



## The Difference Between the Theoreticians Of al-Qutubiyah and the Shaikhs of ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

O you who believe! Fear Allaah as He should be feared, and die not except in a state of Islam (as Muslims) with complete submission to Allaah. (Aali Imraan 3:103)

O mankind! Be dutiful to your Lord, Who created you from a single person (Adam), and from him (Adam) He created his wife [Hawwa (Eve)], and from them both He created many men and women and fear Allaah through Whom you demand your mutual (rights), and (do not cut the relations of) the wombs (kinship). Surely, Allaah is Ever an All-Watcher over you. (An-Nisaa 4:1)

O you who believe! Keep your duty to Allaah and fear Him, and speak (always) the truth. He will direct you to do righteous good deeds and will forgive you your sins. And whosoever obeys Allaah and His Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) he has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and made to enter Paradise). (Al-Ahzaab 33:70-71)

To proceed, verily the best speech is the Book of Allaah and the best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (sallallahu alaihi wasallam). And the worst of affairs are the newly invented matters, every newly-invented matter is an innovation, every innovation is misguidance and all misguidance is in the Hellfire.

## INTRODUCTION

A brother called “Abu Umar al-Jurjaani” posted the following excerpt from the explanation of Kitaab ut-Tawheed of the Noble Shaikh, Saalih bin Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh – hafidhahullaah – which is in cassette form. The translation is of al-Jurjaani and since we do not have the cassette recording that it is taken from, we do not vouch for the correctness or accuracy of the translation. We have quoted it however, to answer some questions that were raised at the end of al-Jurjaani’s post, and we will assume that the translation is accurate enough and has been faithfully transmitted, making good our opinion of al-Jurjaani. Al-Jurjaani wrote:

The Sheikh said in his explanation of Kitaab at-Tawheed tape number 12:

“...And concerning the one who judges according to that legislation, then there is some elucidation to be made (fihi tafseel) ,if he judged one or two times or more than that and that is not his permanent state, and he knows that he is disobedient, meaning the qaadi or judge that judged by other than the shariyah of Allah while he knows that he is disobedient in that, then he has the hukm of those like him from the people of sins and he not to be declared a kafir until he declares that to be halaal (hata yastahil). So due to this, you find some of the people of knowledge saying: “ruling by other than the shariyah of Allah (the doer of that) is not to be declared a kafir until he declares that to be halaal,...” that is saheeh (correct) but this (the above mentioned) situation is not to be placed in the same category of taqneen and tashree’ (making laws and legislation).

Therefore, the haakim is (in the first example), as Ibn Abbaas said (in a state of) kufr less than kufr, not that to which you hold (as kufr akbar) meaning the one who judged in one or two issues with desires by other than that which Allah has revealed and he knows that he is disobedient and has not declared it to be halaal, this is the kufr less than kufr. As for the one who does not judge by what Allah has revealed at all (bataatan) and constantly judges and holds the people (to obey) other than the shariyah of Allah,...some of the people of knowledge have said that he is to be declared a kaafir totally (mutlaqan) like the kufr of the one who made the secular law (sann al qanun) because Allah has said, “they desire to seek judgement in the taghut”, so Allah has made the one who desires to judge by other than the shariyah of Allah as a taghut and said (in the same ayah) “and they have certainly been ordered to disbelieve in it (the taghut)”.

And there are from the people of knowledge who said, “even this category, he is not to be declared a kaafir unless he declares that to be halaal because he could possibly do that (and believe) that he is disobedient, therefore the ruling upon him is like the ruling upon the likes of him from the mujrimoon (the criminals) who are upon disobedience and have not repented from it”. And the first saying, (that the person who always judges by other than the shariyah of Allah and holds the people to that, that he is a kaafir) that is the correct view (saheeh) according to me and it is the view of our grandfather, the Sheikh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim rahimahullah in his book, Tahkeem al Qawaneen, because this (judging), in reality does not come from a person whose heart has disbelieved in at-taghuut. Rather it does not come except from one who has held that the qanun (man made law) is good and has held judging by it also to be good,” (Sharh Kitaab at Tawheed tape number 12 side two).

After reading this ya ikhwa, there are some interesting observations to be noted,

1.it is well known that none understand the books of sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahaab or the scholars of the dawah in Saudia more than Aal ash Sheikh (the family of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahaab rahimahullah). So, based upon this, Sheikh Saaleh has more right to explain the meaning of their words and the views that they hold.

2. that this touchy issue is at best, an issue of khilaaf between the ulema.

3.and if this is an issue of ikhtilaaf at least, it is unjust and wrong for the brothers at "SP" and those that hold their views to declare the other side to be of the khawaarij and takfeeris.

4.that it is likewise unjust to declare sheikh al albaani to be of the murji'ah as Sheikh Saaleh clearly stated that this is an issue of khilaaf. And we do not hear him saying that those who hold the other view are murji'ah (even though some have perhaps fallen into some aspects of irjaa').

5.that is binding on the muslim to know the issues of khilaaf in manhaj based issues so that he does declare his brother to be out of the fold of ad dawatus salafiyyah without just right.

And I would further like to see if "SP" will translate the words of Sheikh Saleh (as I am not a good translator) and put it on their site. Or do they now consider the Sheikh to be a qutbee revolutionary. May allah grant us insaaf (fairness).

We shall reply to this piecemeal inshaa'allaah, and explain our position in truth and also outline the great difference between the Ulamaa of ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah and the Partisans of the Madrasah al-Qutubiyah (The Qutubi School of Doctrine).

### **IMPORTANT NOTE**

Abu Umar al-Jurjaani is not Qutubi or Suroori and nor does he subscribe to the manhaj of the Qutubiyah. This dialogue has taken place because his original post has been copied by others and spread across the Internet, and hence it is our right to make our clarification and to answer some of the points or requests that he made in what he has written above. Our purpose in replying is to illustrate to Abu Umar al-Jurjaani, that the Qutubiyah are upon one thing and the Shaikhs of ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah are upon something else, even though the Qutubiyah may utilise some of the sayings of our Shaikhs in order to promote their own manhaj.

## THE SAYING OF SHAIKH SAALIH AAL ASH-SHAIKH

Al-Jurjaani, like many others, has not thoroughly comprehended what is in dispute here and what actually it is that has led the Qutubiyah astray, and which has separated them from Ahl us-Sunnah.

But let us first recap the saying transmitted from Shaikh Salih Aal as-Shaikh. Firstly, he explains the context of *kufr doona kufr*, in the sense that the Ruler who rules by what Allaah has revealed opposes the judgement of Allaah in making his judgements on a few occasions, (due either to *dhulm* or *fisq*), while knowing he is sinful, or he judges by another legislation on a few occasions, within the same context. He will not become a disbeliever until he makes *istihlaal* of his action (i.e. that he makes ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be lawful, as a matter of belief, meaning that he does not consider it unlawful from the Sharee'ah's point of view).

Then the Shaikh makes a distinction between this situation and between the situation in which a Ruler makes *Taqneen* or *Tashree'*, that he is devises laws himself. Immediately after that the Shaikh then talks about **the one who does not rule by any of what Allaah has revealed absolutely (i.e. at all)** and says that this person **is like the one who devises secular laws (i.e. the one who falls into taqneen or tashree')**. Hence, the Shaikh makes a distinction between these two conditions and states, namely between the one who legislates laws and between the one who does not judge by any of what Allaah has revealed and judges by other laws, and makes them binding upon the people. And though the particular form of their not ruling by what Allaah has revealed may differ in its exact manner, the judgement upon these two people and their form of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is the same, in the view of the Shaikh. In other words regardless of whether one invents laws by himself and implements them, or whether he leaves those of the Sharee'ah completely and implements laws devised by others, then the ruling is the same in both cases.

He then mentions that some from the people of knowledge hold that even the one who falls into the latter two conditions (just described) is not to be declared a **disbeliever until he makes istihlaal of his action**. He then says that the view he holds to be correct is that such a one is a *kaafir*, and that this is the view of his grandfather – *rahimahullaah* – Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem. Finally, he explains that that such a one is a *kaafir* because this action (of either *taqneen* or *tashree'* or not ruling by any of what Allaah has revealed, absolutely), then it only comes from one who has held that judging by this secular law is good (and perhaps the Shaikh might have actually said in the Arabic, it is *ahsan* i.e. better) and that the law itself is good (and perhaps the Shaikh might have actually said in the Arabic, it is *ahsan* i.e. better). Since the translation is vague at places and the original Arabic phrase has not been included, some more clarity is required and perhaps the Arabic text can be transcribed and made available. Nevertheless, the meaning is clear.

So concerning this we say:

**ONE:** What is meant by *taqneen* and *tashree'*? Are we talking here about legislation of laws that relate only to administrative aspects (*idaaree*) or aspects that relate directly to the

religion itself (shar'iiy). In other words, do we mean, for example, that legislating a law that motor vehicles should drive on the left hand-side of the road comes under this taqneen and tashree'? If we do, then this requires some tafseel. If a person invented this law and then said this is from Allaah and from His Book, and he ascribes this specific law to Allaah and His revelation – a lie –, then no doubt this person is a kaafir. And if he does not, then, this is not kufr. And amongst the people of knowledge who have made this distinction (between idaaree and shar'iiy laws) is Imaam ash-Shanqeetee in his tafseer of the verse in Surah al-Kahf (18:26), **“And He makes none to share in His judgement”**. And for further clarity, let us quote it:

Imaam ash-Shanqeetee said, “... that those who follow the secular laws which Shaytaan has legislated upon the tongues of his allies, in opposition to what Allaah, the Majestic and Elevated, has legislated upon the tongues of his Messengers (sallallaahu alaihim wa sallam), then no one doubts about their kufr and their shirk, except the one whose vision Allaah has removed, and has blinded him from the light of revelation... **Know that it is obligatory to make a distinction between the code of law (nidhaam ul-wad'iiy) whose implementation (takheem) necessitates kufr in the Creator of the Heavens and the earth and between the code of law which does not necessitate that.** And to make that clear: Law (nidhaam) is of two types: **Idaaree** (organisational, regulatory) and **Shar'iiy** (legislative, pertaining to the Sharee'ah). As for the Idaaree (law) by which perfection and exactness in the affairs is intended, and to regulate and bring together the affairs in a manner that does not oppose the Shar' (Legislation of Allaah), then there is nothing to prevent this, and there is no one who opposed it from amongst the Companions or those from after them. And 'Umar (radiallaahu anhu) acted on some things which were not in the time of the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), such as his writing the names of the soldiers in a record (i.e. account book) for the purpose of exactness, so he would know who was missing and who was present. Yet the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) did not do that. And also like his, I mean 'Umar's (radidallaahu anhu), purchasing of the house of Safwaan bin Umayyah and making it into a prison in Makkah al-Mukarramah, while the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) did not set up a prison and nor did Abu Bakr... So there is no harm in this type of law, and it is not outside of the confines of the principles of the Sharee'ah of maintaining the general benefits (in the society)... And as for the legislative code (Nidhaam ush-Shar'iiy) which is in opposition to the legislation of the Creator of the Heavens and Earth, then instituting it (takheemihi) is disbelief in the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth. **Such as the claim that favouring the man over the women in the issue of inheritance is not from justice, or that it is necessary for them to be considered equal in receiving inheritance, or like the claim that polygamy is (a form of) oppression, or that divorce is oppressive for the woman, or that stoning (for adultery) and chopping (the hand for theft) are from the strange (backward) actions and that it is not permissible to apply them to a human being and other such (claims).**” (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 4/90). Note: The Revolutionary Takfiris, Qutubites and Suroorists cut off the last part of this quotation(!) – as is their habit with the statements of our scholars. And we have witnessed this first hand!!

Note how what Imaam ash-Shanqeetee calls the “Nidhaam us-Shar'iiy” has been explained by him, and this is what we hold(!) and this is but our creed(!) and this is what we have been telling all neo-Qutubites for years – the while they clip, distort and selectively quote the

statements of our Scholars(!!) and flee from the very same tafseel of the Salaf that is in the words of our Scholars.

Anyhow, the issue here is that mere taqneen and tashree in and of itself is not kufr. Rather, it has the tafseel mentioned by Imaam ash-Shanqeetee to it. And indeed, this is the very same tafseel as has been mentioned by Imaam Ibn Baaz in his well known saying:

Shaikh Abdul-Azeez bin Baaz said: "And whoever ruled by other than what Allaah has revealed (i.e. secular laws) then he will not be in other than one of four situations: 1) The one who says: 'I rule by this because it is superior to the Sharee'ah of Islaam.' Such a one is disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief. 2) The one who says: 'I rule by this because it is like the Sharee'ah of Islaam, so ruling by it is permissible and ruling by the Sharee'ah is permissible'. Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief. 3) The one who says: 'I rule by this and ruling by the Sharee'ah of Islaam is superior but ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is permissible.' Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of major disbelief. 4) The one who says: 'I rule by this' while he believes that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not permissible and who says that 'the Sharee'ah of Islaam is superior and it is not permissible to ruler by other than it' but he is neglectful, or treats matters lightly, or does this action due to a reason which proceeds from his rulers, then he is a disbeliever in the sense of minor disbelief which does not eject from the religion - and it is considered one of the greatest of major sins." [Al-Hukmu bi-Ghairi Maa Anzalallaahu wa Usool ut-Takfeer p. 71/72]

And likewise, this tafseel is that of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee, "And by this it is known that the halaal (lawful) is what Allaah has declared lawful and the haraam (unlawful) is what Allaah has declared unlawful, and the deen (religion) is what has been legislated by Allaah. Therefore, every legislation (tashree') from other than Him is falsehood, and acting upon it – instead of (badala) the legislation of Allaah, **for the one who believes that it is equivalent to it, or better than it** – is clear, manifest kufr, there being no doubt in it." (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 7/162). And the Qutubiyah, Takfiriyyah also clip this part. And we have also witnessed this first hand!

So we do not apply the words of Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh in absolute terms such that mere taqneen and tashree' itself is major kufr. Rather, it falls back upon this tafseel, which is well-known – the tafseel that the Qutubiyah flee from, as if it were a hungry lion, chasing after them.

**TWO:** The second matter to be aware of in the saying of Shaikh Salih Aal ash-Shaikh is his reference to **the one who does not judge by any of what Allaah has revealed absolutely, at all (bataatan)**. And who then makes obligatory another Sharee'ah upon the people. And this is explained further by Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan:

**Excerpt from the Cassette "Questions and Answers on al-Haakimiyyah"<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> To hear the actual recording itself refer to Article **MNJ050014** at **SalafiPublications.Com**

**Questioner:** “Someone has understood from your words in Kitaab ut-Tawheed, which are from your comments, with regards to the issue of al-Haakimiyyah and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. So they have understood from them that (by the act alone) you perform specific takfir of a specific ruler who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. And then they applied (what they understood from your words) to the rulers of the Gulf states.

