



---

## Three Doubts Used by the Qutubiiyyoon, Hizbiyyoon in Ascribing Irjaa' to Ahl us-Sunnah

---

### Introduction

All praise is due to Allaah, the Lord of the Worlds, and prayers and peace upon His Messenger, to proceed:

It is known that the chiefs of Qutubiiyyah and the Takfiriyyah, when they observed the general rise of the Salafi da'wah in the 70's and 80's due to efforts of the people of knowledge such as Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz and other than them, and the spread of the knowledge based affairs of the Salafi da'wah, aqeedah and manhaj, which were also the cause of the realisation of many that the da'wah of Ikhwaan, and all its offshoots, such as the Qutubiiyyah, Surooriyyah and the Takfeeriyyah, was in opposition to Ahl us-Sunnah and in opposition to the methodology of the Prophets.

And the vast majority of these innovated movements focused themselves upon the ways and means of removing the current authorities and replacing them with themselves, and thus this included a fair share of takfeer (in unrestricted and absolute terms), justifications of revolutions at both the theoretical and practical front, and impregnating the thought of al-Mawdoodi - that was borrowed from the Raafidi Shi'ah, which stated that the Imaamah is the most important pillar of the religion - by way of the books of Sayyid Qutb, who was heavily influenced by Mawdoodi, and who regurgitated the thought of Mawdoodi and presented it in the name of "al-Haakimiyyah", which he claimed was the most special characteristic of Uloohiyyah, and which formed the basis of the destructive Takfeer movements in the 50's and 60s.

So when the Imaams of the Sunnah, and foremost amongst them Imaam al-Albaani who faced these Takfeeri movements and refuted them as early back as the late 60's and 70's, and when the Salafi da'wah also gained strength and was spread, the Innovators took a new direction, which was to work from within, in order to spread the same destructive ideas and methodologies.

Enter the likes of Mohammad Suroor and Mohammad Qutb. These individuals, moved to Saudi Arabia, and influenced some of the youth, and entered the same destructive ideas that they themselves were upon, using in all of that the books of the likes of Sayyid Qutb and al-Mawdoodi and others. The apparent closeness of these particular youth, whom they influenced, to the Salafi creed would not raise the alarm, and thus, they could be used to push the same Qutubi methodology that had miserably failed in other lands, and which only resulted in further repression.

So these youth were nurtured upon Qutubiyah and the books of Qutb and Mawdoodi and others. The ideological assault came from Mohammad Suroor, by way of his magazines and secret underground operations, which are known and famous, as exposed by many of those who left his Jamaa'ah. And as for Mohammad Qutb, then it was by way of Safar al-Hawali, and the thesis entitled "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'", and which in reality was an attack against the da'wah and manhaj of al-Albaani, and belittling it and causing it to fall, and a propagation and justification of the da'wah of Sayyid Qutb. Al-Hawali basically attempted to remove the obstacles to the Qutubi, Ikhwaani, Takfeeri movements and their da'wah and goals and objectives, by portraying their da'wah as reform, and pro-activism, and Islamic work and positive titles such as these (despite these movements being movements of Innovation, upon innovation), and at the same time claiming that every time a movement arises for reform, that you find another one standing in its way and being an obstacle to it (and by movements here, he includes the likes of Ikhwaan and others, who are Innovators). And here he presents the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah as being inert, with no movement, and - the actual punch line - characteristic of Irjaa', and the one that opposes these "movements" (which are movements of innovation no doubt). Then, he attempted to ascribe Irjaa' to Ahl us-Sunnah by the most blatant methods of deception, treachery and trickery, amongst them accusing Ahl us-Sunnah of Irjaa' because they do not make takfeer of the one who abandons the prayer, and because they do not make takfeer of the one who dies with no good deeds (both of which are issues of difference, and in which there are precedents from the Salaf), and also the issue of takfir of the rulers and rebellion against them, in which he tries to ridicule what Ahl us-Sunnah are upon of the affairs of the Sunnah and guidance of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) with respect to these issues.

