So the epitome of this rationale is that they, these smelly takfeeri, do not concentrate on rebelling and causing mischief and spreading blood in the land in those lands, where it is clear that tawheed as was understood by the prophet and his sahabah has been abandoned for its opposite (shirk), and they do not concentrate on those lands who clearly replaced the shariah of Allah in their lands. Instead of focusing on true and apparent kufr and shirk, they direct their attention at the only state, the only state in the world who at the least, admits openly that the shariah is the constitution or the ruling factor in the laws of that land, they direct their extremism at the only state, who implements most of the Islamic laws including the haad and others laws. So instead of venting their beliefs and the consequences of those beliefs to the clear people of kufr and shirk, they vent their misguidance on the people who are the closest in allegiance to Allah and His messenger. So I say, all their claims and rhetoric is all bogus and attained the rank of the dumpster as there is total nifaaq in their statements, and the tongue is the reflection of the heart.

It is also noteworthy to mention that from the rationale of these people from the likes of Abu Qatadah is that, for example, he himself decides that renting a town hall (in darul-kufr), where all kinds of kufr and evils happen after his jumua khutbahs is better than being in the masaajid that have been clearly established alone for the intention of the worship of Allah. So he flees to the town centers of the kuffar in favor of going to the masaajid of the muslims

From among their rationale is that due to the bogus fatwa of Abu Qatadah ar-Rajeem, an incident occurred in Algeria where some parents allowed for their daughter to marry a policeman in Algeria, and the Policeman asked for her hand in Marriage. The parents

accepted this, but the brother of the girl, who was influence by the G.I.A (Armed Islamic Group), went to his parents to establish the proofs on them. He said to his parents “This policeman is a taghoot kaafir, it is not permissible that my sister marries him”. The parents rejected what the boy said, so he killed them. I do not need to explain the type of rationale that was the serving factor to this situation ina lillahi wa ina ilaihi raji’oon.

chapter 18 The Takfeer of Imaam Bin Baz

The scoundrel Abu Hamza al-Misri gave his own non scholastic fatwa in which he said that Shaykh Bin Baz, of whom some of the known scholars of ahlu-sunnah believed he was shaykhul-Islam, said he was a kaafir. His judgement was that by Bin baz allowing the infidels and allah's enemies to enter into Arabian soil, then by default this was an action that nullified islam and was an open act of kufr al-bawah, despite the reality that this action was a matter of ijtihaad, upon which even the action itself is not from the matters that negate Islam. So to briefly state the nature of this fool named Abu Hamza al-Misri then I relate the following.

Al Imaam Badru-Deen al Aiynee, the Hanafee scholar said in Raddul-Waafir
“Whosoever says Ibn Taymiyyah is a kaafir, then he is in reality, himself a kaafir. And the one who accuses him of heresy is himself a heretic”

So Likewise the likes of Albanee, Uthaymeen and Bin Baz deserve the same aid by which whoever speaks of them in what they believe, then it is they themselves who are what they are accusing them to be. So the state of Abu Hamza is the state of whom he believed Bin Baz to be.

That is because such a one are hujjah for he people of our times just as the greatest of the salaf and in each generation where hujjah on the people of their respective times by which a persons adherence to the sunah can and will always be used Islamically by a persons' position on the likes of such men and Allah is Azeezul-Hakeem

chapter 19 The Issue of Politics and its position with regards the people of Islam

Question:

To what degree is a Muslim to be concerned with politics today, within it's Islaamic guidelines?

So the Shaykh replied:

If what is intended by "politics" is the administering of the ummah, then the reality is that politics is not from the acts of one individual from the people of the ummah, but rather, it is from the duties of the Muslim State. This is if the objective behind politics, as we stated before, is the administering of the ummah and the managing of its concerns in order to rectify what is in it from its religious and worldly affairs. So if this is what is intended by "politics", then this is fard kifaayah (a collective obligation). However, it is not for those people who are not in control of the state or of the rule, nor for those who can neither produce benefit nor cause harm.

As for obtaining the news to be aware of the state of affairs and the weakness the Muslims are in, and in order to avoid this outcome, then as we say, this is from the tasfiyah (purification) and the tarbiyah (educating) – purifying Islaam from what has entered into it and focusing on educating the Muslims and bringing them up on this purified Islam. So knowing these general circumstances, which encompass the Muslims, is a must for the matter is as the old Arab poet has stated, taking his meaning from an authentic hadeeth: "I learned evil not for the sake of evil, but to avoid it And whoever doesn't know good from evil, he will fall into it."

This is derived from a hadeeth – and I mean by it, the hadeeth of Hudhaifah Ibn Al-Yamaan, radyAllaahu 'anhumaa, which is reported in the Saheehs of Al-Bukhaaree and Muslim. He, radyAllaahu 'anhumaa, said: "The people used to ask Allaah's Messenger, sallAllaahu 'alayhi wa sallam, about the good, but I used to ask him about the evil for fear of it reaching me." So being aware of what the Muslims are upon from humiliation and weakness in order to turn them away from that towards using the means of knowledge, strength and power, this is an obligation from the many obligations.

As for engaging at length in obtaining news, knowledge of battles and western politics, then this is from the aspect of: "Knowledge of something is better than being ignorant of it." This is something that we do not forsake. However, at the same time, we must not be very enthusiastic and fanatical about it. This is since the Prophet, sallAllaahu 'alayhi wa sallam, did not establish the affair of his Companions on knowing and following precisely, the news of his enemies to the same extent as he, sallAllaahu 'alayhi wa sallam, used to focus on teaching his Companions from one perspective and cultivating them on Allaah's command from another perspective. This is our belief concerning politics based on their two categories, which we have mentioned previously. Al-Asaalah No. 18

In this issue there is not much said due to a primary factor. This primary factor is that there are two groups in question under the realm of those who have fallen into the current state of affairs “fiqhul-waaqiah”. The mother head of this group is the Ikhwaanul-muslimeen. But from its splinter factions many of them may not ascribe to the group itself (Ikhwaanul-Muslimeen) but they do hold onto the beliefs and ideologies of their reformer Sayyid Qutb. And it is from the route of Qutb, that the separation between two main bodies have occurred. Those who have taken on the path of involving themselves in politics in order to change and overthrow the existent system, and those who have left out an extreme outlook of the political situations of the world in modern times and have resulted to takfeer and revolt against the rulers. So this issue about siyaasah does not really apply to those who are referred to in this treatise, however I noted this issue here briefly due to some connection it may have to the people in question in this risalaah and Allah is Azeezul-Hakeem

chapter 20 Haakimiyyah (The Sole Rule of Allah)

Haakeemiyyah (The Sole Rule of Allah) and its concept in Islam

Due to the clarity of this topic I will just go straight to the point.

Taken from 'al-Muslimoon,' no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan:

Questioner 1: There is someone who has made a fourth category for Tawheed and called it Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah

Shaikh Fawzaan: [interjecting]... This is misguidance..., this is misguidance. This is misguidance and an [unnecessary] addition, which the people of knowledge have not affirmed. Tawheed is but two or three categories... this is contradictory, one person says Tawheed is only one category and another says it is four categories. All of this is misguidance.

Questioner 1: This person's evidence is that the basis for this categorisation...

Shaikh Fawzaan: [interjecting]... [words unclear].. Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah an independent category and it does not enter into Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah? It enters into Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah! It is a type of worship and is a type of devotion to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic.

Questioner 2: He says that these three categorisations, al-Uloohiyyah, ar-Ruboobiyyah and al-Asmaa was-Sifaat, he says that this is a matter which is arrived at by the ijtihaad of the scholars, or by way of investigation and analysis (istiqraa').

Shaikh Fawzaan: That is sufficient for us, we will not add to what they have unanimously agreed upon, and they agree upon this.. [then] there comes an ignoramus in the twentieth century... he says 'I am a Mujtahid and I will add to what the People of Knowledge have agreed upon'. This is misguidance...Questioner 2: [interjecting]...