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** [Laughs]... is it due to hawaa (desire)?... the words are clear, there is no ambiguity in them, the words are clear. The distinction (tafsil) that is mentioned (i.e. previously in the chapter) relates to them<sup>2</sup>. And it was then said after that that the one who **banishes the Shari’ah entirely** (nihaa’iyyan) and puts another law in its place, **that this is evidence (daleel) to show that he views the [secular] law to be better than the Sharee’ah, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir [emphasis given]**<sup>3</sup>. This is in the same book itself... however they only take [from the book] 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 become clear [to them].

**Questioner:** And the statement of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is [understood] in the same way?

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** 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 gives evidence that he considers this law to be better than the Sharee’ah. And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the Sharee’ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.**<sup>4</sup>

**Questioner:** They mean the rulers of the Gulf states O Shaikh? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** [words unclear] ... .. the words [in the book] are general. As for people and specific individuals, then this requires investigation. **Questioner:** So there is a difference between [takfir of] a specific individual and a general ruling?

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, between a general ruling... **Questioner:** So you intended only a general ruling [not a ruling upon specific individuals]? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, a general ruling, there is no doubt about this. So he said ‘the rulers of the Gulf states (was meant)?’ **Questioner:** Yes, this is it, however al-hawaa (desire) overtook him? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, hawaa (desire).. [words unclear]... Is this rectification? Performing takfir of the rulers of the Gulf states, is this from rectification (of the affairs)?

---

<sup>2</sup> Referring to his words earlier in the same section. The full text of the chapter under question is provided further below.

<sup>3</sup> **IMPORTANT NOTE:** Pay careful attention to these words, for they are important, and they indicate the difference between Ahl us-Sunnah who adhere to tafseel, and the Qutubiyah who make takfir by itlaaq (absolution, generalisation). And inshaa’allaah this will be explained further below.

<sup>4</sup> And all of this goes back to the tafseel that the Shaikh mentioned at the beginning of the chapter. Refer to MNJ050014 to see a full translation of the chapter under discussion.

**Questioner:** No it is not...**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** It is not rectification... it is but kindling of tribulation (fitnah). **Questioner:** May Allaah reward you..." End of the discussion.

So we say that the context of this is about a Muslim Ruler who abolishes the Sharee'ah, **completely and totally**<sup>5</sup> – a situation that does not exist today in any of the Muslim lands – and then brings his own Sharee'ah and makes it binding upon the people. And the judgement of takfir in this issue has its basis in what has been quoted from Imaam ash-Shanqeetee, and Imaam Ibn Baaz, and Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and even Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh himself, in what has been quoted by al-Juraani above:

---

<sup>5</sup> **IMPORTANT NOTE:** When we say "abolish the Sharee'ah" or "banish the Sharee'ah", then what does this mean? And of course the judgement will depend upon what is actually meant by "abolition" in the words used by Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem. So if a Ruler says for example (or anyone for that matter), that we should not judge by Islaam, but by Communism – then whether he physically abolishes the Sharee'ah or not, he is a kaafir. Rather, even if he allows the mosques to remain, and the people to pray therein, and allows the Hijaab, and the many other aspects of the Sharee'ah, yet he says we should rule by Communism and that is the way to go, then such a one is a kaafir, irrespective of whether he totally abolished the Sharee'ah or not. And the judgement of takfir is based upon the well-known tafseel of the Salaf, not based upon the absolution and generalisation of the Khalaf of our times. And if what is meant by "abolish the Sharee'ah" is that a Ruler completely and totally effaces Islaam and everything related to it, such that nothing of it remains, or is allowed to remain, and then brings another law to replace it totally, then that does not exist today. And if anyone fell into it, then his kufr returns back to the kufr of i'tiqaad, since he did not do this except while he considered his law to be better or superior and so on, and this is indicated in the words of the likes of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Saalih as has preceded. In other words, this shows that this person holds other than the Sharee'ah to be superior and better, and hence upon the tafseel of the Salaf, this person is a kaafir.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (rahimahullaah) said (commenting upon some words of Shaikh Albani), "And these words of Shaikh al-Albani are very good indeed, however, we would differ with him on the issue where he does not make a ruling of disbelief over them (the rulers) except when they held that to be permissible (as a matter of belief). This matter needs further investigation, because we say: Whoever rules by what Allaah has revealed yet he holds that something other than the rule of Allaah is better or more befitting, then he is a kafir - even if he judged by the rule of Allaah - **and his kufr is a kufr of belief**. However, our discussion here is concerning an action. And it is **in my opinion (dham)** that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish such laws that oppose the Shari'ah and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement **except that he declares this to be permissible (istahallahu) and holds the belief (ya'taqidu) that such laws are better the Shari'ah laws**. Hence, he is a disbeliever. This is what is apparent, **and if not then what [motive] is it that carried him to undertake this?** (Fitnah of Takfir pp.75)

Shaikh al-Albani replied to this point saying: "I do not understand from which angle this opposition [to our view] can be sustained. Since I say, that if any person - even someone other than a ruler - considered a rule other than Islam to be better and more befitting than the rule of Islam - **even if he acted by the rule of Islam** - then he is a kafir. Therefore, there is no difference at all, since the original point of reference is what is in the heart."

But then, in the completion of the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen above, there is further clarification, the Shaikh said, "... Hence, he is a disbeliever. This is what is apparent, and if not then what [motive] is it that carried him to undertake this? **Sometimes it can be his fear of not undertaking this act on account of people who are stronger than - that makes him undertake this act. So here he would be compromising with them. So here we would say that such a one is like those who compromise with respect to the other sins.**"

Note, that the Qutubiyah omit this last part of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen's statement!!

And the first saying, (that the person who always judges by other than the shariyah of Allah and holds the people to that, that he is a kaafir) that is the correct view (saheeh) according to me and it is the view of our grandfather, the Sheikh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim rahimahullah in his book, Tahkeem al Qawaneen, because this (judging), in reality does not come from a person whose heart has disbelieved in at-taghuut. **Rather it does not come except from one who has held that the qanun (man made law) is good and has held judging by it also to be good.**" (Sharh Kitaab at Tawheed tape number 12 side two).

In other words, this person is a kaafir because of his underlying belief that the secular law is better and judging by it is better. And in the Shaikhs' viewpoint (and in that of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem and also Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan), the external act (of totally abolishing the Sharee'ah) indicates (i.e. is an evidence to show) the beliefs that are held inside, are those of kufr<sup>6</sup>. And hence, **upon the tafseel of the Salaf** concerning the kufr of action and the kufr of belief, such a one is a disbeliever.

---

<sup>6</sup> **IMPORTANT NOTE:** It is important to note that in the original words quoted from Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh, the Shaikh says that he does not agree with the view of those who stipulate the condition of istihlaal for the one who abolishes the Sharee'ah, not ruling by any of it at all then, and then brings another Sharee'ah. And that he considers that this act is indicative of the person holding that the new Sharee'ah that he is ruling by, in opposition to that of Allaah's, is superior and better – hence, istihlaal, is not even required in this case.

So the issue goes back to i'tiqaad (i.e. belief) for the ruler would not have done that if he had not considered Allaah's Sharee'ah to be inferior to what he is judging by, whether it is in relation to a single law, or a complete set of laws that make up a whole legislation. Therefore he is a Kaafir. And what explains this is the explanation of Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan of the statement of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem.

So what is apparent from this is that Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh **is negating the requirement of the condition of Istihlaal. And in this we agree with him.** In the sense that in this particular context, the Ruler does not have to make istihlaal of his action to be considered a kaafir. Rather, his kufr could be from the point of view of his I'tiqaad, i.e. his belief. So if he considers what he is judging by to be better and superior to that which Allaah has revealed, then he is a kaafir from this angle, **even though he may believe that it is not permissible or lawful for him to do this.** And all of this is in conformity with the tafseel of the Salaf, in this regard. In other words, whether he makes istihlaal of his ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, in this particular context, his action is such that it indicates that the Ruler is upon al-kufr al-itiqaadi. (This is why Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in his Tahkeem al-Qawaneen included this particular act within "al-kufr al-itiqaadi" – more about this later.) But this is in the case of when a person totally abolishes the Sharee'ah, completely and brings a totally new, whole, complete legislation.

We do not believe that there any rulers today in the Muslim lands who have abolished the Sharee'ah in its entirety and rooted it out from the society in its entirety, and implemented something else in its entirety.

As for what is less than the above situation, then we do not believe that in this context the actions of a Ruler can conclusively indicate that the Ruler judged by other than what Allaah revealed, due to i'tiqaad (or istihlaal).

So even though a Ruler might implement another Sharee'ah in most aspects of life, we hold that it is plausible for him to have done this without considering his action to be lawful (i.e. istihlaal) and without his considering that this law is better than that of Allaah's, but rather due to either his fear, or due to oppression or due to sinfulness or due to a false ta'weel or due to ignorance and so on. And this is has been explained by the likes of Shaikh Ibn Uthameen and others.

But as for the Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah **[Khaarijiyyah 'Asriyyah]**, they are in a different league altogether!! They make takfir by the act alone, speak with the apparent meanings of the verses related to rule and rulership, fleeing from tafseel and detail. Firstly, they insist that their view is the truth and that anyone who opposes them and who adheres to the tafseel of the Salaf, in arriving at the judgement of takfir in this issue is an Extremist Murji' – as occurs from Safar al-Hawaali, who got a bit carried away in his writings and who got poisoned by

However, some would disagree that the external act of not judging by what Allaah has revealed of secular laws or legislation does not absolutely indicate that a person holds on to them and acts by them due to his belief that they are better. It is plausible that there are some other operative reasons. **And this is where the difference lies** In that some scholars say that this is an absolute indicator of the beliefs of the person, and others say that it is plausible that it is for some other reasons. The difference is not concerning the well-known tafseel of the Salaf (concerning the kufr of action and the kufr of belief), which is the basis for arriving at the judgement of takfir<sup>7</sup>.

**But what is important to remember is that this is in the context of when someone abolishes the Sharee'ah totally and brings another law, and asks for this to be adhered to.**

What about the situations other than that when it is not total absence of ruling by the Sharee'ah, by the sum whole of what Allaah has revealed? And what about when it is only

---

Mohammad Qutb, and who still has not openly repented from his scandalous ways (and we shall explain this in detail in what is yet to come). Secondly, they abandon the way of the Salaf in the principles of takfir and in adhering to caution and so on, but instead fall into extremism and exaggeration. They do not bear in mind the welfare of the people, and the resultant benefits and harms and so on, and on top of that their deviation is even greater than what apparently appears to be so. **This is because their whole da'wah revolves around this issue, as a starting point, as a methodology. They have deviated from the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and instead they have imbibed the methodology of the two Qutb's in calling to Allaah.**

It is for this reason that you see them – like Safar al-Hawaali – portraying the da'wah of the Messengers as being to al-Haakimiyyah (refer to GRV070005 for details and also GRV070003), quoting verbatim from Sayyid Qutb. It is for this reason that you see them so attached to the books of Qutb and Mawdoodi, both of whom were Rafidees in their aqidah, and both of whom made insults against the Prophets of Allaah. It is also for this reason that you see them rousing the sentiments of the common-folk, portraying to them that kufr has engulfed the society around them (this the same as the theories of Qutb concerning the modern-day Jaahiliyyah) and that ALL Muslim lands are lands of Secularism, without exception. Then at the same time, they make takfir of nation states, built upon these principles – the while they flee from the kind of tafseel that we have elaborated upon in this discourse.

So the issue is much more serious, and is not just restricted to holding a particular viewpoint on this issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, it extends to a general methodology of reform. This is where the great danger lies.

This is why the Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah waged such a war against Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee and assaulted him from every direction, because he demolished them and exposed their methodologies when he wrote "The Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah, That is the Way of Intellect and Wisdom". They had nightmares on account of this book(!). These are the realities O Sunni, so understand them well!! The issue is not as al-Jurjaani simplistically puts it across!

<sup>7</sup> **A GREAT AND MIGHTY BENEFIT:** And this is where the Qutubiyah have differed and strayed and opposed!! For they claim that this particular form (of not ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed) is just like the acts of kufr such as reviling the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), or kicking the Qur'aan, or mocking the Religion etc. **and that any attempts to explain this act as being kufr due to the internal beliefs (such as istihlaal, or juhood, or i'tiqaad) is Extremist Irjaa'**. This is the reality of the difference between the Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah, who flee from the tafseel of the Salaf and adhere to the absolution and generalisation of the Khalaf, such as the Qutbs and those upon their way. And this view propounded by the theoreticians of Qutubiyah, such as Safar al-Hawaali and others, necessitates that the whole of Ahl us-Sunnah are Extremist Murji'ah because of this. This will also be explained in more detail further below inshaa'allaah.

partial. What is the guiding principle in all of these situations? And what are the guiding principles for the judgement of takfir?

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, "And it is **in my opinion (dhann)** that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish such laws that oppose the Shari'ah and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement **except that he declares this to be permissible (istahallahu) and holds the belief (ya'taqidu) that such laws are better than the Shari'ah laws**. Hence, he is a disbeliever. This is what is apparent, and if not then **what [motive] is it that carried him to undertake this?! Sometimes it can be his fear of not undertaking this act on account of people who are stronger than - that makes him undertake this act. So here he would be compromising with them. So here we would say that such a one is like those who compromise with respect to the other sins.**" (Fitnah of Takfir, pp.73-74).

The issue here, is that we are talking about adherence to the tafseel of the Salaf and **avoiding** unrestricted, generalised absolute takfir, upon other than Sharee'ah principles (i.e. upon Qutubi principles!). The Qutubiyah do not adhere to this tafseel, because from a practical point of view, it prevents them from their agenda of takfir and khurooj. There are no Muslim lands today, ruled over by Muslim rulers in which the Sharee'ah is totally and completely abolished and made non-existent, and then replaced completely with another Sharee'ah.

Yes, there are some countries in which some Sharee'ah exists, **yet the Ruler is a kaafir**, because, although he has not abolished the Sharee'ah completely, he has verbally uttered his belief and his state of kufr. So one who says "Communism is the way to go" or that it is not obligatory upon him to follow what the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has brought, and that what he himself has devised is better than what the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) brought, or that he has a choice in all of that – then such a one is a kaafir – such as the likes of al-Qadafi. **But the point here is that we are talking about arriving at the judgement of takfir by adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf.** Qadafi is a kaafir because the tafseel of the Salaf and their rules and principles (qawaa'id) of takfir necessitate that. He has made his kufr clear and the judgement upon him is clear.

This is different to what the Qutubiyah fall into of extremism and exaggeration and undue commotion and excitation – and by the mere presence of secular laws in the Muslim lands – declare the Ruler to be a kaafir, and his helpers and assistants to be Kuffar and all the ministries and bodies tied to the government to be Kuffaar as well. They make unrestricted, generalised takfir – based on the actions of people, or the mere presence of secular laws in the Muslim lands – and they have extremism in this regard, and this extremism has been entered into Ahl us-Sunnah on account of the books of Sayyid Qutb, and on account of those who tried to promote the Qutubi manhaj such as Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah.