In short, the plot of Mohammad Qutb was to introduce the Ikhwani and Qutubi legacy into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah by way of al-Hawali and his "Dhaahirah", by praising and lauding the movements of innovation and their doctrines and methodologies specifically, whilst demonising the people of the

Sunnah, foremost amongst them, al-Albaani, and ridiculing their da'wah and attributing innovation to it.

The ideological attack that came from al-Hawaali, by which the justification of the da'wah of the groups of bid'ah, such as Ikhwaan and Jamaa'at ut-Takfeer and Hizb ut-Tahreer and others was attempted, while being pulled by his Asha'rite mentors and teachers (the likes of Mawdoodi, Mohammad and Sayyid Qutb, whose doctrines he was nurtured upon), became the new and most contemporary wave of opposition to the Salafi da'wah, to the Sunnah and it's people.

And this da'wah, despite many years of confusion after the Gulf War which was the event that saw the open emergence of this da'wah (prior to its secret developmental stages), and during which the truth and falsehood was not apparent, then nevertheless, in more recent times this da'wah was identified for what it was and refuted by the people of Knowledge. This occurred starting from around 1415H, when the Hay'ah Kibar al-Ulamaa studied the works, lectures and cassettes of Safar al-Hawaali and Salman al-Awdah, and ruled that they should be prevented from lessons, in order to protect the society from their errors, and this was because the scholars became aware that what they were preaching were the ideas of ideological revolution.

Then in 1417H, Imaam al-Albaani, labelled this sect as "The Khawaarij of the Era", due to their making takfeer by way of sins. Others who refuted them for the same issue were the likes of Shaykh Abdullaah al-Ubaylaan, Shaykh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee. Also the book "al-Qutubiyyah" which is the best book to date that uncovered the innermost secrets and laid bare the scandal of the Qutubiyyah, at the doctrinal and methodological level.

Then in more recent times the likes of Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen and Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan who also refuted the neo-Qutubiyyah by their checking and praise of the book "Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah Min Tazkiyaat Ahl il-Bidah wal-Mudhammah", being a refutation of Sayyid Qutb and his heretical doctrines. And also they refuted the generalised takfir that is with Salman al-Awdah (Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan), and also warned from their cassettes (as was done by Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen), and also explained that their imprisonment was something that cannot be faulted, as they were in error (as was done by Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen who also clarified the truth with respect to the issues in which they had erred, and that they were in error).

And then more detailed issues such as Imaam al-Albaani's refutation of al-Hawaali's "Dhaahirah" and also refutations by others from the people of knowledge who explain the great deceit, misquotes, distortions, clippings and lying upon the people of knowledge that he fell into, in his "Dhaahirah" – all of which by Allaah's permission, will soon reach the awareness of the general people.

So this is just a short history, by which we come to introduce the particular matter, which is under discussion. Which is some of the recent doubts used by the sect of the Qutubiyah and the Hizbiyoon in order to ascribe Irjaa' to Ahl us-Sunnah. And the path they have taken is no different to all the previous sects of Innovation, such as the Mu'tazilah, Jahmiyyah, Ash'ariyyah, Jabariyyah, Qadariyyah, Murji'ah and others in that they make the criterion of their acceptance of the Sunnah to be whatever aids and supports their innovation, and as for whatever opposes it, they explain it away or counter it or reject it, and this is the basis upon which the justification of their da'wah, at both the theoretical and practical front is justified. It is important to understand this well, as many things will become clear about what is presented by the Qutubiyoon, Takfiriyyoon and those caught up in the mess that was first started by their Ash'ari, Mu'tazili, Sufi figureheads like Sayyid Qutb, Mawdoodi and Hasan al-Banna.

So as for the three doubts, then they are statements from people of the Sunnah which they use, misinterpret and apply to the people of the Sunnah, all in order to ascribe Irjaa' to them, and by this method, they wish to refute the Sunnah, or the specific aspect of the Sunnah which goes against their methodology and that is, to hear and obey those who are in authority, in whatever is obedience to Allaah, even if they are far astray from the guidance of Allaah, and have the hearts of devils in the bodies of men and who confiscate the wealth and beat the people. So this is an affair of Sunnah and guidance, left by the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), and which is singled out by the generality of the Innovators, in order to reject it, refute it, ridicule it and to interpolate it falsely. And in this, they have followed the path of the Innovators before them.