Shaikh Fawzaan: This is clear error! Because al-Haakimiyyah enters into Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah. Who has made it another category or made it an independent category? Will he make the prayer into a fifth or sixth category and jihaad a seventh category? [Because] all of the types of worship are from the types of Tawheed? This is not correct...

Questioner 2: So this is an innovated saying, this saying [Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah]?

Shaikh Fawzaan: Yes, there is no doubt in this, it is in opposition to the Ijmaa [of Ahl

us-Sunnah]. None of the people of knowledge have ever spoken with it. It is in opposition to the Ijmaa.”

Next

Shaikh Muhammad ibn Saalih al-'Uthaimeen was asked concerning this, and he replied that:

“Whoever claims that there is a fourth category of tawheed under the title ‘Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah’ is to be counted as an innovator (mubtadi’). So this is an innovated categorisation which emanates from an ignorant person who does not understand anything of the affairs of ‘aqeedah and the deen. This is because ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ falls within Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah from the aspect that Allaah decrees whatever He wills.

It also enters under Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah in that the servant must worship Allaah according to what He has decreed. So it does not fall outside the three categories of tawheed, which are: Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah, Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat.”

Then, when asked, ‘How are we to rebut them?’ he replied:

“We rebut them by saying to them, ‘What does ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ mean?’ It does not mean except their saying that judgement is for Allaah alone ‘ and that is Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah. So Allaah, He is the Lord, the Creator, the Sovereign Owner, the One in control of the affairs. But as for what they intend by it and an explanation of the danger of this idea of theirs, then we do not know their intentions and desire, so therefore we cannot estimate the seriousness of this matter.’

Taken from ‘al-Muslimoon,’ no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

Alamaah Abdur-Rahman al-Ghudayaan

"It is not permissible to deny Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah, for it is from the types of Tawheed. But it falls under Tawheed al-'Ibaadah with regards to the ruler himself as a person. With regards to its meaning Tawheed, then it falls under ar-Ruboobeeyyah, because the Ruler is Allaah. So it should be that the Rabb is the Muttasarriif (Controller of affairs), He is the One who has the Hukm, so it falls under Tawheed Ar-Ruboobiyyah with regards to ruling, ordering, prohibiting, and carrying out, whereas regards to application and action then the slave is responsible for following the Hukm of Allaah, so then it is from Tawheed Al-'Ibaadah in this sense. And making it into a fourth category doesn't make sense because it falls into the three categories. And the division without a reason is a cause of extra words which are not needed, and it is a simple matter anyway. If he makes it a separate category then he is being redundant, and there is no harm in it."

Shaykh Ubayd al-Jabiree

Question 4:

May Allaah reward you and may Allaah preserve you. The questioner asks, what is Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah? And is Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah a category unto itself from amongst the well-known categories of Tawheed? And who was the first person to call

to Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah?

Answer 4:

Firstly, I will affirm what the people of knowledge have affirmed many generations before our time, and that is because many people maintain/allege that the division of Tawheed into three categories is something that Shaykhul-Islaam Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab (rahimahullaah) made up. And some people go back a little further and say that it is something that Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah made up. So they see that the division of Tawheed into the categories of Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah and Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat is simply technical terminology (istilaah) brought about by these two scholars, or that Shaykhul-Islaam Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab followed Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah in this, or they simply connect this to Shaykhul-Islaam Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab. And they claim that there should be no dispute in matters of technical terminology. However, the truth regarding the division of Tawheed into three categories is that the scholars derived these categories of Tawheed several generations before Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah. Therefore, this categorization of Tawheed into three categories is not something that Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah came up with, nor is it something that Shaykhul-Islaam Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab came up with. [6] Rather it is, according to what we know, something that Aboo Haneefah talked about and then his students followed him in this, such as Aboo Yoosuf. So whoever reads the works of these scholars will find that Tawheed was divided into three categories and these are the well-known categories today: Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah, Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat. And these are three categories of Tawheed and no one fully appreciates that except the Salafiyyeen, Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah; may Allaah make us and you from amongst them. The scholars established these categories of Tawheed based upon thorough study and thorough examination of the Qur'aan and the Sunnah. And Tawheed is the singling out of Allaah the Mighty and Majestic for worship, He alone has the ability to create and provide for His creation. And He alone has dominion over all things and He alone is the Manager of all affairs. This is the meaning Ruboobiyyah. And also from the categories of Tawheed is the singling out of Allaah the Mighty and Majestic for worship and commanding the worship of Allaah alone and prohibiting the association of partners in worship with Allaah. This is Tawheedul-'Ibaadah or Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah. And the third category of Tawheed deals with the characteristics of Allaah the Glorified and Exalted, such as Hearing, Seeing, the two Hands, the Leg, the Foot, the Face, the Descension, the Ascension and His Highness over all of creation. These are all characteristics of Allaah so this matter of the division of Tawheed into three categories is not simply one of 'technical terminology', rather it is a matter which has been agreed upon and firmly established by thorough study and examination and continued acceptance over the generations. So verily the division of Tawheed into three categories is something which has been agreed upon. Having said that, it becomes clear to you that Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah and making it a fourth category of Tawheed, arguing that the three categories of Tawheed are only technical terms and that there is no dispute in matters of technical terminology is something new. Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah is a newly invented terminology, invented by the Ikhwaanul-Muslimeen who started their claim in Egypt upon the hands of Hasan al-Banna. And it is said that he took the term from someone before him, I think his name is Ahmad as-Sukkaaree or another person, I forget his name now. So the purpose behind this additional category is the Takfeer (declaring a Muslim to be a disbeliever) of the sinful rulers of the Muslims. Pay attention, the purpose behind this additional category of Tawheed is to make the Takfeer of the sinful rulers of the Muslims. As for the first person who spoke about al-Haakimiyyah without

saying 'Tawheed' al-Haakimiyyah, rather calling al-Haakimiyyah 'Tawheed' and rendering it from the categories of Tawheed is something invented by the Ikhwaanul-Muslimeen. As for the first person to present al-Haakimiyyah and openly come out with it, even though he did not call it Tawheed, but he openly proclaimed it called to it in front of the masses of the people. He was a man called Dhul-Khuwaysirah at-Tameemee and he shouted it in the face of the leader of creation (sayyidun-naas), Prophet Muhammad (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam). Pay attention, he shouted it and openly proclaimed it in the face of who? In the face of the leader of creation, Prophet Muhammad (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam). And here is an example for whoever will take it for bad manners and shamelessness and impudence. And I will summarize the hadeeth for you in which the story of Dhul-Khuwaysirah is found. The Hadeeth is in Saheehul-Bukhaaree as well as other collections of Hadeeth. 'Alee (radiyallaahu `anhu) sent some gold to the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam) from Yemen, so the Prophet divided the gold between four men. So some of the Companions of the Messenger of Allaah said, are you going to give the four men and leave us with nothing? So the Prophet (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam) replied: "I am only trying to develop intimacy and friendship with them."

That was because they were new in Islaam and they were important influential men such as Ibnul-Warqah, Ibnul-Haabis, and `Uyayyin Ibn Hasan whose previous name was Zayd al-Kheel. So the Prophet (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam) wanted to develop intimacy and friendship with them through giving gifts in order to strengthen their Islaam so that they would become firm in Islaam, and so that they would help with the spreading of Islaam within their respective tribes as well as the neighbouring tribes. So the Companions of the Prophet (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam) understood that and their hearts were pleasant and agreeable, they understood what the Messenger of Allaah was doing. So they were silent after that. However, Dhul-Khuwaysirah at-Tameemee said:

"O Muhammad, be just!"

And in one of the narrations of the Hadeeth, he said:

"By Allaah, you did not make this division of wealth seeking the Face of Allaah!"

So `Umar (radiyallaahu `anhu) said:

"O Messenger of Allaah, give me permission to strike his neck with the sword."