This is the difference between the Qutubiyah and the Shaikhs of the Salafi Da'wah. The Qutubi way is extremism and exaggeration and excitation. Let us take a look at a typical

example<sup>8</sup>. Stated the unfortunate doctor who accused Imaam al-Albaani of Irjaa', not actually knowing what is Irjaa', and on top of all of that revived the madhhab of the Mansoori Kharijites(!):

“And just as they (the Murji'ah) conceived of that – i.e. Imaan without actions – the **Contemporary Murji'ah** have come along and they say: Whoever does not judge by Allaah's Book and the Sunnah of His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and does not establish from the Sharee'ah of Allaah except a portion from it, whether it is great or small – yet he does not establish it because it is a command from Allaah, and out of obedience to Him and out of having Imaan in His religion, but because it agrees with his desire (hawaa) and his personal benefit and out of affirmation for the one who has the right of legislation and institution (of laws) regardless of whether it is himself, or a party (hizb) or a legislative council (majlis) – then he does not become a disbeliever until we know that in his heart he has preferred the laws of men over the Sharee'ah of the Best of all Judges, and that so long as we do not come to know of that (from him), then all of his actions are acts of disobedience.

Until even if he was to legislate law after law, and lies in wait for those who request the implementation of the Sharee'ah, and meets them with harm, and then displays clear loyalty to the disbelievers, and abolishes whatever Allaah has legislated amongst the required differences between the Believers and the Unbelievers amongst his subjects, and allows the establishment of Atheistic (political) parties, then all of that is disobedience which does not expel him from Islaam, so long as we do not come to know as to what is in his heart. So if we come to know that he prefers (in his heart) a legislation or judgement other than the legislation and judgement of Allaah, above and over the legislation of Allaah and His judgement, or if he makes it clear with his tongue that he intends or desires (yaqsud) kufr<sup>9</sup>,

---

<sup>8</sup> And to see this explained more clearly, refer to Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri's discussion of “The Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine” in GRV070005.

<sup>9</sup> Notice this deception and exaggeration here. This saying he has quoted is the saying of the Jahmiyyah in that only when a person intends (with his heart) to leave Islaam can he be judged a kaafir. On account of this type of scare-mongering did many of those poisoned by this doctor start accusing the Salafis with falsehood and accusing them of speaking with the saying of the Jahmiyyah – all of that being a wicked lie.

Shaikh Ali Hasan Bin Ali Bin Abdul-Hameed said, “**And just as Imaan, in the view of Ahl us-Sunnah consists of speech, action and belief, then likewise, kufr consists of speech, action and belief. However, the principle of Ahl us-Sunnah, and this is very important, is that not everyone who falls into an act of kufr has the appellation of kufr (i.e. kaafir) applied to him. Since, it is necessarily required for the takfir of a specific individual that the conditions are present and the preventative barriers are absent.**”

As for the first condition, then it is knowledge ('ilm) and its preventative barrier is ignorance (jahl). As for the second condition, then it is choice (ikhtiyaar) and its preventative barrier is compulsion (ikraah). As for the third condition, then it is intending the act (qasd ul-fi'l), and its preventative barrier is unmindfulness (dhuhool), or error (khata') or ijtihaad [or ta'weel].

And it is necessary to pause here and to look at this issue of intent (qasd) because some people have fabricated a lie against us and against our Mashayikh that when we mention intent (qasd) that we mean by this “desiring kufr” (qasd ul-kufr). Meaning, that we hold that a person cannot be considered a disbeliever except when he desires kufr (of the heart) (i.e. to leave Islaam). And this is an error.

or he believes it (ya'taqid), and that he is one who makes it lawful (mustahill) to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed. Hence, the Murji'ah of our times are even greater in their extremism." (Safar al-Hawali in Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa 2/695).

What is all this talbees (deception)?! From a doctor in aqidah?! Nurtured in the midst of the Salafi Mashaayikh and Imaams?! What is all this exaggeration and accusation in falsehood?! What is all this sophistry?! What is all this Qutubi nonsense, which is but the by-product of befriending Mohammad Qutb, the Takfiri – the one who accuses the Salafis of Irjaa' and other slanders and which is but a by product of imbibing the doctrine of Sayyid Qutb? O Sunni, take another careful read of the poison of al-Hawali in what he has stated above, and you will come to realise:

Firstly (in the first paragraph) he makes takfeer on account of the action alone, and applies the apparent meaning of the verses related to rule and rulership (i.e. al-Maa'idah) while fleeing from the tafseel of the Salaf, making great his exaggeration in all of that, and accusing those who adhere to this tafseel as being the "Contemporary Murji'ah". And he took this from his Shaikh and Teacher, Mohammad Qutb.

He then says:

Until even if he was to legislate law after law...

This is the way of the Qutubiyah, generalisation and absolution, and avoidance of the kind of tafseel that we have explained earlier on, by quoting from the Salafi Ulamaa.

And then:

...and lies in wait for those who request the implementation of the Sharee'ah, and meets them with harm...

It should come as no surprise that those who revive the manhaj of the Khawaarij, make takfir of the Sinners, ascribe disbelief and apostasy to the society [as Hawali did in his "Kissinger's Promise" and on account of which Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jamee scolded him openly and challenged him to an open debate in the cassette "Nasihah Ilaa Safar al-Hawaali" and in which he said openly to al-Hawaali, "**What is all this tumult about the Salafi Aqidah?!... You preach the Salafi doctrine in theory and then you call to the**

---

Even a Kaafir does not desire kufr. If we asked a Jew or a Christian, "You say Allaah is one of three, is this Imaan or Kufr?" He will reply, "This is Imaan". [If we said], "You are a Christian, why? Because you desire kufr or because you desire Imaan?" He will reply, "Because I desire Imaan". Until even the people of the first Jaahiliyyah (prior to Islaam), those who used to worship idols and mere names (even they did not desire kufr)... **And if you (O Muhammad) ask them: "Who has created the heavens and the earth," they will certainly say: "Allâh."** (Luqman 31:25) **And those who take Auliya' (protectors and helpers) besides Him (say): "We worship them only that they may bring us near to Allâh."** (Az-Zumar 39:3)

**For this reason Shaikh ul-Islaam said, "No one in the creation of Allaah desires (yaqsud) kufr." Therefore, what is not meant is the "desire for kufr" but what is actually meant is the "desire for the act which necessitates kufr". This is a point that should be understood well. This is a principle." The Fitnah of Takfir (Cassette Lecture, Birmingham UK, 29<sup>th</sup> July 2000)**

**doctrine of the Khawaarij practically?!...”]**, use the example of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi to argue the case for open rejection of the Rulers (as Salman al-Awdah did, refer to “Intermediate Qutubism” GRV070004), spread the faxes dissension of that Innovator and Tahriri, Muhammad al-Mis’ari rousing the common folk against the authorities, abandon the way of the Salaf and the advice given by the contemporary Salafi Ulamaa on the way to advise and correct the Rulers, revive the da’wah and teachings of Qutb and Mawdudi, those which are but the essence of revolution, innovate into the matter of Tawheed, and so on, then it should come as no surprise to the unfortunate doctor that the Rulers should lie in wait for the likes of these ones who cause undue commotion and kindling of tribulation and cause them harm... it should come as no surprise that the Rulers fear for themselves, when this type of activity is being promoted at the ground roots level.

Indeed, this is one of main reasons why the relationship between the Rulers of the current times and their subjects became bitter, because of the existence of these political movements who threatened the positions of the Rulers and the authorities – and made an open display of that. The Activists adopted the methodology of Qutubism, and so it should come as no surprise that the Rulers should retaliate the way that they did. **Of course the behaviour of the Rulers is not justified in the least and whatever crimes or injustice they commit will be upon their own shoulders**, but it shows that blaming the Rulers alone is to be ignorant of the true state of affairs. These people did not heed the advice of Hasan al-Basri<sup>10</sup>, nor that of Ibn Abi al-Izz al-Hanafi<sup>11</sup> and nor that of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (refer to his statement quoted further below).

<sup>10</sup> Al-Hasan al-Basree (d.110) said, “Verily, al-Hajjaaj is the punishment of Allaah. So do not repel the punishment of Allaah with your own hands. But you must submit and show humility, for Allaah the Most High stated, “And indeed We seized them with punishment, but they humbled not themselves to their Lord, nor did they invoke (Allâh) with submission to Him.” (Al-Mu’minun 23:76). (Minhaj us-Sunnah of Shaikh ul-Islam 4/528)

Ibn Sa’d relates in his *Tabaqaat al-Kubraa* (7/163-165), “A group of Muslims came to al-Hasan al-Basree seeking a verdict to rebel against al-Hajjaaj [a tyrannical and despotic ruler]. So they said, “O Abu 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 a punishment from Allaah, 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 judgement 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. Al-Hasan used to say, “If the people had patience when they are 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 with their swords. By Allaah! Not even for a single day did they bring about any good.”

<sup>11</sup> Stated Ibn Abil-‘Izz al-Hanafi, “And as for adhering to obedience to them (the Rulers), even if they commit oppression, then this is because the evils and harms that arise on account of rebelling against them, is numerous times more than that which occurs as a result of the oppression of the Rulers themselves. Rather, in having patience over their oppression there is expiation of sins, and a multiplication of the reward. For Allaah did not empower them over us, except due to the corruption in our actions, and the recompense for an action is its like (al-jazaa’u min jins il-‘amal). Hence, it is upon us to strive (ijtihaad) in seeking forgiveness, making repentance and rectification of our actions. Allaah the Most High said, “**And whatever affliction befalls you, then it is fro what your hands have earned, yet He pardons many**” ... and He the Most High said, “**...And whatever evil befalls you, then it is from your own soul**”, and He the Most High said, “**And thus do we turn some of the oppressors against others on account of what they used to earn**”. Hence, if the subjects (of a state) wish to save themselves from the oppression of the tyrannical ruler, then let them abandon oppression themselves.” (Sharh Aqeedat ut-Tahaawiyah).

They are the ones who plotted with their adulterated manhaj to come out against the Ruler(s) or to at least incite the common-folk against the Rulers, and then they complain of oppression?! Where is the intellect? They are the ones who abandoned the methodology of the Prophets, that of intellect and wisdom, in calling to Allaah, and instead took to the methodology of Qutb and Bannaa, that of stupidity and foolishness, on account of which they were met with harm. Quite clearly, they cannot have been the true Fuquhaa al-Waaqi(!) – the while they accused our Ulamaa of being “Scholars of Womens’ Menses and Impurities” and other vicious slanders and insults.

Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab said in his “Sittah Usool”:

“The Third Principle: From the perfection of being united (ijtimaa) is hearing and obeying the one who has been granted authority over us, even if it be an Abyssinian slave” And Shaykh Abdullaah al-Ubaylaan commented and explained, “And no one revolts against the Imaam except one of three groups: **The first group:** Those who seek the world, such as wealth and position of authority. **The second group: The one who desires that the word of Allaah be uppermost, and they are the Khawaarij.** **The third group:** The Revolters, and they are the ones who revolt against the Imaam on account of a permitted ta’weel (interpretation), but without their holding the aqidah (doctrine) of the Khawaarij.”<sup>12</sup>

When someone claims to extol the Sharee’ah so that all judgement be by the Sharee’ah and only the Sharee’ah and that Allaah’s word reign supreme, then we look and see, are there any associated indicators which show whether this person is a Sunni, Salafi, Athari, upon the correct manhaj who calls to the all inclusive Haakimiyyah of Allaah or whether his person is a Bid’iyy, Harakiyy, Hizbiyy who is merely calling for a politicised form of al-Haakimiyyah alone.

And of course, after we have merely made mention of this, there is nothing more to be said. For we know that the likes of al-Hawali et. al. wallowed in the methodology of the Khawaarij, performed takfir of the sinners, applied the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa’idah to make absolute and unrestricted takfir of all the rulers and nation states, adopted the example and practise of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi, the Father of the Khawaarij in their behaviour towards those in authority over them, spread and distributed the faxes of dissension of Muhammad al-Mis’ari, the founder of Descendants of the Mu’tazilah, Hizb ut-Tahrir in the Arabian peninsula, mocked and ridiculed the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah and defamed them and reduced their worth in the eyes of the youth and so much more. And then on top of that they innovated into the matter of Tawheed, defended and aggrandised the Heretical Innovators and gave support to the groups of Innovation, such as Ikhwaan and Tabligh, and waged a war against those who adhered to the Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah, nay the very Methodology itself and labelled it “the Bid’ah of the

---

<sup>12</sup> And these too should be fought against and repelled, for leaving fighting in this situation is better, on account of the evil that would otherwise result. Refer to Shaikh Abdullaah al-Ubaylaan’s commentary on Usool us-Sittah of Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab.

Qadariyyah”. So what Haakimiyyah were they preaching? And what exactly was the word of Allaah that they were attempting to make supreme and uppermost?

And then to seal their fate, the Imaam and Muhaddith, the Shaikh ul-Islaam, Reviver of the Religion, Muhammad Naasir ud-Deen al-Albaani declared them “**the Khawaarij of the Era**” after he had read the main intellectual doctrinal work of this sect, written by the unfortunate doctor who neither knew the reality of Irjaa’, nor of those whom he accused of it and nor of the limitations of his own self(!).

Then the doctor continued:

...and then displays clear loyalty to the disbelievers, and abolishes whatever Allaah has legislated amongst the required differences between the Believers and the Unbelievers amongst his subjects, and allows the establishment of Atheistic (political) parties, then all of that is disobedience which does not expel him from Islaam, so long as we do not come to know as to what is in his heart....

And this again is just letting of steam and exaggerating and causing commotion and excitation. And what we mean by exaggeration here, is exaggeration over, above and beyond the Sharee’ah guidelines. What the Qutubiyah are attemptig to do is to flee from or to actually abolish the tafseel of the Salaf on this issue. It is just like the first part, unrestricted and generalised takfir – all of this leading the people to fall into unrestricted takfir and to flee from the tafseel of the Salaf. This is the extremism in takfir that al-Hawali has imbibed from Mohammad and Sayyid Qutb. Does al-Hawali wish that we announce that this one is an apostate and then we rouse the common folk against him and then lead them to a bloody confrontation<sup>13</sup>.