Like the Raafidah, when the Sunnah spoke of the virtues of Abu Bakr and 'Umar, they rejected it and called its people "Naasibah", and like the Murji'ah, when the Book and the Sunnah showed the permissibility of excepting oneself of having complete, perfect Imaan, rejected it and called its people "Shakkaakiyyah (Doubters)", and like the Mu'attilah, when the Sunnah affirmed Attributes for Allaah, they rejected it and called its people,

“Mushabbihah” and “Saalimiyyah” and “Mujassimah” and so on, for all the sects of Innovation and misguidance.

And the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, the neo-Khaarijiyyah, then likewise, when the Sunnah prohibited rebellion, and enjoined obedience, even in times of difficulty, social injustice, when the rulers confiscate wealth and beat the backs, and when they do not guide by the Book and the Sunnah, and have the hearts of devils, then they rejected it, reviled it and assaulted its people, calling them “Murji’ah” and “Stooges” and “Spies”, “Madaakhilah”, “Jaamiyyah” and other such repugnant names. And it is for this reason that at the doctrinal level, the neo-Khaarijiyyah, in all their variant flavours, (such as the Qutubiyyah, the Surooriyyah, Jama’at ut-Takfir wal-Hijrah, the Hizbut-Tahrir-Muhajiroon conglomeration, the generality of the Ikhwaan, and the Jamaa’at Islaamee and others), then they all strive to justify this innovation of theirs by making the focus of attention to be the takfir of the rulers. And then once takfir has been justified, they then work on making the people accept that revolution is a way of attaining good, and thus they work towards their objectives.

Subsequently, whoever stands in their way, and enjoins the Sunnah, then he is demonised and reviled and given the labels and titles mentioned earlier, and so the Scholars are singled out first, such as Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimen, and then those after them, and then the generality of Ahl us-Sunnah – and indeed this is the very thing that has occurred from the neo-Khaarijites.

And an important point to clarify here is that sometimes the likes of these people ask and say, “Why do you defend the rulers” and “why do you support them” and other such questions. And the answer is short and simple. This is not a defence of whatever comes from the rulers of sin and transgression, oppression and tyranny or whatever it may be, as much as the Qutubiyyah and other than them may continue to lie and fabricate against the Salafees, and confuse and beguile the common people who do not know any better. Rather, it is a defence of the Sunnah, since this particular issue is one of aqeedah, and which occurs in all the books of aqeedah past and present and which is opposed by the generality of those who have arisen in the current times, and who have been nurtured upon the thought of Qutb, Mawdudi, Suroor and others. It is not as the liars, fabricators and deceived ones claim, that we justify whatever comes from the leaders and defend it and aid them in it. No, the Sunnah is clear, and inshaa’allaah it will be explained in what is to follow, so that the lies of the liars and the fabrications of the deceivers can be made apparent.

To proceed then, these are just three of the contemporary doubts used by Ahl ul-Ahwaa, those who are caught up in the da'wah of the neo-Khaarijiyyah, and the intent here is merely to illustrate that Ahl ul-Ahwaa are gathering their doubts and misconceptions with which to attack Ahl us-Sunnah, by twisting and distorting, in meaning and application, the words of the Scholars, and that by no means is this a complete list of their doubts.

## The First Doubt: Using the Statement of Sa'eed bin Jubayr

The Qutubiyyah, and those poisoned with their poison of ignorance, utilise the issue of the rebellion of Sa'eed bin Jubayr against al-Hajjaaj Ibn Yoosuf, and his justification of it, and to then tie that and link that with the well known statement of Saeed bin Jubayr concerning the Murji'ah, "The Murji'ah are the Jews of the Qiblah", (أهل الجبل يهود القبلة), (as-Sunnah 1/323).

So the link that is made or implied by the Qutubiyyah, the neo-Makhaarijah, is that Sa'eed bin Jubayr's words are addressed to those who oppose him in his takfir or rebellion against al-Hajjaaj Ibn Yoosuf, and that their da'wah, is therefore a da'wah of Irjaa'. And some of the Juhhaal and pretenders to knowledge amongst the Qutubiyyah have expressed the likes of this doubt.