And `Umar wanted to do this in order to honour and protect the Prophet (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam). However, the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam) replied:

"No. From the progeny of that man will come a people who will read the Qur'aan, yet it will not go below their necks." [7]

Therefore, the origin of al-Haakimiyyah first started with Dhul-Khuwaysirah at-Tameemee, the founder of the Khawaarij. And you have seen the rude and unseemly manner in which he addressed the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu `alayhi wa sallam). After that, the Saba'iyyah followed Dhul-Khuwaysirah in this and the Saba'iyyah are followers of `Abdullaah Ibn Sabah who was known by the name Sawdaa' (the blackened one) and he was a Jew from Yemen who outwardly pretended to accept Islaam, but inwardly he remained a disbeliever. He hated Islaam and entered into it in order to try to destroy it from within. He roused and agitated the weak minded against `Uthmaan (radiyallaahu `anhu) by exploiting some mistakes that `Uthmaan made. So he combined and enumerated these mistakes and he exaggerated and over-emphasized these mistakes under the pretense of commanding the good and forbidding the evil. So he used to say to his followers: 'Command the good and forbid the evil, until you win over the common folk.'

This culminated into the eventual assassination of `Uthmaan (radiyallaahu `anhu).

After that, the Khawaarij followed in the footsteps of Dhul-Khuwaysirah at-Tameemee, there came the people of Nahraawan who seceded from the authority of

'Alee (radiyallaahu 'anhu). [8] And there are many ahaadeeth that criticize and despise them and there are many ahaadeeth that command to fight against them and kill them and that they are evil game and that they pass through Islaam like an arrow passes through a game animal. And some of the scholars have even said that the Khawaarij are disbelievers. And if these ahaadeeth are not mutawaatir (concurrent narrations), then they are mashhoor (famous) ahaadeeth. So you have come to know Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah. It only remains to be said, where is **Haakimiyyah** with reference to Tawheed? We say that **Haakimiyyah** is not a separate category of Tawheed, rather it is part of Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah and Tawheedul-'Ibaadah. This means that there is no ruling or governing except with the Laws of Allaah. And it is part of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah or a part of worship in as much as the ruler rules his people by the Laws of Allaah hoping to get closer to Allaah the Glorified and Exalted and to please Allaah. So therefore, it is a form of worship.

Shaykh 'Abdullaah as-Sabt said:

"Therefore, why do the revolutionists and the callers to revolution and the khawaarij utilize 'al-haakimiyyah'? I say - as the 'allaamah of shaam, shaykh Naasirud-Deen al-Albaanee explained - that they utilize this for the purpose of politics, since they make this haakimiyyah only for the rulers. For that reason, they quickly run to making takfeer of them, because they do not rule by the Revelation. Followed by this, they obligate revolting against them and carrying weapons! This in itself is from the theory of the Khawaarij of old who carried weapons against the Khaleefah (radiyallaahu 'anhu).

Shaikh Muhammad Naasiruddeen al-Albaanee was asked, "Our Shaikh, may Allaah bless you, the scholars of the Salaf, may Allaah have mercy upon them, mention that Tawheed is of three types: 'ar-Ruboobiyyah,' 'al-Uloohiyyah' and 'al-Asmaa was-Sifaat,' so is it correct for us to say that there is a fourth Tawheed that is 'Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah' or 'Tawheed of Judgement?' So he replied:

"'Al-Haakimiyyah' is a branch of the branches of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, and those who focus their attention upon this newly invented saying in the present age use it as a weapon not to teach the Muslims the Tawheed that all of the Prophets and Messengers came with, but rather as a political weapon. So if you wish I will establish for you what I have just said, even though this question has repeatedly been answered by me, many times - or if you wish we will continue upon our topic.

I have said in similar circumstances, as support for what I have just said, that usage of the word 'al-Haakimiyyah' is part of the political da'wah that is particular to some of the parties present today; and I will mention here something that occurred between myself and someone who gave the khutbah in one of the mosques of Damascus. So on the day of Jumu'ah he gave a khutbah which was all about judgement being for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. But this person made an error with regard to a matter of fiqh. So after he had finished the prayer I went forward to him and gave him 'salaam,' and said to him, 'O my brother, you did so and so, and that is contrary to the Sunnah.' So he said to me, 'I am a Hanafee, and the Hanafee madhhab says what I have done.' So I said, 'Subhaanallaah! You have given khutbah that judgement is just for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, but you only use this word to attack those rulers whom you think are Unbelievers because they do not rule according to the Islamic Sharee'ah. But you have forgotten about yourselves - that Allaah's judgement covers every Muslim. So why, when I say to you that the

Messenger did so and so, why do you say, 'But my madhhab is such and such.' Then you have contradicted that which you call the people to.'

So if it were not for the fact that they use this saying as a tool for political propaganda of theirs, then we would say, 'This is our merchandise that has been returned to us.'

Taken from 'al-Muslimoon,' no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

chapter 21 ***The Ulema of Takfeer & Revolutions***

It is necessary to also bring the names of individuals from among the major scholars who have treaded upon this path of terror and revolt and takfeer of the hukaam in order to expose their reality (of their opposition to the prophetic manhaj) and to be acquainted with them in general and the abandonment of heir beliefs in these issues.

The first one on the list of ulema is the shaykh **Hamood Bin Uqla ash-Shuabee**

So it is imperative that the following issue regarding him is produced.

The Council of Senior Scholars in Saudi Arabia considers the "fatwa" of Hamood al-'Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee in which he spoke about the "al-Qaa'idah" movement of Usaamah ibn Laadin "not worthy of adhering to."

The Council went on to clarify that "Hamood al-'Uqlaa is a graduate from the Faculty of Sharee'ah, and was also previously a teacher at the Ma'had al-'Ilmee (Knowledge Institute) in Riyadh, and then later a teacher at the Faculty of Sharee'ah itself. He then transferred to the Faculty of Sharee'ah in Qaseem where he entered retirement due to his old age, in accordance with the law (of the land)."

The Council added regarding al-'Uqlaa "...that his fataawa are extremely out of focus, especially this fatwa in which he has declared the permissibility of spilling the blood of innocent people."

The Council stressed that "ash-Shu'aybee has no right to pass fataawa, and that he never previously held such a position. It also stressed that the passing of a fatwa is not accepted except from one who is suitably qualified and prepared with complete knowledge of the Sharee'ah and its evidences."

It is clear that the ijma of the lajnati-Daimah has called for the abandonment of the Shaykh Hamood's Fatwaa. Now in an attempt to nullify this fatwa, the people who treaded upon this path came up with the following argument

The aforementioned website was informed – either directly or indirectly – of a statement regarding al-'Allaamah Humood bin 'Uqla ash-Shu'aybi issued by the Amaanah Hay'ah Kibaar al-'Ulamaa (The Secretariat Department for the Council of Senior Scholars – and NOT the Senior Scholars themselves!), from a state-sponsored, secular/modernist magazine called "'Ukaadh". In the past, 'Ukaadh was a market place in Taa'if where the Arabs would gather in Jaahiliyah with their jaahili poetry with someone announcing his Kufr and Shirk, while other praising his idols.

Sheikh 'Ali al-Khudhair and Sheikh 'Abdul-'Aziz al-Jarboo' have already refuted the hilarious comments supposedly made by Amaanah. The former, in his refutation made a very good point that there are two main possibilities regarding such comments. The first possibility is that the magazine has shamelessly lied upon the Amaanah, which is not a surprise for us at all, in which case the Amaanah should clarify its position. The second possibility is that the words are correctly attributed to the Amaanah, and that Amaanah has lied and exposed its sheer ignorance, and oppressed, insulted and slandered not only al-'Allaamah Humood bin 'Uqla ash-Shu'aybi, but also Sheikh Muhammad bin Ibraahim and Sheikh 'Abdul-Aziz Ibn Baz – may Allah have mercy on them, as they both gave Tazkiya to Sheikh Humood.

But first, let us see who exactly is this Amaanah of the Hay'ah al-Kibaar al-'Ulamaa. The Amaanah of Hay'ah al-Kibaar al-'Ulamaa is composed of some bearded and some clean-shaven, big moustache Muslims, whose responsibility is restricted to cutting paper, sending posts, burning Bukhoor and making tea and coffee for the Scholars and arranging meetings for them, etc. In a nutshell, they only play an administrative role, nothing more.