Then he said:

So if we come to know that he prefers (in his heart) a legislation or judgement other than the legislation and judgement of Allaah, above and over the legislation of Allaah and His judgement, or if he makes it clear with his tongue that he intends or desires (yaqsud) kufr<sup>14</sup>, or he believes it (ya’taqid), and that he is one who makes it

---

<sup>13</sup> Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, “These words are very good (i.e. Imaam al-Albaanee’s). Meaning, that those people pass judgement against the Rulers of the Muslims, that they are disbelievers, what benefit do they achieve by judging them to be disbelievers? Are they able to put an end to them? They are not able. And when it is the case that the Jews have occupied Palestine for around 50 years, yet despite that the Islamic Ummah has not been able in its entirety – Arabs and Non-Arabs alike – to remove them from their place! **How then, after this, can we go and strike those who rule over us with our tongues (i.e. make takfir of them) while we know that we are not capable of putting and end to them, and that blood will be shed, and the taking of wealth will become lawful, and even the honours of people. And then we will not even have achieved the desired result!! Therefore, what is the benefit – such that if a person was to believe – in that which is between him and his Lord – that amongst the rulers is one who is a disbeliever in truth, with the kufr that ejects from the religion - what then is the benefit in announcing this and spreading this, except the kindling of tribulation?!” (Fitnah of Takfir, p.74).**

This is the difference between the Neo-Qutubiyah and the Shaikhs of Da'wah Salafiyyah(!). So reflect!

<sup>14</sup> And this is a lie against Ahl us-Sunnah, for they have not stated this (i.e. that one has to desire kufr in his heart before he becomes a kaafir). Rather this is a wicked lie on account of which many of those poisoned by this unfortunate doctor and his heretical writings began to label Imaam al-Albaani of being Jahmi and the

lawful (mustahill) to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed. Hence, the Murji'ah of our times are even greater in their extremism.

And as we had said a long time ago, the neo-Qutubiyah call all of our Ulamaa "Murji'ah", including Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimen, and all of the Ulamaa who adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of the takfir of the one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed.

The Shaikh, Abdul-Malik bin Ahmad al-Mubarak al-Jaza'iri said about the delegate of Alee Bin Haaj, "The delegate of Alee bin Haaj in The Algerian Front, called al-Hashimi Sahnouni used to label everyone that did not perform takfir of the rulers with this name, "Murji". So when I asked him, what was his reference point for this, he said, **Mohammad Qutb and 'Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq'.**" Madarik un-Nadhar (p.110, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition).

Imaam al-Albani was asked concerning the book, "Dhahiratul-Irjaa fil-Fikr al-Islami" of Safar al-Hawali, and in this book takfir is performed on account of certain sins! He replied: **"I gave my viewpoint on a matter about thirty or so years ago when I used to be in the [Islamic] University (of Madinah) and I was asked in a gathering about my opinion on Jamaa'at ut-Tabligh. So I said on that day, 'They are the Sufis of this era'. And now it has occurred to me that I should say about this Jamaa'ah who have emerged in the present times and who have opposed the Salaf, I say here, in accordance with the statement of al-Hafidh adh-Dhahabi: They have opposed the Salaf in much of the issues of manhaj, and it is befitting that I label them the Khawarij of the era. And this resembles their emergence at the current time - in which we read their statements - because they, in reality, their words take the direction and objective of that of the Khawarij in performing takfir of the one who commits major sins. And perhaps I should say, this is either due to ignorance on their behalf or due to devised plot!!** (The Cassette: The Surooriyyah are the Khawarij of the Era, end of the first side). Dated 17th Dhul-Hijjah 1417H.

Imaam al-Albani also stated in one the most recent of his books that were published, Adh-Dhabb al-Ahmad an Musnad al-Imaam Ahmad, p.33 (1999, 1420H): "And Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has explained the perspective from which faith, Imaan, consists of actions, and that it increases and decreases - [his discussion] needing no further elaboration - in his book 'al-Imaan'. So the one who requires more detail can refer back to it. **I say: This is what I used to write for more than twenty years, affirming the madhhab of the Salaf and the aqidah of Ahl us-Sunnah - and all praise is due to Allaah - in the issues pertaining to Imaan, and then there come - in the present times - reckless ignoramus, who are but young newcomers accusing us of Irjaa!! To Allaah is the complaint of the evil that they are upon, of ignorance, misguidance and scum...**".

---

Salafis as "Jahmiyyah of the Era". And for a refutation of all of this refer to MSC060006 (The Creed of Imaam al-Albaani on Takfir and Apostasy). Al-Hawali has insidiously made reference here to the beliefs of the Jahmiyyah, and out of exaggeration - or a deliberate ploy - has ascribed it to those who adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of Takfir of the Rulers - so that he can then label them Extremist Murji'ah. As Imaam al-Albaani said, **"And this resembles their emergence at the current time - in which we read their statements - because they, in reality, their words take the direction and objective of that of the Khawarij in performing takfir of the one who commits major sins. And perhaps I should say, this is either due to ignorance on their behalf or due to devised plot!!"**

As we explained right from the very beginning, these people have extremism in takfir, they promote takfir or at least imply it in the strongest of manners – and then accuse those who do not agree with their extremism of being “Extremist Murji’ah”. May Allaah guide this doctor back to his senses – and may He make him abandon the evil and wicked company that has led him to this state of accusing the Ummah with Irjaa’, its Imaams with Irjaa’ the while he wallows in the extremism of the Khawaarij, propounding their theories (such as that of the Mansoori Kharijites and takfir by way of sin!!). Their da’wah is based upon catching the emotions and sentiments of the people and not adhering to the way of the Salaf, in their tafseel, and in making takfir, and in their great fear in this regard.

Which is why we say that our Ulamaa, like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem, Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh are upon one thing and the neo-Qutubiyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah are upon something else. Our Ulamaa do not praise, defend and aggrandise the Mockers of the Prophets of Allaah, the Revilers of Uthmaan and the Mukaffiroon of the Companions of Allaah’s Messenger. Nor do they compare such people to the likes of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah or Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and nor do they call such people “Shaheed”(!!) absolutely and unrestrictedly – the ways of the Murji’ah(!!). And nor are they upon the extremism in Takfir, that which the Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah are upon. Rather, they give obedience to the Rulers, and give advice to them, by the proper means and methods, nor do they stir hatred of the Rulers amongst the common-folk and nor do they plot and plan and organise the youth into a mob – teaching them the Haakimiyyah of Qutb and Mawdoodi and the current affairs by engrossing them in the news and reports of the Infidels, and nor do they allow co-operation and working with the groups of innovation and destruction, like Ikhwaan and Tabligh. This is the difference O intelligent ones... between those who speak of Haakimiyyah and the Sharee’ah of Allaah upon evidence and insight and upon Sharee’ah principles, holding their view due to an ijtihaad and whose manhaj is sound and upright, and between those whose manhaj is adulterated and corrupt and who speak of the Haakimiyyah of Qutb and Mawdoodi, the extremist Takfiri manhaj.

For if it was the case that the likes of Safar al-Hawali and others merely held the view that is held by Shaikh Saalih or Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem and that was it [and remember this is on the issue of **the one who totally abolishes or banishes the Sharee’ah** – and even then, their judgement of takfir is based upon the tafseel of the Salaf regarding the kufr of action and the kufr of belief], then fine no problem. But when it is the case that the unfortunate doctor and his likes revived the madhhab of the Mansooriyyah (a sect of the Khawaarij), accused the whole Ummah of Irjaa’, mocked Imaam al-Albaani, made takfir by way of sin, defended and praised the Innovators, such as Sayyid Qutb (who is actually the origin of his teachings), implied takfir of all of the Rulers of today, in absolute terms, abandoned the way of the Salaf in advising the Rulers and corrected them, slandered and belittled our Scholars – then that is something else. It is but hawaa (desire) and misguidance(!!) for anyone who has eyes to see and a heart to understand.

## COMMENTING ON ALJURJAANI'S COMMENTS

As for the comments of al-Jurjaani:

1. It is well known that none understand the books of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahaab or the scholars of the dawah in Saudia more than Aal ash Sheikh (the family of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahaab rahimahullah). So, based upon this, Sheikh Saaleh has more right to explain the meaning of their words and the views that they hold.

It is correct to say that Aal ash-Shaikh, from among the descendants of Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab, **are more familiar** with the teachings and da'wah of the Shaikh, no doubt. And it is also correct, from this perspective, that the descendants of the Shaikh, such as Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh, will know their position better. However, this does not necessitate that others cannot know just as well, the positions of Aal ash-Shaikh, and can understand them, and can evaluate them, and that they do not have the same right to discuss them, and explain them and comment upon them. And we mean here the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz and others.

Secondly, the words of al-Jurjaani, "Sheikh Saaleh has more right to explain the meaning of their words and the views that they hold" are in fact meaningless, for if this is an issue of difference, then if Shaikh Saalih explains the viewpoint of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem, it does not mean that the viewpoint of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem is correct merely because Shaikh Saalih explained it and clarified it and showed what it was. Rather, all of this depends upon evidences and proofs.

Further, we find that Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem has some other words of his, written five years after "Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen" which contain the clear tafseel that we have alluded to:

"...And similarly, more important than that, is what the deviants, heretics and Orientalists are entering into the ideas and thoughts of the Muslims in causing doubts about the foundation of their religion and causing them to stray from the Sunnah of their Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and his sharee'ah, **and judging (tahkeem) by the secular laws that are in opposition to the Islamic Sharee'ah**. And the most important [part of all of this] is being acquainted with the foundation of Tawheed, that which Allaah sent His Messenger Muhammad (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) with, to actualise it in both word and deed, and to fight against everything that opposes it such as the major Shirk which expels from the religion or the variety of minor forms of shirk. This is the actualisation of 'Laa ilaaha ilallaaha'. The actualisation of the meaning of 'Muhammad is the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam)' is from judging to his sharee'ah and confining oneself to that - and rejecting whatever is in opposition to that from amongst the rules (qawaaneen) and regulations and all those things for which Allaah has not revealed any authority. **And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement whilst believing in the correctness (sihhah) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that without belief (I'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz), then**

**he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion.”** (Majmoo Fataawaa Ibn Ibraahim 1/80).

Now how do we reconcile with what is stated in Tahkeem al-Qawaaneen? We need an answer to this. If we did not adhere to what has been stated by Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem above, it would necessitate takfir of a large portion of the Ummah, whether they live in the lands of Islaam or those of kufr. Those who refer to the secular laws in their personal judgements, and those who work or preside over these law courts in the lands of the Muslims. The tafseel mentioned in the saying above, clarifies the generalisation in the statement below:

“...And so these law courts are now present in many Muslim lands, complete and established, with open doors and the people flock to them in their throngs; their judges make judgements between them with what opposes the judgement of the Book and the Sunnah, from amongst those laws, and they make these judgements binding upon them, and force them upon them and impose them upon them. So which disbelief is over and above this disbelief. And what greater contradiction of the testimony that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah is there, after this contradiction?” (Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen).

And this disbelief is because these people – whether the judges or the subjects – have a) **either made istihlaal**, or b) **they have considered these laws to be better and superior to those of the Sharee’ah, or they have considered them equal to the Sharee’ah**. And if we did not adhere to the words of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in which he makes the tafseel, then it would necessitate takfir of a very large number of people, unrestrictedly and absolutely – amongst them those who know they are not judging to the Sharee’ah and who know they are sinful and who know the Sharee’ah is superior, but judge to these because they are the laws of the land or due to fear, or the various other reasons.

And as for those who impose these laws, institute them (taqneen) and legislate them (tashree’) and so on, then this goes back to the tafseel we mentioned earlier (such as in the words of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee).

Then there is the saying of the Allaamah, Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan **Aal ash-Shaikh**, “...and it is forbidden to pass judgement (tahkeem) when the judgement is based upon a false (baatil) Sharee’ah which opposes the Book and the Sunnah, **such as the laws of the Greeks (Ahkaam Yoonaan) and those of Europe, and those of the Tartars, and their various legislative codes (qawaaneen) the source of which are their own opinions and desires**. Similar to this are the various cultural and customary practices of the Bedouins. Hence, whoever made it lawful to judge (istahalla) by [any of] this in the issues pertaining to blood, or other than it is a Kaafir. Allaah the Most High said, “And whosoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Unbelievers” (5:44). And concerning this verse, some of the Mufasssiroon have said that the kufr intended here is the kufr that is lesser than the Major kufr (kufr doona kufr al-akbar), because they understood that this verse applies to whoever judges by other than what Allaah has revealed but does not make that lawful (ghayr mustahill). But they do not dispute amongst themselves regarding its

application in general to the mustahill (one who makes it lawful), and that the kufr in this case is the one that expels from the religion.” (Minhaaj ut-Ta’sees, p.71).

Then to add to all of this, the transcript of the gathering that took place with the Noble Shaikh `Abdul-`Aziz Bin Baz – rahimahullaah – and he is the student of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibrahim and the spreader of his knowledge. In this gathering he was asked the following question:

“There is a fatwa of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibrahim Aal Shaikh – rahimahullaah – which the People of Takfir use to demonstrate that the Shaikh did not differentiate between the one who ruled by other than the Sharee’ah of Allah - `Azza wa Jalla – while he declares this act of his to be permissible (mustihillan), and the one who is not like this (i.e. does not declare his act to be permissible) – (while this) differentiation is well known amongst the Ulamaa.”

Shaikh Ibn Baz : This matter is firmly established with the Ulamaa – as I have mentioned previously – **that the one who declares that to be permissible (man istahalla dhalik) then he has disbelieved.** As for the one who does not declare that to be permissible, such as the one who judges subject to bribery and similar things, then this is only the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr). And when an Islamic State is established and which has power and capability, then it should struggle against the one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed until it forces him to do so.

Questioner: But they use the fatwa of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibrahim as evidence?!

Shaikh Bin Baz: Muhammad bin Ibrahim is not infallible (ma’soom), he is but a scholar from amongst the scholars, he is sometimes correct and sometimes in error and he is not a Prophet nor a Messenger. Likewise, Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn Kathir and other scholars. All of them are sometimes correct and they sometimes err. But only what conforms to the truth is taken from their statements and as for what opposes the truth, then it is rejected from the one who said it.” (Al-Furqaan, No. 82).

And this is what we hold. That evidences are sought for the sayings of men and not the sayings of men sought for evidences. Which is why our viewpoint is to reconcile and to bring together the statements of the Salaf on this topic, and show that they all come from the same angle and perspective, even though in some of them their might be a generalisation or an absolution which cannot be left as it is, and which is restricted by another statement somewhere else – either from the same scholar or from other scholars.

To illustrate. In Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem mentions the six types of **al-kufr al-i’tiqadee (kufr in belief)** in relation to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed:

- a) those who fall into this kufr on account of juhood (rejection)
- b) those who fall into this kufr by believing that some other judgement is better, more complete and comprehensive than that of Allaah and His Messenger

- c) those who fall into this kufr by believing that some other judgement is equivalent to the judgement of Allaah and His Messenger
- d) those who fall into this kufr by believing that it is permissible to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed.
- e) The setting up of law courts and institutions which judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, the basis of all of them being the secular laws of the disbelievers and the likes.
- f) What the bedouins fall into of judging by the habits and customs inherited from their forefathers and which are passed on from generation to generation.