So in reply we say:

**Firstly:** The Khurooj (rebellion) of the early Salaf, then it was opposed by the majority of the Salaf, and those who rebelled were the clear minority, the very small minority. All of them realised the error of their ways, and some of them were even advised to abandon the khurooj, by others from the people of knowledge from the Sahaabah and otherwise, and they also showed remorse and regret for what they had entered into. Thus, to take the actions of Sa'eed bin Jubayr, or the others from the Salaf, such as Hussain, or Aa'ishah (radiiallaahu anhaa) and to justify this manhaj of khurooj is from the ways of the Innovators, those who utilise the actual ikhtilaaf itself, as a basis for the justification of their madhhab.

Al-Khattaabee said, "And Ikhtilaaf (in a matter) is not a proof, rather the explanation of the Sunnah is a proof against the opposers, whether they be from the first (Muslims) or the later ones." (A'laam al-Hadeeth 3/2093).

And al-Haafidh Abu Umar Ibn Abdul-Barr said, "Ikhtilaaf is not a proof in the view of anyone that I know from the Fuquhaa of this Ummah, except the one who has no vision, and who has no knowledge, and who has no proof in his saying". (Jaami' Bayaan ul-Ilm 2/229).

And Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah further explains, "And it is not for anyone to seek the saying of anyone as a proof in the matters in which there is dispute. Rather, the proof is in a text, and ijmaa' and an evidence deduced from that (i.e. text or ijmaa'), whose premises and foundations are established

by Sharee'ah evidences. Not just the sayings of some of the scholars - for verily the sayings of the scholars - evidences are sought for them by Sharee'ah evidences, and these sayings themselves are not be sought as the Sharee'ah evidences" (Majmoo Fataawaa 26/202-203).

You may refer to the lengthy article from Shaykh ul-Islaam in which there is the greatest of refutation of the neo-Khaarijiyyah, MNJ160006, read it for it is amongst the most excellent of what has been said, concerning the khurooj of the early Salaf.

**Secondly:** The actual meaning of the saying of Sa'eed bin Jubayr, that "the Murji'ah are the Jews of the Qiblah" is as follows:

That the Jews claim that they are the chosen people of Allaah, and that by virtue of their being Jewish, that they are guaranteed Paradise, or at that they will only, at most, spend a few days in Hell, but that Paradise is guaranteed for them, by virtue of their being the "chosen race", irrespective of their actions. In light of this, they abandon much of what is required from them by way of obedience to Allaah, and they fall into the greatest of the affairs of disobedience, out of choice, and out of their belief that they are guaranteed Paradise, without any punishment at all, or little if any. Rather, a fair portion of them fall into what is disbelief and shirk, out of choice, and also promote the greatest of the affairs of corruption amongst the people of the earth, whether that be disbelief in Allaah, or the various sins and affairs of disobedience, and yet alongside all of that, consider that they will enter Paradise without punishment in the Fire, merely by virtue of their being the "chosen race".

And thus the Murji'ah, who are those who expelled actions from Imaan, and said that Imaan is either merely what is in the heart of its belief, or what is in the heart alongside expression with the tongue, and that actions are not from Imaan, and that it is possible for a person to attain complete, perfect Imaan, without acting upon any of the pillars or obligations, and that the Imaan of all the people is exactly the same, be they sinners, or be they pious. Thus, they belittled the affair of action, and took the affair of sins and disobedience lightly. Hence, by the mere Imaan that is in the heart (i.e. its knowledge and belief in Allaah) or by this Imaan in the heart and its utterance with the tongue, claimed the Murji'ah that a person will enter Paradise without punishment, and that he has attained complete faith, merely by way of this. Thus, they expelled actions from Imaan.