Therefore, if the comments are truly attributed to the Amaanah, then we simply have a case of a rumour-monger, narrating from a modernist-secular magazine, which is narrating from coffee-makers, but definitely not from Hay'ah al-Kibaar al-'Ulama. Certainly, the Kibaar al-'Ulamaa would not release a statement belittling Sheikh Humood, whilst some of the members of this Council are in fact students of Sheikh Humood himself, including the head of this Council, Sheikh 'Abdul-'Aziz Aal-ash-Sheikh.

But let us now relate something of the ludicrous statements, apparently made by Amaanah and refute it.

It states: The Council stressed that "ash-Shu'aybee has no right to pass fataawa, and that he never previously held such a position. It also stressed that the passing of a fatwa is not accepted except from one who is suitably qualified and prepared with complete knowledge of the Sharee'ah and its evidences."

Comment: The above is simply a lie, fabrication and a slander against the Sheikh because:

al-'Allaamah Humood bin 'Uqla ash-Shu'aybi has been studying for over forty years – 'Aqeedah, Fiqh, Usool al-Fiqh, Nahw, Tafseer and is regarded to be a Professor and a Specialist. The 'Allaamah is from the foremost students of Sheikh Ibn Baz and Sheikh Muhammad bin Ibrahim, so much so, that he would be able to repeat the entire lesson learnt from Sheikh Muhammad bin Ibrahim from his memory upon request, as stated by Sheikh Saalih al-Atram.

Many of the well-known scholars, students of knowledge, and judges have been his students, including the General Mufti – Sheikh 'Abdul-'Aziz Aal-ash-Sheikh, and other members of the Council of Senior Scholars, including Sheikh Saalih al-Fawzaan. Apart from them, Sheikh Saalih al-Lahaydan, Dr. 'Abdullah Ibn 'Abdul-Muhsin at-Turki, Dr. 'Abdullah Ibn Muhammad bin Ibraahim Aal-ash-Sheikh, Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan bin Saalih al-Jabr, Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan Bin Sulaiman al-JaarAllah, Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan bin 'Abdul-'Aziz al-Killiyah, Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan bin Ghaith, Sheikh 'Abdullah al-Ghunaiman, Sheikh Salmaan bin Fahd al-'Awdah, and the list continues.

The 'Allaamah was appointed by the Islamic University of Madeenah to review and mark books written by some well-known scholars, in order to promote them to PhD level. From them, Sheikh Abu Bakr al-Jazaa`iri and Sheikh Rabee' al-Madkhali. He was also appointed by the same university to review a book by Sheikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaami as-Somaali and to determine whether it is suitable to be published or not. Likewise, Imaam Muhammad bin Sa'ud University appointed the Sheikh to review some books by Sheikh Muhammad bin Saalih al-'Uthaymeen – may Allah have mercy on him – in order to promote him to PhD level.

Sheikh Muhammad bin Ibraahim (teacher of Sheikh Ibn Baz) appointed Sheikh Humood to issue fataawas and deliver lectures in the Haram in Makkah from 1380 to 1384 AH during Hajj seasons, which refutes the lie of the coffee-makers, that he has never been appointed to give fataawa.

Sheikh Muhammad bin Ibraahim instated Sheikh Humood as a judge, but Sheikh Muhammad al-Ameen ash-Shanqeetee requested Sheikh Ibraahim to allow him to remain at university, due to what he saw from Sheikh Shu'aybi's learning, understanding and memorisational skills.

And

Thus, the Amaanah, then the 'Ukaadh Magazine, and then the rumour-monger website have exposed their own foolishness, in their bid to wage war against the Scholars. And even if they do not accept the fatwa of Sheikh Ibn Jibreen, nor of Humood al-'Uqlaa, then for their information, we've had two more senior scholars to give their ruling on aiding the Taliban against the American crusaders, Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan al-Barraak and Sheikh 'Abdullaah al-Ghunayman, and as time passes, InshaaAllah we'll see more of those fatawas from Ahlus-Sunnah pouring in, so Ayna al-Mafar (Where will you run)?

This incident speaks volumes about the credibility of this fatwa website, as well as their translations of fatawas, and this further proves that a Muslim, in order to protect his Deen should not seek fatawas from this website, which appears to use the name of the scholars to support its own agenda, much of which – unsurprisingly – agrees with much of US foreign policy, in most cases due to sheer ignorance. Those seeking fatawa from this website can easily get hold of the very same fatawa published in volumes from al-Muntada al-Islami or elsewhere, as the maintainers of this website have no links with the Senior Scholars, rather the fatawa are merely translated from already published volumes and placed on the website. The alternative to this website is probably the first, and the original website for fatawa known as Islam-QA.Com, run under the supervision of Sheikh Saalih al-Munajjid, a student of Sheikh Ibn Baz Raheemahullaah, who has direct links with the senior scholars, and has many times sought their help in answering questions, as it is evident from his website.

Lastly, at this time of crisis, when the Western powers have globally mobilized their efforts to besiege Afghanistan – not because of terrorism – but due to the existence of Islam in Afghanistan as a state, it is not sane for a Muslim to write, say or do something that might aid Based on the above, they use the issue that amanaah or the body that handles the affairs fo the lajnah are in fact contrary to them and they also relie upon the general and overided praise of the shaykh by the scholars like Bin Baz and Muhammad ibn Ibraheem and Shanqeeti. So now to clarify what they added of confusion, I present the one who has taken their way of emaan and kufr Faalih al-Harbi. He stated

Question: Is the ruling which was recently issued by the Amaanah (Secretariat) of the Council of Senior Scholars regarding Hamood al-'Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee considered the ruling of the Council of Senior Scholars itself?

Response: What is meant by the term "Amaanah" is that they are the people who are responsible for the affairs of the Council of Senior Scholars. It appears that the person asking this question does not know of the affairs of the office of the Council of Senior Scholars, in particular him assuming that the Amaanah does not represent the Council of Senior Scholars. In fact that Amaanah is the office specific to the Council of Senior Scholars and this means that this ruling (concerning Hamood ash-Shu'aybee) was actually passed by the Council of Senior Scholars themselves; and they are the ones we have previously indicated that are qualified for passing fatwa, and if any incidents occur then it is imperative we turn to them for guidance on such affairs, otherwise the ummah will be left to misguidance and following the many (corrupt) paths of Shaytaan; as Allaah (Subhaanahu wa Ta'aala) says:

{Had it not been for the Grace and Mercy of Allaah upon you, you would have followed Shaytaan, save a few of you}, [Soorah an-Nisaa., Aayah 83]

And this ruling (of the Council of Senior Scholars) refutes the fatwa of Hamood ash-Shu'aybee in addition to the number of individuals who have passed fataawa in accordance with the fatwa of ash-Shu'aybee; and such individuals include: Sulaymaan al-'Alwaan, 'Abdullaah as-Sa'd, ('Abdur-Rahmaan) al-Barraak and 'Abdullaah al-Ghunaymaan.

the world coalition of propaganda either directly or indirectly against the Taliban. Moreover, Muslims should not pay attention to these issues of refutations as they are continuous and will never end. In fact, these situations are mostly created by the enemies of Islam who always like to create diversions for those who seek to positively remedy the situation. Therefore, do not be diverted by these e-mails and rumours, rather focus on the major issue faced by the Muslims in Afghanistan at present and think how you can be of benefit to them.

Following from there, InshaaAllah I hope this will be my last e-mail in response to that which occurred, nor do I intend to entertain any further comments issued by such people. The priority that should be foremost in the mind of every Muslim right now should be to alleviate this problem from their brethren in Afghanistan, with a hope that Allah accepts this from us.

So the truth has been clarified that it truly was the council who passed the fatwa against Hamood bin Uqla in the issue of not accepting his fatwa.

The next on the list of the scholars who has taken on this path is the **Shaykh Sulaymaan Bin Naasir al-Ulwaan**

So the Imaam of the **Ummah Shaykh Uthaymeen** had utterly refuted the basless jahl of what he (al-Ulwaan) propagated in that he said

“Also from the evil understanding is the saying of the one who attributed (al-Ulwaan) to Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah that he said, “When Kufr is mentioned with the definite article (i.e. al-Kufr), then the Major kufr is intended by it”, then seeking to use this as evidence to justify making takfeer on account of the verse “... then they are the disbelievers” (5:44)!! Despite the fact that there is nothing even in this verse to show it is the kufr (that expels from the religion)!