As for the first four then all of that is clear! As for the latter two, then they are to be understood in the light of the first four, let alone the fact that Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem described them as “kufr in belief” at the beginning of his discussion of these six types, saying, “And it is impossible for Allaah, the Most Perfect, to call the one who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed a Kaafir and for him to not be a Kaafir – rather he is a Kaafir – either being Kufr of action or Kufr of belief. And that which is reported by Ibn ‘Abbaas (radiallaahu anhumaa) by way of Taawoos and others in explanation of this aayah, shows that the ruler by other than what Allaah has revealed is a Kaafir, **either in belief, which takes him outside the religion** - or in action, which does not take him outside the religion.”

Now O Sunni, go back and read what was quoted from Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan **Aal ash-Shaikh** (who should know better the da'wah of Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab) above<sup>15</sup>, and this statement clarifies both the fifth and sixth types of kufr in belief alluded to by Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in a generalised way – in the sense that the fifth and sixth types mentioned by Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, are looked at from the same angle as the first four.

Now O Sunni read the saying of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, “**There is no doubt that the one who does not believe (i'taqada) in the obligation to rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever. Hence, whoever declares it permissible (istahalla) to judge amongst the people with what he considers to be justice, without following what Allaah has revealed, then he is a disbeliever. There is no nation except that it orders ruling with justice. And sometimes justice, as perceived by its senior leaders, can exist in its religion. Many of those who ascribe themselves to Islam judge by their customs that Allaah has not revealed,**

---

<sup>15</sup> “...and it is forbidden to pass judgement (tahkeem) when the judgement is based upon a false (baatil) Sharee'ah which opposes the Book and the Sunnah, **such as the laws of the Greeks (Ahkaam Yoonaan) and those of Europe, and those of the Tartars, and their various legislative codes (qawaaneen) the source of which are their own opinions and desires**. Similar to this are the various cultural and customary practices of the Bedouins. Hence, whoever made it lawful to judge (istahalla) by [any of] this in the issues pertaining to blood, or other than it is a Kaafir. Allaah the Most High said, “And whosoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Unbelievers” (5:44). And concerning this verse, some of the Mufasssiroon have said that the kufr intended here is the kufr that is lesser than the Major kufr (kufr doona kufr al-akbar), because they understood that this verse applies to whoever judges by other than what Allaah has revealed but does not make that lawful (ghayr mustahill). But they do not dispute amongst themselves regarding its application in general to the mustahill (one who makes it lawful), and that the kufr in this case is the one that expels from the religion.” (Minhaaj ut-Ta'sees, p.71).

such as the ancestral customs of the bedouins. And the chiefs (umaraa) were obeyed (in this) and **they used to consider that it is desirable to judge by these such customs, without the Book and the Sunnah. And this is disbelief.** For many people have accepted Islaam but along with this they do not judge except by their natural [inherited] customs, those which are ordered by those whom they obey. **So if they know ('arafoo) that it is not permissible to judge except by what Allaah has revealed and did not adhere to that, but in fact declared it to be lawful (istahalloo) for themselves to judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, then they are disbelievers. And if not [i.e. did not declare it lawful for themselves] then they are [merely] ignorant people – as has preceded about them”** Minhaaj us-Sunnah (5/130).

And see how this clarifies the sixth type of kufr in belief that Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem mentioned in a generalised way, concerning the bedouins who judge by their ancestral customs and habits.

Now O Sunni, let us go back to the saying of Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh himself: “...And the first saying, (that the person who always judges by other than the shariyah of Allah and holds the people to that, that he is a kaafir) that is the correct view (saheeh) according to me and it is the view of our grandfather, the Sheikh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim rahimahullah in his book, Tahkeem al Qawaneen, because this (judging), in reality does not come from a person whose heart has disbelieved in at-taghuut. **Rather it does not come except from one who has held that the qanun (man made law) is good<sup>16</sup> and has held judging by it also to be good.**” And compare this with the explanation of Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan, that has preceded<sup>17</sup>.

And note how this too is actually based upon the tafseel of the Salaf, when we gather and reconcile (and not separate and divide!!).

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps the word used in Arabic is actually “ahsan” i.e. better, and the translator has not made note of this. And this would actually fit in with what has been said by Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem himself in the second type of kufr in belief he discusses in his treatise. Hence, the statement should actually read, **“Rather it does not come except from one who has held that the qanun (man made law) is better and has held judging by it also to be better [than the Sharee’ah].”**

<sup>17</sup> **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** [Laughs]... is it due to hawaa (desire)?... the words are clear, there is no ambiguity in them, the words are clear. The distinction (tafsil) that is mentioned (i.e. previously in the chapter) relates to them<sup>17</sup>. And it was then said after that that the one who **banishes the Shari’ah entirely** (nihaa’iyyan) and puts another law in its place, **that this is evidence (daleel) to show that he views the [secular] law to be better than the Sharee’ah, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir [emphasis given]**<sup>17</sup>. This is in the same book itself... however they only take [from the book] 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 become clear [to them].

**Questioner:** And the statement of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is [understood] in the same way?

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** 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 gives evidence that he considers this law to be better than the Sharee’ah. And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the Sharee’ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.**

Refer to the complete discussion quoted earlier on.

Now O Sunni, read carefully what was said by Shaikh Saalih as-Sadlaan in his introduction to al-Anbari's book on the topic: "And he took to pains after that – may Allaah reward him – in [addressing] the issue of the era, the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. He was extremely successful in discussing and clarifying it, establishing rules, principles and compiling the statements of the people of knowledge, past and present, on this issue. **He also explained that all of these statements emanate from the same lamp [i.e. are in agreement]** and that they, the people of knowledge, do not perform takfir of the rulers save those **who declare it lawful (istihlaal)** to rule by the secular laws, or **those who wilfully reject (juhud)** ruling by the Islamic Shari'ah, or **those who claim that it is not suitable for these times**, or **those who claim that ruling by the Shari'ah and other than that Shari'ah is the same** [i.e. that they are both equal in status] and what resembles all of this."

And then finally, reflect O Sunni, upon what has been quoted by Shaikh Ali Hasan from Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan bin Mu'allaa al-Luwaihiq in his book "al-Ghuluww Fid-Deen" concerning the six types of kufr in belief mentioned by Shaikh Ibn Ibraheem in Takheem ul-Qawaaneen (p.291), "That which is apparent, and Allaah knows best, is that he – rahimahullaah – mentioned the first four types with expressions that indicate that they are in conformity with the rules and principles of making takfir of a specific and known individual (muy'ayyan) from amongst the Rulers, and this is why he used words which are in reference to a specific person. So he said, "... **that he rejects (An yajhada)**" and also "... **that he believes (An ya'taqida)**"... And as for the last two types, then he has intended "takfir an-nau' (takfir by way of type, or takfir of the action)" by them. For this reason (in these latter two cases) **he has made his words revolve around the actual action (fi'l) itself, not the doer (faa'il)**. And built upon this, it is necessary, in the case of making the takfir of a specific individual who has fallen into any of the last two types, **that reference is made to the principles contained in the first four types**". (Refer to Saihatu Nadheer p.97).

And, by Allaah, this is what we hold as our religion and this is what we hold as the truth.

Then al-Jurjaani said:

2. that this touchy issue is at best, an issue of khilaaf between the ulema. 3. and if this is an issue of ikhtilaaf at least, it is unjust and wrong for the brothers at "SP" and those that hold their views to declare the other side to be of the khawaarij and takfeeris.

How the realities are turned around?!! Al-Jurjaani, go back and read the words of Safar al-Hawaali above, which we have quoted, then tell us, **who began this affair?!!** By Allaah, how they see twigs in the eyes of others and cannot see the branches in their own.

It was the likes of Safar al-Hawaali and Salman al-Awdah who entered the fitnah of Sayyid Qutb, his extremism, his exaggeration, and his faulty understanding of al-Haakimiyah into the ranks of the Salafis, causing them to split and divide, and accusing those who did not agree with them of being Murji'ah, nay Jahmiyyah (!!). I implore you by Allaah, O al-Jurjaani, why don't you preach to mankind that it is wrong for the likes of Safar al-Hawaali to accuse Ahl us-Sunnah of being Murjiah, and extremist Murji'ah at that, and that they are the ones

who began this fitnah and caused the splits, divisions and dissension and gave a new lease of life to the Takfiris and Kharijists of our times!!

And as for us labelling those who do not agree with our view on this issue as being Khawaarij, then that is not the case. It is those who fall into absolute and unrestricted takfir, upon other than the tafseel of the Salaf, they are those who are Khawaarij in our estimation. If they had merely held on to their view (i.e. on the issue of total abolition of the Sharee'ah), and then not accused the Salafis and their Imaams of being Murji'ah and Jahmiyyah, reviling them and slandering them, belittling them and reducing their worth, and had they not defended and aggrandised Sayyid Qutb in falsehood, and had they not used the example of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi as their model and guide (as Salman al-Awdah did in his pathetic attempt to justify open rejection, refer to GRV070004), and had they not made takfir of the societies and takfir of the sinners, and had they not propounded the theory of Jins ul-'Amal by which they make takfir of the people on account of the abandonment of the obligatory actions, and had they not revived the madhhab of the Mansoori Khaarijites, and had they not co-operated with Dr. Muhammad al-Mis'ari, the Doctor of Fitnah, and had they not innovated the bid'ah of Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah, and had they not innovated the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanaah – so if they had merely held as their view that the one who totally abolishes the Sharee'ah and then brings another one and makes it binding upon the people is a kaafir, and then stopped at that, and adhered to the methodology and tafseel of the Salaf in arriving at the judgement of takfir, then fine. There would be no objection to them. But that is not the case O al-Jurjaani!! Further, it is not we who labelled them Khawaarij, it was the Imaam and Muhaddith, Shaikh Naasir ud-Din al-Albaani who labelled them "Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah". So please show some insaaf (justice)!! **But justice is indeed very rare to find these days. And how hidden is this hizbiyyah!!**

Stated the Ibn Ma'een of the Era, Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, when asked about the saying that Salman al-Awdah is the "Imaam of Qutubiyah", "I personally do not say this, **however he is not far from it**. Do you not see how all of the Takfeeris and Khawaarij in all of the various parts of the world, without exception, consider him to be their Imaam? And opposite to this, they attack the Mashaayikh such as Ibn Baaz, al-Albaani and Ibn Uthaimin? By Allaah, my daughter, this country would not even have known Sayyid Qutb and his innovations, and nor would the youth have had any knowledge of him and become attached to him and start to show love for Ahl ul-Bid'ah had it not been for the writings of Shaikh Salmaan may Allaah guide him, and his making Sayyid an Imaam. Shaikh Salmaan hears and sees, just like you do from those Takfeeris, outside of this country, and he knows that they consider him to be an Imaam, so why does he and Shaikh Safar, why do they not publicly announce in every single place that they are free of them (the Takfeeris) and from their ideas in their own books, cassettes, magazines and newspapers and on the Internet? So that our youth and our sons and our lands can be freed from their tribulation? We are still waiting from these two Shaikhs to recant from their previous errors, for which we have not heard any recantation. And we also await for them to free themselves from Ahl ul-Bid'ah, those who are in every place, especially the Takfeeris..." (3<sup>rd</sup> July 2000, phone conversation with a Sister from the Emirates).

I hope now O al-Jurjaani, that you can see the difference between the Qutubiyah [Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah] and the Shaikhs of the Da'wah Salafiyyah(!).

Then he said:

4.that it is likewise unjust to declare Sheikh al Albaani to be of the Murji'ah as Sheikh Saaleh clearly stated that this is an issue of khilaaf<sup>18</sup>. And we do not hear him saying that those who hold the other view are Murji'ah (even though some have perhaps fallen into some aspects of irjaa').

Yes, and this is the difference between our Ulamaa, the likes of Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh and between the neo-Qutubite Revolutionaries, such as Safar and Salmaan who got poisoned from the direction of Mohammad Qutb and Mohammad Suroor. But what did you say at the end? "... (even though some have perhaps fallen into some aspects of irjaa')..."? What do you mean here? And who are you referring to? What is this ambiguity in your words. We hate ambiguity and love clarity, and tafseel and detail!! And you say "have **perhaps** fallen into...". So are you unsure and in doubt? Then why convey a doubt, if you are not sure? In fact, what is apparent, is that al-Jurjaani does not understand the issues and has not understood the true nature of the difference that has occurred in recent times and the fitnah that has appeared in this regard in the current times.

But we ask him, make your intent by this sentence known and understood, so that your viewpoint can be answered in detail. But in short, we say that the accusation of Irjaa' that came from the direction of Safar al-Hawaali has been exposed and demolished, walhamdulillah. And as for the accusation of Irjaa' that came from the Permanent Committee, then they made an erroneous Ijtihad, and all of that has been answered and explained somewhere else, and many from the people of knowledge rejected their verdict, and some of them stated that only the "Revolutionary Takfiri's" rejoiced with this verdict (such as Shaikh Ibn Uthameen). And as for the accusation against Imaam al-Albaani that he is Murji', Jahmi, then that too has been dealt a deathblow, walhamdulillah. So we advise al-Jurjaani to fear Allaah and not to convey doubts and to be clear in his words and to leave aside these ambiguities.

The Qutubiyah [Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah] tried to pull down our Mashaayikh by calling them "the scholars of women's menses and impurities" – but alhamdulillah, the true Salafis never fell pray to their trap. Then they tried to pull down Shaikh Rabee' bin Hadee when he exposed them for their bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah, but alhamdulillah, they failed. Then they

---

<sup>18</sup> As for the issue of khilaaf, then what Shaikh Salih Aal ash-Shaikh is talking about in his words quoted right at the very beginning, is that he does not agree that the one who abolishes the Sharee'ah and brings another law, has to make istihlaal of his act, before his act is considered kufr. Rather it is kufr because of what he holds of the underlying beliefs, which made him do this act, which are believing that other than the Sharee'ah is better than it. Hence, there is actually no difference at all, since this judgement is based upon the same tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. Namely, that amongst it is that which is the kufr of action, and amongst it is that which is the kufr of belief. But as for the Qutubiyah, then they treat this issue like the issue of kicking the Qur'aan or mocking the religion and so on and claim that explaining this act to be kufr because of istihlaal, or i'tiqaad or juhood and the likes is Extremist Irjaa'(!) and that adhering to this tafseel in arriving at the judgement of takfir is from the ways of the Extremist Murji'ah(!).

tried to promote their manhaj by innovating Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah as an independent fourth category, but alhamdulillah, the Senior Scholars made Tabdee' upon the one who spoke with Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah. So they became Qutubiyyoon Mufflisoon after this. Then they attempted to justify the sects of innovation and working with them. And they were refuted again. Then they tried to assault Shaikh Rabee' and his correctly explaining the Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah, but again they were humiliated and exposed because the Ulamaa supported Rabee' and explained he was upon the truth. Then they tried to defend the Mocker of Moosaa (alaihi salaam), the Reviler of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and the Mukaffir of Banu Umayyah – all in falsehood. But they were disgraced when the refutations of the Ulamaa against Qutb were made known and especially when the book "Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah" came out recently. They attempted to assault Shaikh Rabee' in his exposition of Qutb's "**ignorance and deviation from Islaam**", but they were disgraced again by the most recent praise of Imaam al-Albaani for Rabee's defence of the honour of the Messengers, and the deen of Islaam and the Sunnah. Then they tried to accuse our Imaam, the Shaikh and Muhaddith of the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan. And then they were disgraced even further and made to wander further into the mires of misguidance. Then they attempted to use the erroneous ijtihaad (or verdict) of the Permanent Committee on Shaikh Ali Hasan's books on Takfir, and then after the dust had settled and the Scholars spoke out and rejected this verdict, and Shaikh Ali himself wrote his excellent reply to it, their wanton condition came to the forefront, and their opportunism was all but readily apparent, and the stench of partisanship, and hatred for the Salafi Da'wah and its people was all but evident. **For how they rushed to ascribe misguidance and innovation to Shaikh Alee Hasan on account of this issue, and at the same time** how they defended Sayyid Qutb, the Raafidee Heretic, the one who uttered kufr and apostasy, attacked the honour of the Messenger Moosaa (alaihi salaam), that of Uthmaan (radiallaahu) and refused to acknowledge the Islaam of Banu Umayyah, called for the adoption of Marxist Socialism for the perfection of Islamic life, called for the abolition of parts of the Sharee'ah due to their not being suitable for the times, claimed Islaam was a concoction of Christianity and Communism, and revived the innovations of the Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah, Soofiyyah, Ash'ariyyah and many others – and after all that called him "an Imaam of Guidance" and a "Shaheed" unrestrictedly and without exception (istithnaa). By Allaah what filthy, repugnant, revolting and obnoxious hizbiyyah.