Shaikh ul-Islaam said, “The one who believes that a person’s mere utterance of this kalimah, he will enter Paradise, and will not enter the Fire at all then he is a strayer, an opposer to the Book and the Sunnah... However, if he said, Laa Ilaaha Ilallaaha truthfully from his heart and died upon that, then he will not remain eternally in the Fire, since the one who has just a seeds weight of Imaan in his heart will not remain eternally in the Fire forever, as is authentic in the ahaadeeth.” (Fataawaa 35/201). And he also said, “And the one who said that everyone who utters the Shahaadatayn and then does not perform the obligations and keep away from the prohibitions, will enter Paradise and that not a single one of these people will be punished by the Fire, then this one (the one who says this) is a kaafir, apostate.” (Fataawaa 35/105). And he also said, “And whoever said that the obligatory Imaan (al-Imaan al-Waajib) can be attained without acting upon a single one of the obligatory actions, he is in very clear error, and this is the bid’ah of Irjaa’, about the adherents to which the Salaf were severe in their words.” (Fataawaa 7/610).

Thus, it is from this angle that they resembled the Jews, and this is what is actually meant by the saying of Sa’eed bin Jubayr that “the Murji’ah are the Jews of the Qiblah”.

**Thirdly:** Once this is clear, the great deceit of the neo-Khaarijiyyah, Qutubiyah becomes evident, in that firstly, they attempt to justify their false methodology of takfir and khurooj by way of the ijtihaad of one of the taabi’een, and who was opposed by the majority of the people of knowledge an excellence in these affairs, arguing by way of this extremely small minority, and by way of the difference (and not by the Book and the Sunnah) and whose action was one of error, as indicated by the people of knowledge. And then, secondly, they add to this deceit, further deceit, by using some other words of Sa’eed bin Jubayr, which are actually very good and appropriate words concerning the Murji’ah, but misinterpreting them and portraying them in such a manner that they are thought to be in reference to those who do not consider takfir and rebellion to be the adopted path. And then using this to attack Ahl us-Sunnah and justify the label of “Murji’ah” being applied to them.

And all of this indicates the jahl (ignorance) and talbees (deception) and tahreef (distortion) that is with the neo-Khaarijiyyah, born of the Re-Awakening (Sahwah) of Qutubism, newly arisen and foolish minded, as was said about the Khawaarij of old, who were at least more honest and more superior than their modern day counterparts.

## The Second Doubt: Using the Statement of Shaykh ul Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah

The second doubt relates to the issue of obedience to the Rulers, and the neo-Khaarijiyyah have searched and investigated and looked for statements by which they can justify this particular accusation of Irjaa'.

And this deceitful methodology is merely an extension of what was adopted by one of the chiefs of Qutubiyyah, Safar al-Hawaali, who when laying down the foundations for his doctrinal thesis, would first bring many quotations from Sayyid Qutb and his mentor and teacher, Mohammad Qutb (who supervised the book, "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'"), in order to lay the foundations and principles, and then he would go out and try to seek statements of Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah that would serve as a branch, or extension of what he had laid down from his Qutubi patrons, twisting and distorting the intent of Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and portraying it to be in support of the re-awakened Qutubite doctrine of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. And amongst those who have exposed this scandal and fraud are the likes of Shaykh Mukhtar at-Teebaawee in his book "Naqd Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'".

Thus, you find the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah and the generality of the Hizbiyyoon and those confused and mixed up with this da'wah, employing the same methodology.

So this second doubt then is built around the following words of Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, taken from Majmoo' al-Fataawaa 28/508:

وَقَالَ الرَّبُّ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ لِمَنْ كَفَرَ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبَيْتِ وَالْأُمَّةِ أُولَئِكَ كَانُوا فِي سَاءِ مَا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ  
وَقَالَ الرَّبُّ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ لِمَنْ كَفَرَ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبَيْتِ وَالْأُمَّةِ أُولَئِكَ كَانُوا فِي سَاءِ مَا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ  
وَقَالَ الرَّبُّ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ لِمَنْ كَفَرَ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبَيْتِ وَالْأُمَّةِ أُولَئِكَ كَانُوا فِي سَاءِ مَا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

The translation of which is, "And this way is the way of the best (people) of this Ummah both of the past and of contemporary times, and this (way) is obligatory upon every mukallaf (i.e. one who is sane and mature, and bound by the Sharee'ah). And this (way) is moderate between the way of the Harooriyyah (the Khawaarij) and their likes, those who adopt the path of a corrupted type of piety which arises from little knowledge, and between the way of the Murji'ah

and their likes, those who adopt the path of absolute, unrestricted obedience to the Rulers, even when they are not pious.”