There are other ulema under this caliber that need to be mentioned. They include Shaykh Nasr al-Fahd, Ahmad al-Khaldi, and the shaykh Ali al-Khudair al-Khudair, Abu Jandil al-Azdi (extreme takfeeri khariji), and the Shaykh and Alim Muhammad Sa’eed al-Qahtani.

From among the callers to this manhaj of takfeer and revolt are the foolish group of individuals who will be names below.

The two most influential people propagating this manhaj is first and foremost Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisee in al-Urdun (Jordan) and Abu Qatadah al-Philistinee in London. He also is known as Umar Mahmood ibn Umar.

From among the others stooges to this call are Abdul-Qaadr Abdul-Azeez, Abu Hafs ash-Shamee, Abu Hamza al-Misri, Abu Baseer Mustapha Haleema (one of the more influential of the rest), and Abu Hudhayfah Yusif al-Kanadi (the esteemed one who refuted Spubs with trash), Muhammad al-Qurayshee and Abu Dujana

Among those who were not upon their manhaj at one time had found themselves that they allowed for these ideas to penetrate them and these likes are the respected caller at one time Ali at-Tamimee and Idrees Palmer.

Among the more knowledgeable ranks of scholars who also found themselves at a crossroads when these ideas came to them and accepted them were the shaykhs Salman al-Awdah, Safar al-Hawali, and Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaaliq.

And the only Shaykhs, who have been used or had their fatwa stripped from what they actually believed in was Saalih al-Fawzan, Abdur-Rahman al-Ghudayaan, the Alamaah and probably the most knowledgeable of our time Bakr Abu Zaid, and Muhammad ibn Jibreel. And all of these are alive presently and the perceived notion coming from these takfeeris is that these four shaykhs are in line with what they themselves believe in absolute takfeer and revolt and their understanding of emaan and kufr. And from those who have past who they have deceived the people into thinking that these scholars as well are in line with them are first and foremost Shaykhul-Islaam ibnul-Taymiyyah, Ibn Abdul-Wahhab, Ahmad Shakir, Mahmood Shakir, Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem aali-Shaykh and Muhammad al-Ameen ash-Shanqeeti.

I, as well as the rest of the people of the sunnah, assure the general masses of muslims and those whom it may concern, these Imaams of the sunnah and great scholars has no relation or connection with these current day people bent on takfeer of all rulers and revolt and their style of jihad.

As for the internet, much of their dawah worked through the internet so it is also integral in exposing their cover. The leader of leaders who are the extreme promoters of this call is the site called at-Tibyan which the address is like at-tibyanpubs. So due to this I made a site named at-Tibyaan in clarifying what they tricked everyone to believe in. Next is the infamous clearguidance forum. It is noteworthy to mention these sites at most times do not appear to even work due to matters usually associated with national security of the kuffar society of the U.S. So what happens is that they have mirror sites who express the same voice as them and they are state of Islam. Org and Islamic awakening. The matter with the latter site is that they hold a lesser level of extremity of this issue than the first. The only other site who has certain members who from time to time have embraced the knowledge based aspects of this issue of which the moderators also accepted these notions are the site group named ahya.org. From all of them ahya seems to be the least in rank from the rest, even though some of the members in it are those who propagate more influentially in the more extreme sites.

So due to this issue the fact that ahya had brought on board these ideas, many of these matters mentioned therein in this risalaah are really addressed to them in regards to the knowledge based matters and I only address them not in enmity but in the wish to want for my brothers what I want for myself. This is because this main group has branches, some of which do not associate with other branches. I will explain further below.

This group of people are divided into 2 main branches.

1. the extreme kharijists with no knowledge. They are those who are known by their actions that they do not accept any of the scholars of our time so it would be useless to even point out the statements of the scholars in refutation of them. From among this group is that they specifically perform takfeer of Imaam Bin Baz rahimahullah.
2. The other main body who do not perform takfeer of these ulema but hold that they are murji and the real scholars are those whom, on the outset their words seem to correspond to their manhaj, while in reality it is not.

There is yet another group. Among this group is that they do not hold this manhaj of extremism like the first two, but are fundamental in the issues of iman and kufr, and of the three, they are the most knowledgeable, and many of them, just so happen to ascribe to the salafite manhaj. So it is important to explain further that I, nor anyone else knowledgeable do not hold these people to be out of the fold of the sunnah, but in this issue, it is apparent that they have taken the opinions of the unknown stances (meaning not the majority). So this group is or falls within the fold of the sunnah which means that there is khilaf in this matter. And among this group, the main people are on the ahlul-bayt forum. This is because they do not hold that the scholars who they take form who refuted other scholars who just so happened to be in conformity to what is in this risalah, do not even hold them to be out of the fold of the sunnah. And this is the reason why most of what is here is for them as is known that the best dawah to others are those who are most close to or those who have the same fundamentals as yourself, and then those after them who fall less in these mutual qualities.

chapter 22 We Should Not Call Them Khawarij

Oh people of justice and wisdom. Look at the double standard in the actions and statements of the people of takfeer and revolt. Read the following kalaam

Proofs that we should not call anyone khawarij.

The Following is from the statements of those who have argued upon this issue.

We need to elaborate on how many Imams of Ahl us-Sunna walJama`ah have rebelled against tyrant ruler and no one ever called them Khawaarij. It was also not known that these rulers were kuffar either. We will now present you with examples of those Imams who went out against the rulers and in some cases fought against them,

1- An-Nafs az-Zakiyya, whose name was Muhammad ibn Abdullah ibn Hassan ibn Hassan ibn Ali ibn Ali Taalib, died in 145 AH. He went out of the Abbasid Khalifate, but Khalifa alMansur had him killed. Imaam Maalik said his Bai`a was correct.

2-Mu`awiya ibn Abu Sufyan, 6 months and two days after Hasan ibn `Ali was given bai`a as the khalifa, came out against him in dispute. This was due to the unresolved bloodshed that had resulted in the death of Mu`awiya's cousin, the third khalifa of Islam, `Uthman ibn `Affan.

3- Perhaps the most famous example in Islamic history above all, is that of alHussain, who went out of Yazid ibn Mu`awiya and was killed in the battle of Karbala. No one once said Hussain was Khawaarij.

4- Abdullah ibn Az-Zubair, the son of Az-Zubair ibn al`Awwaam, went out of Bani Umayyaa and was given bai`a as the amir of Madina as well as against the existing Khalifa. He was killed and hung for three days.

5- At the time of the Khalifa Hadi (170 H), Imam Abu `Abdullah Hussain ibn Ali ibn Hassan ibn Hassan ibn Hassan ibn Ali ibn Abi Taalib, who died in 167 AH, went out against the Khalifa in Makkah and the Hijaaz. His revolution ended when he was killed and left to be eaten by the scavenging animals and birds.[29] <ruling.html>

6- Imam AbulHasan Musa Kaazim ibn Jaafir as-Saadiq ibn Muhammad alBaaqir, who died 183 AH, revolted against the Khalifa Harun ar-Rashid, was arrested and put in jail until he died.[30] <ruling.html>

7- Imam Muhammad ibn Jaafar as-Saadiq, who revolted in the Hijaaz and Makkah, went out against Ma`mun.

8- Imam `Ali ar-Rida ibn Musa Kaazim ibn Jaafir as-Saadiq ibn Muhammad ibn alQaasim revolted in the time of the Khalifa Mu`tasim. He was captured and defeated.

10- Ibrahim ibn Musa Kaazim ibn Jaafar as-Saadiq revolted against the rulership and killed many people in Yemen.

11- Perhaps the most famous example of going out of a ruler in recent times is the case of Sheikh ul-Islam Muhammad ibn `Abdul Wahhab (RH) [1116-1206 AH (1704-1792 AD)], who went out against the `Uthmani Khalifate in his struggle to rid to Peninsula of grave worship and so forth. None of the historians or scholars of Ahl us-Sunna have referred to neither these Imams as Khawaarij, nor the rulers of their time as kuffar either. What then of the Mujahideen? They are seeing such a clear kufr from everywhere, in which we have so much support for in the Book and Sunna to rebel against them, that the evidences are too numerous and too famous to elaborate on in this short treatise. These kinds of rulers aren't even legitimate rulers.