Indeed, what a truly despicable and wretched state, wal-'Iyaadhu billaah.

Then al-Jurjaani said:

5.that is binding on the Muslim to know the issues of khilaaf in manhaj based issues so that he does declare his brother to be out of the fold of ad dawatus salafiyyah without just right.

We wish that the neo-Qutubiyyah had been given this advice right from the very beginning, before they began to accuse our Imaams with Irjaa' even though they themselves might have considered this to be an issue of khilaaf<sup>19</sup>. But they were upon the heresy of Qutubism, and

<sup>19</sup> And we do not consider this to be khilaaf (difference) that is haqeeqi (true real difference), it is only lafdhee (in wording), since in both views (i.e. whether you stipulate the condition of istihlaal or whether you explain that the act is kufr akbar because of the underlying beliefs), the judgement of kufr is actually based on the well

that explains their behaviour. But as for our declaring them to have opposed the Salafi Da'wah and have entered into a Bid'iyy Manhaj, then that is because they indeed "opposed many of the issues of methodology of the Salaf" as Imaam al-Albaani observed. So the issue O al-Jurjaani, it is not just this issue of a so-called difference [as the Qutubiyah see it] on the one who abandons the Sharee'ah as a whole and brings a new Sharee'ah and then makes it binding, or the difference on the one who legislates laws (tashree' or taqneen) – even though in this second issue we do not see that there is in fact a difference at all, since the issue of tashree' and taqneen falls back upon the tafseel that we have mentioned earlier on. The issue is not just centred around this, but it is centred around the deviation of the neo-Qutubiyah on many other issues, which collectively show that they are upon misguidance. And **"to Allaah is the complaint of the evil that they are upon, of ignorance, misguidance and scum."** (!! in the words of Imaam al-Albaani (about those who accuse him with Irjaa'). (Adh-Dhabb al-Ahmad an Musnad al-Imaam Ahmad, p.33 (1999, 1420H)

Al-Jurjaani concluded:

And I would further like to see if "SP" will translate the words of Sheikh Saleh (as I am not a good translator) and put it on their site. Or do they now consider the Sheikh to be a qutbee revolutionary. May Allah grant us insaaf (fairness).

We have quoted his words from you, in this article, which will be read and spread, and which is available on our site. We do not hide the words of the Scholars. We write both what is in our favour and what is against us. And whatever is against us, we make our position clear on it. We are not like the neo-Qutubiyah, like Idris Palmer, Ali Timimi and others like them, who quote what is for them from the Scholars and throw behind their backs what is against them, even if it is from the very same scholars. Only because it is in line with what they are upon of Qutubism, having been poisoned from the direction of Safar al-Hawali and his likes.

They used to quote some generalised, unrestricted words from Imaam Ibn Baaz to justify their madhhab of takfir without tafseel and they would leave all his other statements that explain his general statements (refer to the Anbari Papers Part 3, MNJ050011, and also Imaam Ibn Baaz on Tabdeel, MNJ050016).

---

known tafseel of the Salaf concerning kufr of action and kufr of belief. All of it returns back to the kufr of i'tiqaad. Whether it is due to istihlaal (in the view of some, as occurs in some of the statements of Imaam Ibn Baaz), or the underlying beliefs of the heart (in the view of others) and so on is irrelevant. This is of great benefit and importance because it refutes the sophistry of the Qutubiyah and their absolution and exaggeration and extremism in this regard and their fleeing from this tafseel in their works, writings and discussions. And what occurred from Safar al-Hawaali is a prime example of that.

The Salaf of the past made reference to either Juhood or Istihlaal overwhelmingly and not so much the consideration of other than the Sharee'ah to be better than it. The Later Salaf, like those of our times, have made mention that considering other than the Sharee'ah to be better or equal to the Sharee'ah, or that the Sharee'ah is not suitable for the times and the likes, that all of this is kufr. Irrespective, the tafseel of the Salaf holds in all circumstances in arriving at the judgement of takfir.

Then they would rely upon the words of Imaam Ibn Uthaimen what would support them, even though the Shaikh made statements in other places that showed his real position, when you brought them all together, and reconciled them. Then the Qutubiyah were finished altogether, when the Shaikh made his clarification in 1420H on Tashree' ul-Aamm and his position on the one who brings another Sharee'ah and makes it binding upon the people (refer to MNJ050017).

Then they would twist and distort or selectively quote the sayings of many of the Scholars, such as that of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (refer to MNJ050018), or those of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee (refer to MNJ050018) and so on.

This has been the way of the Qutubiyah [Khaarijiyyah 'Asriyyah] may Allaah sever them and free Ahl us-Sunnah from their fitnah.

As for al-Jurjaani's final comment:

Or do they now consider the Sheikh to be a qutbee revolutionary. May allah grant us insaaf (fairness).

Then may al-Jurjaani be pardoned for his ignorance, for he neither knows the true reality of the fitnah of Qutubiyah, nor does he understand their true doctrine and what they are upon, and nor has he actually understood the reality of the difference between Ahl us-Sunnah and the Madrasah of Qutubiyah (the Qutubi School of Doctrine) and nor has he even understood this whole issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and takfir and nor has he even been able to reconcile and come to terms with the saying of Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh – hafidhahullaah – and how it is in fact in conformity with the tafseel of the Salaf, when one looks at it and understands it in light of all the other statements of the Salaf, past and present. And nor has he made note of the nature of the difference, which is that the Shaikh negates the condition of Istihlaal in this case, and states that total banishment of the Sharee'ah and bringing another one in its place is indicative that the person considers other than the Sharee'ah is better and superior to it, and hence such a person is a kaafir. From the point of view of the tafseel of the Salaf, this makes no difference, since both of these fall into the kufr of i'tiqaad. What is of significance is arriving at the judgement of takfir, based upon whether you stipulate the condition of istihlaal or not. Those who stipulate istihlaal do not consider that the external act conclusively indicates the internal beliefs that necessitate kufr, whereas those who do not stipulate istihlaal do consider the external act (of banishing the Sharee'ah and bringing something else, i.e. total istibdaal) to conclusively indicate the internal beliefs that necessitate kufr. Either, way, the judgement of takfir falls back and has its basis in the tafseel of the Salaf – which is our debate with the Qutubiyah who flee from this tafseel and accuse those who oppose them as being Murji'ah, Jahmiyyah.

## AN IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE

The key to understanding this affair, and this fitnah of the current times is the following:

That kufr can occur by beliefs, (i'tiqaad), statements (qawl) and actions ('amal). Some of the Ulamaa have categorised kufr into the major disbelief (kufr akbar) and the minor disbelief (kufr asghar, kufr doona kufr)<sup>20</sup>. **And they included within the major disbelief, the beliefs, statements and actions that expel from the fold of Islaam.**

And some of the Ulamaa have categorised kufr into the kufr of action (kufr 'amali) and the kufr of belief (kufr i'tiqadi)<sup>21</sup> **and their intent behind this is to illustrate that amongst the external actions that have been given the label of kufr by the texts of the Book and the Sunnah are those that do not expel from the fold of Islaam and are hence they called them the kufr of action (kufr 'amali).** Facing this is what they called the kufr of belief (kufr i'tiqadi) and they included within this kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi), the beliefs, statements **and external actions** that expel from the fold of Islaam.

This second perspective is the one from which Imaam al-Albaani explains his viewpoint. And it is also the explanation of others from the people of knowledge. **Pay extreme attention** to the words of al-Haafidh al-Hakamee, "When it is said to us: Prostrating to an idol, belittling the Book, reviling the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), jesting about the religion – and so on – all of this is from the kufr of action – from what is apparent – so why then does

---

<sup>20</sup> Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "Allah differentiates among believers; so he who achieves the required Imaan deserves reward, but he who has some hypocrisy and has committed major sins is among those threatened with punishment. His Iman will benefit him and remove him from the Fire, even if he has a mustard seed's weight of Imaan. However, he does not deserve the absolute Imaan on which depends the promise of entering Paradise without first being punished. To summarize, there are people who have a degree of unbelief [or hypocrisy] as well as a degree of Iman. As Ahmad Ibn Hanbal said, such people are called Muslims.

Thus, a human being may have some degree of Iman and some degree of hypocrisy, or he could be a Muslim who is guilty of [minor] unbelief, which does not exclude him from Islam completely, as Ibn Abbas and others have said. This is what Ahmad Ibn Hanbal said concerning the thief, the drunkard, and so on, whom our Prophet (pbuh) considered to be Muslims but not believers. Reference is made to the Quran and the Sunnah to demonstrate that such a person has Iman but not Islam. **A man could be a Muslim and have unbelief that does not take him away from the Muslim community since unbelief is of two kinds: that which excludes one from Islam, and that which results from neglect of deeds, which does not exclude him from Islam, but causes him to be a mere Muslim rather than a believer.** This is how Ibn Abbaas and his companions interpret Allah's saying: "... If any do fail to judge by what Allah reveals, those are the unbelievers" (5:44). They say that unbelief that does not exclude one from the Muslim community is unbelief of a lesser degree than unbelief, sin of a lesser degree than sin, and wrongdoing of a lesser degree than wrongdoing.

This is also cited by al-Bukhari in the first chapter of his Saheeh entitled The Book of Belief in which he indicates that deeds are part of Imaan. Here he includes the ideas of Orthodox Muslims as well as refutations of the Murji'ites as he was a supporter of the Sunnah and the Orthodox Muslims who in turn sincerely followed the Companions of the Prophet and their Successors." Kitab ul-Imaan pp. 344-345.

<sup>21</sup> Ibn al-Qayyim said, "...And the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) negated Imaan from the fornicator, thief, and the one who consumes khamr, intoxicants. And also from the one whose neighbours are not safe from his evil. So when the label of Imaan has been negated from such a one, then he is a disbeliever from the point of view of his action, but the kufr of juhood and belief (i'tiqad) has been negated from him. It is likewise in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, "Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another." Kitaab us-Salaat of Ibn al-Qayyim

it also expel from the religion, and you have at the same time, labelled the minor kufr (al-kufr al-asghar) with the kufr of action (al-'amali)? And the reply is: Know that these four – and whatever resembles them – are not considered to be from the kufr of action except from the point of view that they occur by the actions of the limbs as observed by the people. However, [in reality], they do not occur except with the passing away of the action of the heart – of intention (niyyah), sincerity (ikhlaas), love (mahabbah) and compliance (inqiyaad) – none of that remains. So therefore, these actions, even though they occur by [physical] action [of the limbs] outwardly, they in fact necessitate (mustalzimah) the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi), and there is no escaping from this....” Then he said, “And we do not define the minor kufr (al-kufr al-asghar) with the kufr of action (al-amali) absolutely and unrestrictedly – but merely as occurring by action alone, that which does not necessitate a belief (that negates Imaan), and which does not negate the speech (i.e. the belief) of the heart, and nor its action.” (A'laam us-Sunnah al-Manshoorah pp.181-182)

This is because every external action which is kufr (that negates Imaan from every aspect), also internally necessitates kufr. And hence it is the kufr of belief by default. Now listen to the words of Imaam al-Albaani, which explains this fine point: **“And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the kufr of belief (i.e. apostatises).** This is because such actions show his disbelief with certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the Qur'an while he knows it is the Qur'an and intending to kick it, deliberately...” Refer to Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1<sup>st</sup> edition)

And this is statement is the exact replica of the various statements of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah such as, “So whoever uttered a statement of kufr **without having any need for uttering it, doing it deliberately, knowing that it is a statement of disbelief, then he becomes a disbeliever through that both externally (dhahiran) and internally (batinan) and it is not permissible for it to be said that it is possible for him to still remain a believer internally...**” and also “And whoever reviled Allaah or the Messenger, **then he disbelieves both externally and internally...**” See as-Saarim al-Maslool (p.513-515). He also said, “**And whatever is kufr from amongst the outward actions, such as prostrating to idols, abusing the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and their likes, then it is so because it necessitates kufr internally.**” (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 14/120).

This is actually different to what the Jahmiyyah and the Extremist Murji'ah are upon. For they say, that a person can only become a disbeliever through takdheeb (rejection) and the likes. And that if a person committed kufr on the outside (such as mocking the religion, or kicking the mus-haf and so on), then it is kufr because the person has lost the tasdeeq in his heart, i.e. has fallen into takdheeb (rejection), and this is false. Since, this kufr does not necessarily have to be in relation to takdheeb alone.

And the statement of Imaam al-Albani quoted above is parallel to the refutation of the Jahmiyyah contained in the statements of Shaikh ul-Islam such as, “So those who speak with the view of Jahm and as-Saalihee have made it clear that reviling Allaah and His Messenger and saying that Allaah is one of three (i.e. the Trinity) **and every other statement of disbelief is not internal disbelief**, but it is in reality an outward indication of disbelief and

despite this it is possible for this one who reviled to be one who acknowledges Allaah, unifying (his belief and worship) for Him and a believer in Him internally. So when the proof is established against them, either by way of textual evidence or a consensus on this issue, they reply, "This means that such acts necessitate internal rejection, takdheeb." Majmoo Fataawaa (7/557).