Conclusion

So it is proven that anyone who fails to rule by Allah's Shari`a are kuffar, not merely those who replace the Shari`a. It is actually a kufr just to fail to rule by it. But those who actually introduce their own shari`a, they are doing a kufr above a kufr (major kufr stacked on top of major kufr). And those impose their own shari`a upon people by the sword, they are doing a kufr above a kufr above a kufr. And those who are calling all of these kufr allowable, they are doing the most kufr of all and they have distorted the religion of Allah U completely, for they called to what is kufr and labeled it allowable.

It is then very clear that these people who are killing Muslims because of their own Shari`a, they are a kind of Khawaarij. The only difference between them and the Khawaarij before is that the Khawaarij before were doing the bid`a to protect the Shari`a but they hurt and killed Muslims in the process. But the new Khawaarij are killing Muslims and so forth to destroy the Shri'a.

The Khawaarij were known to be pious and zealous in their worship, but these Khawaarij rulers today hardly do any worship. The modern Khawaarij today fit the general category of Khawaarij precisely because they kill Muslims and leave alone the pagans as narrated in Bukhari and Muslim.

However, dear brothers, imagine if you knew all of these evidences and then attend a gathering where Ibn `Abbas's words have been abused.

One of the historical misconceptions I wish to clarify is the apparent misunderstanding of the masses believing that he, Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Abdul-Wahhab had revolted against the uthmani khilafa (or so called khilafa). This is totally against the known history of the Shaykh rahimullah and this actual fantasy has its origins with the people of shirk and kufr, and irony of which these people (takfeeris) who claim to fight against them accept this narration of theirs which holds no congruence with reality.

Proofs to the reality of affairs which override their general assumptions that they should not be labelled as khawarij

It has been narrated in Saheeh of Bukharee that

" People that recite the Qur'an will come out of the East, but it will not go past their throats. Every time a generation of them is cut down another one will come until the last one finds itself on the side of the Antichrist"

All of the people of knowledge have come to know by this route that these people talked about in this hadeeth are the khawarij. There are 2 distinctive and inherent traits that is connected with reality, one of which is an apparent reality and the other will be (future tense) a reality. The first one that is apparent now is that

1. **Everytime a generation is cut off from them another one is brought forth.**

This is because the ideas that have taken form by these people were from a methodological and ideological standpoint. And as is known by common sense and reason, anything related from this can be adopted or bred by anyone or group of people. Also another factor of this reality is that just as occurs in the hadeeth, we see these very same people with the same thought patterns (ideas, beliefs) throughout the history of Islam. So just as Ali had destroyed them at Naharwan, they arose after these people, and kept on rebirthing themselves in different people.

2. **They will fight along with the dajjal**

This is the future tense of this reality mentioned in the hadeeth.

The names like Khawarij, Mutazilah, Murji'a, Jahmiyyah and others were specifically labeled as such by ahlul-ilm of that time due to a primary factor that these people were the originators and the backbone of all beliefs regarding that which they fell to. So what is meant is that those after them, after the truth has been clarified is that no one will ever claim to follow the madhab of these misguidances. To further clarify I say that in the issue of kharijiyyah, no one will claim that they make takfeer on account of sins. The primary attribute of the khawarij is their takfeer of the muslims. So just because they do not state this by name does not mean they do not perform this in reality. It is also important to note the following.

The primary characteristics among the khawarij are the following

1. They make takfeer on the one who makes major sins (which is what no one really does in our time by statement)
2. They revolt against the rule (as has been proven from the statements of the aimah above)
3. they leave fighting the people of shirk and kufr and tend to fighting the muslims (which is the apparent and open trait of these people in current times)

The primary attributes of the murji'a

1. They hold that emaan has no connection to the actions of the limbs
2. that emaan does not increase or decrease

This is it. These are the only trait inherent in the people that makes them have irj'aa. Of course there are four categories of irj'aa that the Imaams of sunnah have clarified. But the real deception is that these takfeeris among this neo khariji mentality have added (innovated) a fifth category to irj'aa and I will explain below in this section that this added category of irj'aa is the worst of the irj'aa that has ever existed in this ummah (worse than the irj'aa of jahm Ibn Safwaan) and attribute this form of irj'aa to the notables of ahlu-sunnah wal jama'ah from the imams and those who have followed them.

Now, the problem with this manhaj of revolt and takfeer gets more technical. This technicality is due to one factor only. This factor is that, these concepts and notions that had no place among the people of actual knowledge in the religion and only stayed in the ranks of those like Sayyid Qutb, Muhammad Qutb, and Muhammad Suroor, had actually penetrated their manhaj into some of those who had authentic knowledge of the religion (salafiyyah) from the likes of Uqla, al-Ulwaan, Naasr al-Fahd and others. Due to this actual occurrence, the knowledge of kharijiyyah in the issues of emaan and kufr had magnified due to the primary factor that now, the innovations of these concepts had an ability to find route in the texts (Quraan and Sunnah). Another factor resulting from this factor is that many of those who had also endowed themselves with the knowledge regarding the affairs of the salafee manhaj also followed suite due to the collapse of these scholars into these pitholes of innovations regarding this issue. Basically in elementary terms, these people now had a platform to stand on for a while, and simply put, they brought the excuses like their shaykhs had ijazaah and praise from the major scholars and that they are shaykhs of salafiyyah, so by this route, they have held on to the view, that their innovated theories that these scholars had taken on in this issue, were actually correct and could not be wrong according to the usool of Islam or salafiyyah.

Example of this grasping at straws is the issue of Hamood bin Uqla. They use that he was praised by the Imaams of the time Muhammad ibn Ibraheem and studied with Bin Baz, and has many many students who are major scholars themselves. There is no doubt, for their knowledge and rank in the religion regarding all other matters. And this is one of the crossroads between these people and the main body of salafees upon the understanding of the madkhali thoughts regarding jarh and t'adeel in that they have a pristine scope of what salafiyyah is. They hold that the people of sunnah and salafiyyah are clear, crystal clear in manhaj (which was an innovated saying as declared by the ulema) so anyone who has mistakes in manhaj, is automatically off of the dawah (out of the fold of the prophetic sunnah) according to this pristine belief, every other scholars except for Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Maalik, Shafi'ee, Taymiyyah, and Ibn Abdul-Wahhab are out of the prophetic manhaj. So it is due to their puritanical measures of judging the muslims upon the sunnah that these people of takfeer had come through the avenue that the salafis have cut off knowledge and do not know who the people of knowledge are. So I say in reply to this, yes those people among the haddadiyyeen who claim to salafiyyah have this attribute, but not the rest of ahlu-sunnah, the true salafis.

This is the reason why, this issue had become so technically complicated in the knowledge based issue due to this number one factor, and if it were not for the fact that these notions had taken root in some of these ulema, nearly the entire world of the takfeeris and revolutionist would have been reduced greatly to nearly ashes, but just as the prophetic ahadeeth have confirmed, as one generation of them is wiped out, another comes in their place, so it may be that these fools among them will be destroyed by the muslims or kuffar (hopefully the muslims) and yet by the qadr another group of people will use the foolish mistakes and phoney fatwa of these people in our times to justify the same exact manhaj that these current day people are upon. It is as if each group of them that emerges builds off of the old concepts and actions of those before them to justify that which is unfounded.