So from all of the above, we come to realise the following points:

- 1) That kufr can occur by beliefs, sayings and actions
- 2) That the kufr of action is itself divided into two types: a) the kufr of action that does not expel from the religion (al-kufr al-asghar) and b) the kufr of action that does expel from the religion (al-kufr al-amali al-akbar).
- 3) The kufr of action that does expel from the religion, negating Imaan from every aspect, is by default also the kufr of the heart, since it necessitates the passing away of the speech or action of the heart. This is why reviling the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) or mocking the religion or kicking the Qur'aan and so on is kufr, both externally and internally – as stated by the likes of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah.
- 4) That the Jahmiyyah and the Extremist Murji'ah and their likes were in error because, based upon their erroneous definition of Imaan that it is only tasdeeq (assent) of the heart or ma'rifah (knowledge) in the heart, they considered firstly, that a person cannot become a disbeliever through any external action, and then when they were proven wrong in this, they then began to say, that this (external action) is only kufr because of the absence of tasdeeq (or the presence of its opposite, takdheeb, rejection) or the absence of ma'rifah (mere knowledge of Allaah).
- 5) That **there is a difference** between:
  - a) the principle we have affirmed from the sayings of the Scholars and between the sayings of Murji'ah in that we say that such and such action is kufr because of such and such (i.e. what it necessitates internally of istihlaal, juhood, i'tiqaad, and so on and the variety of other types of kufr which necessitate the passing away of the actions of heart.)
  - b) and what the Murji'ah say either that the act itself is not kufr at all, externally and internally, but it is just indicative of kufr, or that it is only kufr because of the presence in the heart of the opposite of what they define as Imaan (i.e. the presence of takdheeb which cancels out tasdeeq, in the case of Jahmiyyah, or the presence of jahl which cancels out ma'rifah in the case of the Ash'ariyyah). In addition, the Extremist Murji'ah would still consider one who committed acts of kufr to be a Believer, perfect in his Imaan, this being a natural extension of their viewpoint and definition of Imaan.

Once you have understood all of the above, let us now come and expose and explain the debauchery of the neo-Qutubite theoreticians, their great ignorance, and their wicked and

evil machinations and their calculated and devised plot against the Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah, their having toyed with innovation and its people, left all sense of intellect and wisdom and wallowed in the darkneses of bid'ah and hawaa.

**Firstly:** The accusation made by the doctor in aqidah, Safar al-Hawaali, who mocked and ridiculed the Imaam of the Sunnah, al-Albaani. So stated this mouthpiece of Mohammad Qutb, **“Rather, one who fights against partisanship for madhhabs has himself fallen into it (Irjaa’), such as Shaikh al-Albaani”** (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa’ p.658). And also, **“And the Shaikh – may Allaah preserve him – is amongst the most severe of people in fleeing and making others flee from the blind-following of the Hanafees in the subsidiary issues (furoo’, i.e. fiqh). So how can that be when this (i.e. Irjaa’) is from the major matters (usool, i.e. aqidah)”** (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa’ p.726). He means here, how can the Shaikh forbid blind-following in matters of fiqh, and then fall into what the Hanafees fell into of matters of aqidah (i.r. Irjaa’). Also in the same book, in his categorisation of people, he puts Imaam al-Albaani in the same league as al-Bootee, the Heretical Innovator.

And amongst the reasons for his accusation of Irjaa’ is that al-Albaani does not make takfir of the one who leaves the prayer out of laziness and neglect. So he stated, **“And no one says that the one who abandons it (the prayer) is not a kaafir except one who has been affected by the (thought of) al-Irjaa’, whether he realises it or not.”**!! (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa’ pp.650-651). And also, **“...without their knowing that the source of this doubt (of the absence of takfir of the one who abandons prayer) and its foundation is actually from Irjaa’!!”** (p.419)

And no one utters this nonsense except one who is merely reviving the madhhab of the Mansoori Kharijites, whether he realises it or not, and whether he has a doctorate in aqidah or not!! May Allaah kill this blind desire.

Abul-Fadl Abaas Ibn Mansoor asSaksakee (683H), in his powerful Sunni, Salafi treatise said **“...The Mansooriyyah (a sect of the Khawaarij), and they are the associates of Abdullaah Ibn Zaid, labelled them as Murji’ah due to their saying that the one who abandons the prayer, without rejecting (juhood) its obligation, is a Muslim based upon the correct view in the madhhab.** And they (the Mansooriyyah) say that this saying of their’s (i.e. that of Ahl us-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imaan is speech without action. **Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them.** Rather, they are the Firqat al-Haadiyyah al-Mahdiyyah (the Guiding and Guided Sect) and its creed is the correct creed and the clear and manifest Imaan (faith), that with which the Qur’aan was revealed and which has come in the Sunnah, and that which the Ulamaa of the Ummah from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah have agreed upon.” Al-Burhaan Fee Ma’rifat Aqaa’idi Ahl il-Adyaan, (pp.65-66).

The unfortunate doctor thought he could use this sophistry in his doctrinal farce, “Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa’” to ascribe Irjaa’ to the Ummah and to the Imaams of the Sunnah, but as the Salafi Mashaayikh informed this neo-Qutubite theoretician “lasnaa mughfileen, walaakinnanaa nataghaafal” (We are not unmindful (of you), but we are merely pretending to be).

**Secondly:** On the issue of not ruling by what Allaah has revealed. Know O Sunni, that the sophistry used by the unfortunate doctor to ascribe Irjaa' to Ahl us-Sunnah and its Imaams, by using the issue of the abandonment of prayer, is the same sophistry he tried to fool Ahl us-Sunnah with on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.

For in the case of the prayer, Ahl us-Sunnah are agreed on the one who abandoned the prayer while rejecting (juhood) its obligation, but on the one who affirms its obligation, but abandons it out of laziness and neglect they differ. So Safar al-Hawali, tried to push this under the carpet, and in turn accuse those who did not agree with him to be Murji'ah – while being ignorant of the principles we outlined earlier – or merely pretending to be ignorant. He tried to make takfir merely on account of the action of abandonment, and described any attempts to stipulate the condition of juhood (rejecting its obligation) for takfir by this act of abandonment of prayer as being Irjaa'. This was important to his thesis, since it would nicely pave way for the real and true doctrine to be outlined – the actual doctrine of Sayyid Qutb on the issue of Haakimiyyah, and absolute, generalised takfir of those who do not rule by what Allaah has revealed.

So, likewise, on the issue of not ruling by what Allaah has revealed, in all its various forms, Ahl us-Sunnah were agreed that the one who does so with Juhood, or Istihlaal, or the various beliefs of the heart (such as considering the Sharee'ah to be outmoded, or other than the Sharee'ah to be better than it and so on), is a disbeliever, and the one who does not do so is not a disbeliever. This is the well-known tafseel of the Salaf. There is no difference between any of them concerning the one who judges by the secular laws, either in a single instance or in many instances, either in respect to one aspect of the Sharee'ah or many aspects of the Sharee'ah – the guiding principle in all of that being the tafseel of the Salaf in this issue.

However, there is a perceived difference on the issue of the one who abolishes the Sharee'ah totally and then brings another one and then makes it binding upon the people. The actual difference is in relation to this act indicating absolutely that the Ruler did so because he considered this new law to be better and superior and so on.

So some scholars say, yes this act in and of itself does indicate that absolutely, and others say no, that it can occur for other plausible reasons, and hence it is not major kufr that expels from the religion unless it is accompanied with other indicators that show that he has fallen into the kufr of belief.

What is important is that this is on the issue of the one who abolishes the Sharee'ah totally and brings in a whole new system of laws, or a new legislation (as is indicated in the words of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem, and Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh and Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan and others). And this is an extreme and rare case – something that is not found today, and has hardly or rarely been found in history – from a Ruler who is originally Muslim. And as for anything other than or less than this particular example (of total abolition), then that is not differed over, rather there is agreement on this that such a one

who rules by secular laws, or refers to them, or makes them a reference point and so on<sup>22</sup>, in whatever level or degree, then the well-known tafseel of the Salaf applies to this – in the pronouncement of the judgement of takfir and apostasy.

Now the unfortunate doctor duplicated his sophistry here, the same one that he used in the issue of prayer, and then began to make absolute and unrestricted takfir by speaking with the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa'idah related to rule and rulership, and falling into exaggeration and extremism, and wallowing in all of that - instead of outlining and detailing the tafseel of the Salaf, and quoting from the Imaams of the Salaf, he in fact began to quote extensively from his takfiri supervisor Mohammad Qutb<sup>23</sup>, on this subject. And Mohammad Qutb is but upon the Khariji manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, whose books of bid'ah and hawaa began this whole affair and this fitnah.

Let us now go back to the words of Safar al-Hawali and see the unfortunate lot of the one who befriended the Innovators and opened up his mind and intellect to them:

“And just as they (the Murji'ah) conceived of that – i.e. Imaan without actions – the **Contemporary Murji'ah** have come along and they say: Whoever does not judge by Allaah's Book and the Sunnah of His Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), and does not establish from the Sharee'ah of Allaah except a portion from it, whether it is great or small – yet he does not establish it because it is a command from Allaah, and out of obedience to Him and out of having Imaan in His religion, but because it agrees with his desire (hawaa) and his personal benefit and out of affirmation for the one who has the right of legislation and institution (of laws) regardless of whether it is himself, or a party (hizb) or a legislative council (majlis) – then he does not become a disbeliever until we know that in his heart he has preferred the laws of men over the Sharee'ah of the Best of all Judges, and that so long as we do not come to know of that (from him), then all of his actions are acts of disobedience.

Until even if he was to legislate law after law, and lies in wait for those who request the implementation of the Sharee'ah, and meets them with harm, and then displays clear loyalty to the disbelievers, and abolishes whatever Allaah has legislated amongst the required differences between the Believers and the Unbelievers amongst his subjects, and allows the establishment of Atheistic (political) parties, then all of that is disobedience which does not

---

<sup>22</sup> There occurs in the previous verdict of the Permanent Committee (signed by Imaam Ibn Baaz, and Shaikh Abdullaah bin Ghudayaan and Abdullaah bin Qu'ood) in response to the question, “...what is the ruling upon the one who refers judgement to (yatahaakama) the secular laws (al-qawaaneen al-wad'iyyah) while he knows of their futility, yet he does not fight against these laws and nor does he work to end these laws...?”

The reply of the Permanent Committee: “...Judging (at-Tahaakum) is to Allaah the Most High and to the Sunnah of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam). **So if he does not judge to them both (yatahaakam ilaihimaa), whilst making it lawful to judge to other than them (mustahillan it-Tahaakuma ilaa ghayrihimaa) amongst the secular laws (al-qawaaneen al-wad'iyyah) with the hope of deriving some material benefit or for the sake of honour or for seeking a better position then he is one who is sinful (murtakibu ma'siyatin) and is a sinner, faasiq, with the lesser fisq with does not expel him from Imaan..**”. Refer to Fataawaa Lajnah ad-Daaimah of Shaikh Ahmad bin Abdur-Razzaq ad-Dawaish 1/540-541, Question 3 of Fatwaa No. 6310.

<sup>23</sup> Refer to his “Ahlmaaniyyah”.

expel him from Islaam, so long as we do not come to know as to what is in his heart<sup>24</sup>. So if we come to know that he prefers (in his heart) a legislation or judgement other than the

#### <sup>24</sup> BETWEEN PROPHETIC GUIDANCE AND KHARIJITE IMPATIENCE

From Hudhaifah Ibn al-Yamaan (radiallaahu anhu) who said, "I said: "O Messenger of Allaah! We used to be in a state of evil, then Allaah brought this good, which we are now in. Will there be any evil after this good?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Will there be any evil after that good?" He said, "Yes." I said, "How will it be?" He said, "There will be after me Leaders who do not guide themselves with my guidance and nor do they adopt my Sunnah, and there will arise from amongst them, men with the hearts of devils in the bodies of men." I said, "What shall I do then, If I reach that time?" He said, "Hear and obey the leader, even if he strikes your back and takes your wealth, then still hear and obey". (Bukharee, Muslim and others).

And what then will be the doctor's reply to the saying of the one compared to whom he is an insignificant speckle of dust? Stated al-Hasan al-Basri, "Know – may Allaah pardon you – that the tyranny of the kings is a retribution (niqmah) from among the retributions of Allaah the Most High. And Allaah's retributions are not to be faced with the sword, but they are to be faced with taqwaa and are repelled with supplication and repentance, remorse (inaabah) and abstention from sins. Verily, when the punishments of Allaah are met with the sword, are more severe. And Maalik bin Deenaar narrated to me that al-Hajjaaj (Ibn Yoosuf) used to say, "Know that every time you commit a sin Allaah will bring about a punishment from the direction of your ruler (sultaan)". And I have I have also been told that a person said to al-Hajjaaj, "Do you do such and such with the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)?" So he replied, "For the reason that I am the punishment of Allaah upon the people of Iraaq, when they innovated into their religion whatever they innovated, and when they abandoned the commands of the their Prophet – alaihis salaam – whatever they abandoned." (Adaab Hasan al-Basri, of Ibn al-Jawzee, pp.119-120, by way of Mu'aamalat ul-Hukkaam, of Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis).

So what is the benefit of all of this commotion and exaggeration and rousing the sentiments of the common-folk and bewildering them and making them rush to their swords and being left to their swords?

And Shaikh Abdul Azeez bin Baaz - may Allaah protect Him - was asked: "Is it from the *manhaj* (methodology) of the *Salaf* to criticise the Rulers from the *minbar* (the pulpit)? And what is the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* with respect to advising the Rulers?" He responded:

"It is not from the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* to publicise the faults of the Rulers and mentioning such things from the pulpit because that leads to disorder and the absence of hearing and obeying the ruler in what is good. It also results in [the people] becoming engrossed [with these matters, arguing and debating] which causes harm and produces no benefit. The followed path with the *Salaf*, however is to give *naseehah* (advice) with respect to the matters which are between themselves and the leader, writing to him, or by reaching him through the scholars who keep in touch with him [to advise him] until the ruler is directed towards the good. Repelling the evil occurs without mentioning the doer of the evil. So fornication, drinking of intoxicants and the taking of usury are curbed without mentioning the one who does such things. Warding off the evil and warning the people against it is sufficient without it being mentioned that such and such a person does it, whether he is a ruler or other than the ruler.

And when the *fitnah* occurred in the time of Uthmaan - may Allaah be pleased with him - some of the people said to Usaamah bin Zaid - may Allaah be pleased with him: 'Will you not speak to Uthmaan?' So he replied: 'You think that I will not talk to him without letting you know about it [also]. Indeed, I will certainly talk to him regarding that which concerns me and him without initiating a matter which I do not love to be the first to initiate.'

And when they [the *Khawaarij*] opened up the evil in the time of Uthmaan - may Allaah be pleased with him - and rejected Uthmaan openly the *fitnah*, the killing and the mischief, which has not ceased to affect the people to this day, was brought about. And this caused the *fitnah* to occur between Alee and Mu'aawiyah and Uthmaan was killed for these reasons. [Furthermore] a large number of Companions and others besides them were killed due to this open rebellion and the open proclamation of the faults [of the ruler], until the people began to hate the one charged with authority over them and killed him. We ask Allaah for success." End of the words of the Shaikh - may Allaah protect Him. Al-Ma'loom min Waajib il-'Ilaaqah bain al-Haakim wal Mahkoom (p.22-23).

legislation and judgement of Allaah, above and over the legislation of Allaah and His judgement, or if he makes it clear with his tongue that he intends or desires (yaqsud) kufr<sup>25</sup>, or he believes it (ya'taqid), and that he is one who makes it lawful (mustahill) to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed. **Hence, the Murji'ah of our times are even greater in their extremism.**" (Safar al-Hawali in Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa 2/695).