Likewise as for irj'aa, no muslim is going to claim that emaan does not increase or decrease or that emaan is not connected to the actions. Yet in theory, this concept still can be inherited by muslims and in fact does have a grip in some people, but the phenomenon of this is basically in essence non-existent. Why? From among the groups of innovation and sunnah, the only real book that has been truly deemed to have irj'aa is found in the book of Muhammad Shukree, and this is clear, not like the books of Halabi where there is clearly khilaaf from the ulema regarding the fatwa against these books. The issue with Shukri is clear and evident and even Halabi testified to this. Sobasically one book out of the entire array of books throughout the Islamic world for the past millennia had real irj'aa. This is how minimal this issue lies with the ummah. Unfortunately, the people among the takfeer and revolt and terror, due to their misguided masination and their nonsensical fantasies, have claimed that the emergence of irj'aa is on the rise and nearly the entire muslims nation is upon this. They say that irj'aa is the greatest threat in our times. So in reply, the people of the sunnah say, this notion is only according to your deviant beliefs regarding this issue, because if you would have submitted to the realities and beliefs of ahlu-sunnah, these fantasies of yours would vanish in the sky and the picture would be clear and apparent.

This is because both irj'aa and kharijiyyah are two concepts that are totally opposite of each other. That is, if someone were a murji or had irj'aa, then the one there is no middle way for them. That means anyone who holds a view contrary to them is among the khawarij. Likewise, the khawarij, due to their thoughts, do not see a middle way or balanced path. Rather what they see is that if anyone who opposes their creed regarding emaan and kufr, is a murji. Nay, these have been uprooted by the Imaams. It is clear that the majority of the Imaams of Sunnah agreed that one does not become a kaafir by abandonment of action alone, rather what is required along with this action is his istihlaal (making permissible of that action). So the murjia fall short of this and say that such a statement is a statement of a takfeeri or of the khawarij. The khawarij go past this and say that the minor kufr that has been described by the Imaams that does not exit the religion by actions alone, actually does exit from the religion. So anyone can see clearly how the original statement lies in between the two deviated thoughts and can easily judge for themselves.

chapter 23 **The Madaakhilah**

This term, is really much like the term in Islam that the enemies of the sunnah use to brand the followers of the sunnah, namely, wahhabi. Another name they use for such a people is Salafiyyah Jadeedah or neo salafis. Likewise, in this recent wave of understanding in among the neo takfeeris is the issue of the madaakhilah. So it is imperative, oh reader, to understand the history of what the term is and what its used to denote.

In reality, the term madaakhilah refers to those who have followed the ways and concepts of the Shaykh Rabee bin Hadee al-Madkhalee. But there is a lot, lot more to it than this

There was a recent fitnah, similar to this fitnah of takfeer and revolt, from the avenue of the masa'il (issues) regarding jarh wa t'adeel. From this aspect of the praise and criticisms of an individual, many of the du'aat (callers) in the English speaking world had taken on the full acceptance of the ideas propounded by the Dr. Shaykh Rabee bin Hadee al-Madkhalee. One of the main issues that resulted from this fitnah was that due to the blind attachment of some of these callers to the shaykh, by which he is free from, they had made the actual manhaj asalafee (the methodology of the salaf) to be known by way or avenue of the Shaykh rabee bin hadee. This concept was not admitted by statement, it was witnessed and experienced in reality when the same people and those who had no choice but to follow these callers understood from this that anything that opposed the thoughts and stances of the shaykh, hafidhahullah is deviant and in opposition to the manhaj of the salaf.

Of course, the people of truth, those who were not infected with this wave of thought, were few, and I, myself was not of those few, yet wal-Hamdulillah for the baseerah Allah had bestowed upon me to see through this. Unfortunately, many, many of the people who ascribed themselves to the salafee manhaj were upon this wave of thought. In a way, these ideas and positions formulated into a type of school concerning the shaykh.

The issue gets deeper. The people who were upon the manhaj of the salaf had split into two groups, one not disparaging one, and the other disparaging the other. From among the people who did not exit the people of the dawah of ahlu-sunnah were the people who merely coincidentally did not accept the criticisms of the Shaykh Rabee on another Scholar from Yemen by the name of Abu Hasan al-M'arabi al-Misri. Yet, unfortunately the shaytaan made his way into the ranks from the top ranks of individuals among the scholars, whom the Muhadith of our time Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbadd had brought a true bayaa, which was actually the tibyaan (ongoing bringing forth of truth and light or guidance). Unfortunately those who did accept this criticisms of the shaykh had begun to show hatred, enmity, and disassociation of their brothers and organizations due to their not accepting a criticism of one scholar of another, despite the clear and open fact that while they claim that 30 ulema have sided with them on the issue, there is 3 times that who do not, most of which are senior and greater in rank and knowledge than those whom they have followed in the Shaykh's criticisms against Abu Hasan al-M'arabi.

The issue goes further. Both camps understood a plain reality. That is that the Shaykh, Rabee is a scholar from among the ulema, despite the fanatical overpraising of some of his followers.

Now, where does the people of takfeer enter into this.

Part of the issue is that Shaykh Rabee has been on the attack for two issues.

1. For holding the viewpoints of the majority of the salaf on emaan and kufr and form among the ulema who have passed and our time like Haafidh al-Hakamee, Ahmad Shakir, Albanee, Bin Baz, Uthaymeen, Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbadd, Ahmad bin Yahya an-Najmee and others.
2. The most crucial of which is that he, Rabee Bin Hadee, was one of those crucial and most responsible for exposing the figureheads of takfeer, among them, ashShayijee, Hasan at-Turaabi, Salman al-Awdah, Safar al-Hawali, Muhammad as-Suroor, Muhammad Qutb and the king, the originator of all originators of modern day takfeer and terrorism, Sayyid Qutb.

Now, of course, it is known that exaggerations have been made regarding the Shaykhs criticisms of Sayyid Qutb, but nevertheless, the truth of his non scholarship, deviance in the issue of takfeer and revolt have been plainly clear and accepted.

So from the viewpoints of the takfeeris, they had utilized their hatred for point two mentioned above and attacked him with point one in the statements above.

Another matter which adds more confusion in this matter is that they have lumped both those who had followed him and his errors (Rabee Bin hadee) in certain issues, and those who merely accepted him for what he was, a scholar, from among the good and learned scholars and who did not fanatically attach themselves to him. So both peoples have been lumped into one by these takfeeris, so they call anyone who quotes him or accepts him as being from the madaakhilah or a madkhali (singular)

Here is a fatwa from one of the takfeeri charlatans

The **Madaakhilah** are the name of a sect which ascribes itself to Salafeeyah. They are named after Rabee' bin Haadee al-Madkhalee (from the Madkhalee tribe). Just like the Ashaa'irah are named after Abul-Hasan al-Ash'aree (from the Ash'aree tribe).

They have been named other things too

Jaameeyah: named after Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee, a scholar from Africa, who started some of the criticisms of scholars, students, and callers early on. I personally don't like this name, because Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee is not as well known as Rabee', nor does he hold as high a place amongst the sect, nor was he as extreme as Rabee'.

Salafeeyah Jadeedah: Neo-Salafeeyah.

Jamaa'at at-Tabdee' wal-Hijrah: The group of declaring others innovators and boycotting.

Ad'iyaa' as-Salafeeyah: Salafee claimants.

Khuloof: Which means those who came after (the Salaf), in reference to the Hadeeth in Saheeh Muslim, "Then there will come Khuloof, who will say what they do not do, and do what they were not ordered, so whoever does Jihaad against them with his hand, then he is a believer...etc."

Salafeeyoo Ahl al-Walaa': Those with alliance/friendship [to the government] Salafees. This term was coined up by a group of **Madaakhilah** in a research paper that they wrote for the interior minister of Saudi Arabia, to help him against "the callers to revolution." The label has also been used against them by some of the scholars.

Murji'at al-'Asr: The Murji'ah of the era, due to the fact that Irjaa' runs rampant amongst their followers, although it is not their most unique trait.

I prefer to call them **Madaakhilah**, because the person who spread their corrupt call east and west was Rabee', May Allaah Give him what he deserves. He is also the most famous of their scholars.

As for their most unique trait (not their worst), I personally believe that to be their exaggerated and extreme understandings of Jarh and Tabdee'. Jarh is the science of disparaging narrators due to deficiency in their trustworthiness. This was practiced by the scholars so as to know from who Hadeeth can be accepted from, and from who should it be rejected. They also used it in the later generations in the sense from who can knowledge be taken from. Tabdee' is to declare someone an innovator.

This extremity is most clear in their wrong application of the principle "whoever does not declare the innovator to be an innovator then he is an innovator." So they misapply this principle as the Takfeeree groups misapply the correct principle "whoever does not declare the Kaafir to be a Kaafir then he is a Kaafir." The starting point for the average and typical Madkhalee (layman or scholar) is Sayyid Qutb. Whoever does not declare him to be an innovator, then he is an innovator. Whoever does not declare the one who abstained from Tabdee' of Sayyid, to be an innovator, then he also is an innovator, and onwards, until noone is left on the earth except the few members of their sect.

Due to their extremism, they followed the habits of Ahl al-Bida' before them, so they further divided into subsects. Those who sided with Rabee' on some issues, and those who sided with an Egyptian by the name of Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribee. The division started over Abul-Hasan's abstaining from declaring certain individuals innovators (in addition to other things), and those who abstained from declaring Abul-Hasan an innovator was grouped with him. This includes the Jordanian **Madaakhilah** who claim to be students of Shaykh al-Albaanee (which has been declared a false claim, by some of those who were close to the Shaykh, such as Aboo Maalik Muhammad Ibraaheem Shaqrah, an ex-Madkhalee).

The innovations and deviance of the **Madaakhilah** include:

Believing that legislating manmade laws, complete abstinence from ruling by the Sharee'ah, or resisting to rule by the Sharee'ah, seeking judgement from Taaghoot, are all just minor Kufr, that do not exit the doer from the religion of Islaam, except with Istihlaal. Istihlaal is to believe his sin to be permissible. So they make the sins of major Kufr and major Shirk equal to lesser sins like adultery, drinking alcohol, etc., by placing the condition of Istihlaal on the major Kufr, which only exists as a condition for minor Kufr.

Believing that actions of the limbs are not a pillar nor condition for the existence of Eemaan for one to be ruled a Muslim. So for them one can never pray, give Zakaah, fast Ramadaah, or do Hajj, never do Wudoo', never get Tahaarah, etc., and he would still be a Muslim, who's Islaam can save him from Hellfire eventually. They would label him a sinner, as for a Kaafir, then no. So they have followed the Murji'ah of the past.

Exaggerating the concept of excuse due to ignorance with regards to the rules of this life. So for them they excuse the one who calls himself a Muslim (i.e., they judge him a Muslim), in all

situations, in all issues. So for them, there is no difference between the basis of Islaam, the matters that are known from the religion by necessity, or those issues that are less apparent or obvious. There is no difference between one who was raised amongst the Muslims, or the one who was not. There is no difference between the new Muslim, and others. All of them are always Muslims, even if they fall into many types of obvious Kufr and Shirk, because of the "possibility" of ignorance. This confusion amongst them also applies to the issue of Ta'weel (misinterpretation) by which (for example) they excuse many of the rulers who have pronounced their Istihlaal of their legislating manmade laws.

Believing that major Walaa' (alliance/friendship) with the Kuffaar is not major Kufr, unless the person internalizes a Kufr intention, such as wishing to aid the religion of Kufr, or to destroy Allaah's Religion, etc. So if one were to lead the crusade against Islaam, head it, support it by wealth and blood, he would still be a Muslim, until he pronounces the internalized intentions of Kufr. So they do not make the act itself Kufr, until this innovated condition is proven.

Believing that Jihaad cannot be Fard 'Ayn upon the whole Ummah. Also, related to Jihaad, is believing that Jihaad is not permissible without an Islaamic state whose Imaam directs it. Believing Jihaad to be forbidden without the permission of the Imaam. All of this is regarding defensive Jihaad.

Labelling those who do Takfeer of the apostate rulers and their soldiers to be Khawaarij or Takfeerees. They prohibit Khurooj against these apostate rulers, due to the fact that they rule them to be Muslims. If they rule some of them to be Kuffaar, they still prohibit it due to the fact it is not led by an Imaam (head of Muslim state).

Belittling the importance of awareness of current affairs and events, saying that such is only for the rulers and scholars, and that the laymen have no need for such. This foolish idea leads many laymen to believe the rulers in their lands to be Muslims, because they are unaware of the Kufr that he practices. So these laymen sometimes end up sacrificing themselves for the apostate ruler by being his sincere servants and slaves.

Testing people on their positions regarding certain individuals they have labelled innovators. If the person agrees with them regarding their Tabdee' then he is befriended, if not, he is taken as an enemy and belittled. The individuals they test people by, many times are labelled innovators based upon some of the above misunderstandings. Example: 'Abdullaah 'Azzaam said Jihaad is Fard 'Ayn, according to the **Madaakhilah** this is an innovation, so he is an innovator. They ask Fulaan at the Masjid giving a lecture, what do you think of 'Azzaam? He says he is good, then they consider him an innovator, or hold him suspicious.

They blindly follow the official government scholars on their stances towards their governments and politics. So if the government scholars say peace with the Jews is fine in Palestine, the **Madaakhilah** parrot his words. Note: Not all government scholars are **Madaakhilah**, but the **Madaakhilah** blindly follow them in politics. Example, Ibn Baaz or Ibn 'Uthaymeen are not **Madaakhilah**, although they might possibly have some branches of the Madkhalee fundamentals, but the **Madaakhilah** blindly follow their opinions that are related to politics.

Holding a few people to be scholars in what they call "Manhaj." Noone else can be questioned on these "Manhaj" issues. These "Manhaj" doctors include Rabee', 'Ubayd al-Jaabiree, etc. They follow them blindly in issues of Jarh and Tabdee'.

The **Madaakhilah** tend to have a supportive position of the Saudi apostate regime, although they are supportive of most of the apostate regimes in general. But due to the fact that some of them do do Takfeer of some of these regimes (Syria, Libya, etc.), they always are in agreement in praising and supporting the Saudi regime by heart and soul.

They are very quick and easy in declaring people to be innovators, even over issues which are not innovation, rather from the best of Islaam! Like Jihaad. As for things that are indeed innovation, if one falls into them, they prohibit reading or praising anything that person wrote. For example, Sayyid Qutb had innovations, but so did many many scholars of the past and present, who Ahl as-Sunnah, as well as the **Madaakhilah**, both quote, such as Ibn Hazm, an-Nawawee, Ibn Hajr, etc. Yet they absolutely prohibit to treat the books of Sayyid Qutb, or others like him in the same respect.

Due to the fact that they hold many of these apostate rulers to be legit Muslims rulers/governments, and those who revolt against them to be rebellious Khawaarij bandits, they permit allying and befriending the apostate governments, even if that ends up in aiding these apostates against a Muslim. This is probably the worst of the **Madaakhilah**'s crimes (for those who hold this position) since it is apostasy, the apostasy of Mudhaaharah (helping the Mushrikeen against the Muslims). In the end, they tend to take positions that are favorable for Islaam's enemies, harsh against the Muslims, mimicking the Khawaarij in their "killing of Islaam's people, leaving the idol-worshippers."

So it is apparent here according to the wording of this takfeeri that in it, there is truth, but by it, falsehood is intended.

It is no doubt, that those who did cling fanatically to the shaykh had left the affairs of knowledge and its people and only connected themselves with a srt few of scholars, namely 6 main ones, Rabee, Ubayd, Faalih, Muhammad ibn Hadee, Najmee, and Ahmad Bazmool due to their excessive love, extremism, harshness, and even infatuation concerning the matters of jarh wa t'adeel as Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbadd pointed this out long ago. Yet, due to the actions of the juhaal shabaab, they have also lumped anyone who merely accept the shaykh as from among the generality of mashayikh and those who do acquaint themselves with the kibaaru-ulema and the issue of knowledge to be this deviant sect called the madakhilah.

Another attempt of this bewildered takfeeri is his lumping the likes of Sayyid Qutb, to be from the likes of the Imaams of Sunnah and hidaya wallahu Musta'an wallahi this is jahl murakab (compound ignorance)

chapter 24 *Was Sayyid Qutb responsible for Neo
Terrorism*

chapter 25 ***Repelling the misconceptions of Abu
Hudhayfah's 'SalafiPubs refutations'***