This is what happens when you befriend the Innovators, O intelligent ones, whether you have a doctorate in aqidah or not – so will you take heed?!! And we have already commented upon this exaggeration and extremism already in what has preceded above so refer to it.

---

And this shows that Khurooj (rebellion) is not just by raising the sword, but it is also initiated by the word. And the unfortunate doctor, is but wallowing in the ways of the Khawaarij here, propounding their manhaj, their impatience, their rebellious nature and their desire to spread takfir and tumult. Then there comes Salmaan al-Awdah and makes his leader and guide Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi, the Father of the Khawaarij, in order to justify open rejection(!!!!!). And then these neo-Qutubite elements wonder why they should be grouped with the Khawaarij(!!) [by Imaam al-Albaani]. What sheer foolishness?!

And all of this, O Sunni, is the manifest difference between the neo-Qutubite theoreticians and the Shaikhs of ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyah, so reflect!!

<sup>25</sup> Notice this deception and exaggeration here. This saying he has quoted is the saying of the Jahmiyyah in that only when a person intends (with his heart) to leave Islaam can he be judged a kaafir. On account of this type of scare-mongering did many of those poisoned by this doctor start accusing the Salafis with falsehood and accusing them of speaking with the saying of the Jahmiyyah – all of that being a wicked lie.

Shaikh Ali Hasan Bin Ali Bin Abdul-Hameed said, **"And just as Imaan, in the view of Ahl us-Sunnah consists of speech, action and belief, then likewise, kufr consists of speech, action and belief. However, the principle of Ahl us-Sunnah, and this is very important, is that not everyone who falls into an act of kufr has the appellation of kufr (i.e. kaafir) applied to him. Since, it is necessarily required for the takfir of a specific individual that the conditions are present and the preventative barriers are absent.**

As for the first condition, then it is knowledge ('ilm) and its preventative barrier is ignorance (jahl). As for the second condition, then it is choice (ikhtiyar) and its preventative barrier is compulsion (ikraah). As for the third condition, then it is intending the act (qasd ul-fi'l), and its preventative barrier is unmindfulness (dhuhoor), or error (khata') or ijtihaad [or ta'weel].

And it is necessary to pause here and to look at this issue of intent (qasd) because some people have fabricated a lie against us and against our Mashayikh that when we mention intent (qasd) that we mean by this "desiring kufr" (qasd ul-kufr). Meaning, that we hold that a person cannot be considered a disbeliever except when he desires kufr (of the heart) (i.e. to leave Islaam). **And this is an error.**

**Even a Kaafir does not desire kufr.** If we asked a Jew or a Christian, "You say Allaah is one of three, is this Imaan or Kufr?" He will reply, "This is Imaan". [If we said], "You are a Christian, why? Because you desire kufr or because you desire Imaan?" He will reply, "Because I desire Imaan". Until even the people of the first Jaahiliyyah (prior to Islaam), those who used to worship idols and mere names (even they did not desire kufr)... And if you (O Muhammad) ask them: **"Who has created the heavens and the earth," they will certainly say: "Allāh."** (Luqman 31:25) And those who take Auliya' (protectors and helpers) besides Him (say): **"We worship them only that they may bring us near to Allāh."** (Az-Zumar 39:3)

For this reason Shaikh ul-Islaam said, **"No one in the creation of Allaah desires (yaqsud) kufr."** Therefore, what is not meant is the "desire for kufr" but what is actually meant is the "desire for the act which necessitates kufr". This is a point that should be understood well. This is a principle." The Fitnah of Takfir (Cassette Lecture, Birmingham UK, 29<sup>th</sup> July 2000)

Know O Sunni, that according to the doctrinal farce of al-Hawaali, our Imaams, the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen<sup>26</sup>, and all those who have preceded them in these affairs, **until even Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem<sup>27</sup>**, and all the Salaf before them, are actually Murji'ah, extreme in their Irjaa', and that the true Sunnis are

<sup>26</sup> Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said (on 22/03/1420H), "As for what is connected to [the issue of] ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, then it is, as occurs in the Mighty Book, divided into three types: that which is kufr (disbelief), that which is dhulum (oppression) and that which is fisq (sinfulness) – all in accordance with the various reasons upon which this judgement is made:

1. So if a person judges by other than what Allaah has revealed due to following his desires, alongside his knowledge that the truth lies in what Allaah has decreed, then such a one does not disbelieve, however he is either a faasiq (sinner) or a dhaalim (oppressor).
2. **Or when he legislates (yusharri'u) a general ruling (hukman 'aamman) which the Ummah [adopts and] traverses upon, and he considers this to be of benefit (maslahah), and he is caught up in [confusion about it], then he does not disbelieve either**, because many of the rulers have ignorance of the knowledge of the Sharee'ah and one who does not know the Sharee'ah ruling is often connected to them (i.e. by their side) and they (the rulers) consider such a one to be a great scholar, and opposition [to the Sharee'ah] occurs as a result of all of this.
3. **And if he knows the legislation (Shar') however he judges by this [legislation] or he legislates this [law] and then makes it a code of law (dustoor) to be followed by the people, believing (ya'taqid) that he is an oppressor (dhaalim) in all of that and that the truth is what has come in the Book and the Sunnah, then we are not able to make takfir of this one.**<sup>26</sup>
4. **But we make takfeer of:**
  - i) the one who holds that the a legislation other than Allaah's is more appropriate for the people to be upon
  - ii) or the one who believes that this legislation is equivalent to the legislation of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic

It is this one who is a disbeliever **because he is a mukhaddhib (makes takdheeb)** of the saying of Allaah, the Blessed and Almighty, **"Is not Allaah the Best of all Judges?"** and also His saying, **"Is it the judgement of Jaahiliyyah they seek. And who is a better judge than Allaah for a people of sure (faith)?"**.

<sup>27</sup> Due to his saying: "...And similarly, more important than that, is what the deviants, heretics and Orientalists are entering into the ideas and thoughts of the Muslims in causing doubts about the foundation of their religion and causing them to stray from the Sunnah of their Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and his sharee'ah, **and judging (tahkeem) by the secular laws that are in opposition to the Islamic Sharee'ah.** And the most important [part of all of this] is being acquainted with the foundation of Tawheed, that which Allaah sent His Messenger Muhammad (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) with, to actualise it in both word and deed, and to fight against everything that opposes it such as the major Shirk which expels from the religion or the variety of minor forms of shirk. This is the actualisation of 'Laa ilaaha ilallaaha'. The actualisation of the meaning of 'Muhammad is the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam)' is from judging to his sharee'ah and confining oneself to that - and rejecting whatever is in opposition to that from amongst the rules (qawaaneen) and regulations and all those things for which Allaah has not revealed any authority. **And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement whilst believing in the correctness (sihha) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that without belief (I'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion.**" (Majmoo Fataawaa Ibn Ibraahim 1/80).

This statement has yet to be explained by the Qutubiyah who use the words of the Shaikh to justify their own madhhab of tumult and dissension.

the likes of Sayyid Qutb and Mohammad Qutb, and no one explained the kalimah better than they did?!! And no one understands Tawheed in the current times better than they do!!

This is why Safar al-Hawaali, in his doctrinal farce “Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa” portrays the da'wah of the Prophets as being a call to Haakimiyyah, following his chief and leader, his sayyid, Sayyid Qutb in all of that, nay quoting him verbatim in his claim that the Prophets came with the call to al-Haakimiyyah. This is why he also says – out of great deceit and deception – “Indeed those are few, those who when they call to the correction of Imaan and the exposition of its meanings and explain kufr and its manifestations to the Ummah, and its great danger. **We find that in turn, the Ummah stands in their faces and accuses them of making takfir of the Muslims, as occurred with Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and the Shaheed, Sayyid Qutb**”. (Dhaahirah p.83).

Have you seen such great deceit? Equating between the Shaikhs of Islaam and a Raafidee Heretic who uttered statements of apostasy and kufr, and who was wholly, totally, grossly, and completely ignorant of the Islamic aqidah!! And just look at the underlying debauchery here... “. **We find that in turn, the Ummah stands in their faces and accuses them of making takfir of the Muslims...**” (!! ) May Allaah kill this wicked and blind desire. Where are the Shaikhs of Islaam and where is this Khaarijee?!

Sayyid Qutb, the mentor and leader of all neo-Kharijites, said (Zilal 2/1057): “**And mankind has apostatised [by turning] to the worship of the servants [of Allaah] and to the oppression of the religions. And they have turned away from ‘Laa ilaaha illallaaha’ (the declaration) – even if a small party from them remain repeating ‘Laa ilaaha illallaah’ upon the minarets without actually understanding its meaning and intending its meaning, yet he repeats it without rejecting the legislative Hakimiyyah that the servants have claimed for themselves**”

And he says further, “**Except that mankind has returned to the Jahiliyyah (of the first times) and it has apostatised from ‘Laa ilaaha illallaaha’, having given to those servants the specific characteristics of Uluhiyyah and has not considered the Tawhid of Allaah and has not given exclusive loyalty to Him**”.

And then he follows this with, “**The whole of mankind, including those who repeat from the minarets, in the eastern and western parts of the world, the words ‘Laa ilaaha illallaaha’, without any [consideration of] meaning or reality, then they are the most sinful of people and will be the most severely punished on the day of Judgement because they have apostatised by turning to the worship of the servants (of Allaah).**”!!!!?

Stated Qaradawi, one of the Astry Innovators of Ikhwaan, “And it was in this period that the books of the Shaheed<sup>28</sup>, Sayyid Qutb appeared, the books that **represented his final**

---

<sup>28</sup> It is not permissible to state “Shaheed So and So” without adding to that, “Inshaa’allaah”, since this is in opposition to the Sunnah and is the way of the Murji’ah. Imaam Bukhari included a chapter in the ‘Book of Jihad’ in his Sahih entitled, “Chapter: It is not to be said, so and so is a Shahid”, and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen gave a fatwaa in this regard, quoting from Imaam al-Bukhaaree and also stating, “It is not permissible to testify

**thoughts** (in ideology, before his death). Those which **justified the takfir of (whole) societies.. the breaking of all sentimental attachments to society, breaking off ties with others, and the announcement of a destructive jihad against the whole of mankind. And showing contempt against the du'at who call for lenience and softness, accusing them of idiocy, and being defeatist.** [Saying all of this], in front of the western civilisation. He made this manifest, in the most clear manner in the tafsir, "Fee Zilaal il-Qur'aan", in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition and in 'Ma'alim fit-Tariq' (Milestones), and the bulk of it is taken from 'Zilal' and 'Al-Islam wa Mushkilat al-Hadaarah' and others..." (Priorities of the Islamic Movement p.110)

What is this talbees?!!! What is all this sophistry?? What are all these veiled attempts to defend and aggrandise the Innovators and Heretics?? What are all these delusions in bringing the manhaj of the Heretical Innovators into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah?!! Don't forget O Sunni, that the supervisor of this doctrinal farce, is none other than Mohammad Qutb, the brother and acting minister of Sayyid Qutb(!!).

I think enough has been said for the one who has a heart to understand...

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen was asked, "The questioner asks that some people say that Shaikh al-Albani – rahimahullaah – his position on the issues of Imaan is that of the Murji'ah. What is your view on this?". **Answer:** The Shaikh paused for a while, remaining silent and then replied, "...I say, just as one who has preceded has said: "Al-Albani is a scholar, a muhaddith, a jurist – even if he is greater in being a muhaddith than a jurist – **and I do not know of any of his statements which indicate Irjaa, ever. However, it is those who want to perform takfir of people, they are the ones who accuse him and those like him of being Murji'ah, and this action of theirs is by way of ascribing evil names [to him].** I testify for Shaikh al-Albani – may Allaah have mercy upon him – with uprightness, (istiqaamah), a sound creed, and good intention...". (30<sup>th</sup> April 2000, Question and Answers from Qatar on Imaan).

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen also said: "**Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa' has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa'.** Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah's pardon – **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 [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers]. So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity! We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from

---

for a specific individual that he is a shaheed, even if he had been killed while performing jihad against the disbelievers. This is because this implication of this testimony is that Paradise has been testified for him, and testification for Paradise is not permissible except for those whom the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) has given testimony for. However it can be said, "It is hoped that he is amongst the Shuhadaa"...As for when is one resolved and says "He is a Shaheed", then this is unlawful, haraam. It is not lawful to say this because this is from the matters of the unseen..." (Alfaadh wa Mafaahem Fee Meezaan il-Islam, p.18)

sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them.** Then 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!"** (Cassette: Makaalamaat Ma'a Mashaayikh ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4) Dated 12/6/2000CE).

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, **"As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, 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 (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)... As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists..."** (Refer to the Cassette: "Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn")

## **CLOSING REMARKS**

Perhaps in what has preceded, you have come to know the great difference between the knowledge-based viewpoints of the Shaikhs of ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah, and their sound and pure manhaj and their sticking to the affairs of Sunnah and Salafiyyah and the ways of wisdom and intellect, and between the hawaa-based ramblings and meanderings of the theoreticians of Qutubiyah, their adulterated manhaj, and their sticking to the affairs of Bid'ah and Qutubiyah and the ways of foolishness and stupidity.

For the viewpoints of some of our Scholars (like Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh) do not support for one moment what the Qutubiyah are upon of hawaa and misguidance. They have only latched on to these viewpoints of our Mashaayikh, because they support what they are upon of the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb of unrestricted and generalised takfir. For alongside this issue, you have seen O Sunni, what other matters they are upon of adulterated principles and methodologies.

The reader is strongly recommended to read GRV070005, Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri on the Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine, where he outlines the exaggeration and the extremism of the Qutubiyah in this subject.

We also ask Abu 'Umar al-Jurjaani, as a sign of his insaaf (justice) that he spread the verdicts of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen, Imaam al-Albaani, Ibn Taymiyyah, Imaam ash-Shanqeetee, Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem, those which we have quoted here and elsewhere, and that he asks the youth of Ahl us-Sunnah to adhere to them, for they all emanate from the same lamp and understanding... Our call is a call to reconciling, bringing together, and taking the words of all the scholars and throwing them against the understanding of the Salaf. The Qutubi, Khariji way is to take what supports them and hide and throw aside (and hide from the people) what goes against them, and to enjoin taqleed at one time (when it supports them and is in their favour) and to promote ijtihaad another time (when it is in their favour and when it supports them, when the sayings of the scholars go against them.)

And may the prayers and peace be upon Allaah's Messenger, his family, his companions and those who follow him upon Tawheed and Sunnah till the affair is established.