So using these words of the Shaykh ul-Islaam, the neo-Khaarijiyyah and the confused and bewildered youth, fight the Sunnah and its people and attack their da'wah and accuse them of being Murji'ah because they enjoin obedience to the Rulers in that which does not entail disobedience to Allaah. And indeed in this particular example, is a perfect illustration of the ignorance, deception and distortion that is with these people, and their foolishness, which shows no limits.

So in demolishing this doubt from its very foundations, and illustrating that it is in fact against the Qutubiyyah, neo-Khaarijiyyah, and in fact a demolition of their own madhhab and doctrine, and in exposing their jahl and talbees, and in exposing them and effecting their humiliation, and in aiding and manifesting the Sunnah and it's people, and in illustrating that they are far from the aqeedah and manhaj of Shaykh ul-Islaam, and that they only use his words to justify the false madhhab of the Ash'arite Mu'tazilite that was Sayyid Qutb, who is actually the true source of their methodology, we say:

**Firstly:** This particular fatwaa of Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah is concerning the ruling with respect to fighting the Tartars who approached the lands of the Muslims, and the Bayt al-Maqdis, in the year 699H, and who caused much killing and violating the sanctities of Allaah, and caused corruption and took much of the wealth of the Muslims, and also took many Muslims as captives, all the while they claimed that they are Muslims who adhere to the two testimonies of faith, and thus claimed that it is forbidden to fight against them. So the question is whether it is permissible to fight against them or not and if so, then from what angles or perspectives, or in what manner. This is what the text of the question contains, as you will see on page 501 of the 28<sup>th</sup> volume.

**Secondly:** The essence of the answer given by Shaykh ul-Islaam can be summarised as follows: That fighting any group or faction who withholds from any outwardly legislated affair, from the affairs of Islaam, and which is from the rights of Islaam, then it is to be fought until it abides by them, and that this fighting applies, even if this faction outwardly makes the two testimonies of faith and adheres to other outwardly legislated affairs. The Sahaabah were agreed upon this matter, namely, to fight so that the rights of Islaam are restored and maintained, such as the zakaah, which is from the rights of Islaam. And that included amongst those who are to be fought are the Khawaarij, due to their exiting from the Sharee'ah and the Sunnah.

So concerning the outwardly legislated and obligatory affairs, the scholars are united that any faction or group who withholds from them is to be fought. However, the scholars differed concerning some of the affairs of the Sunnah, such as the two rakah's of Fajr, as to whether people should be fought for them. Nevertheless, they are in agreement concerning the obligatory affairs.

That in light of this, those who are being asked about, the Tartars, are more worthy of being fought, since they of all people, do not adhere to many of the outwardly legislated affairs of Islaam, while at the same time showing enmity towards the Muslims, fighting them.

And that there is a differentiation to be made between the fighting of Alee against the Khawaarij, which comes under this category of fighting, and the fighting that took place between him and the people of Shaam and Basrah, which is to be considered like the fighting of one brother with another. And that fighting the Khawaarij, fighting those who withheld the Zakaah and fighting the Tartars is all from the same category, and if the Khawaarij and withholders of Zakaah were fought, then how much more so should the Tartars be fought.

Then Shaykh ul-Islaam speaks about the reality of the religion of the Tartars and what it actually consists of and how they do not really adhere to Islaam, and treat other religions to be more or less equivalent, though they do consider the Muslims to be superior and better. That they consider a Muslim to be like an upright, just person, or a righteous person who performs the voluntary affairs of worship, and a Kaafir to be like a sinful Muslim, or one who abandons the voluntary affairs of worship. And, that in light of all of this, the scholars have not differed concerning fighting them.

Then Shaykh ul-Islaam speaks about adopting the correct Sharee'ah method when fighting the likes of these, which is to first invite them to Allaah, and for them to make the two testimonies of faith, before fighting them, or for them to adhere to the legislative affairs of Islaam, if they already have made the two testimonies, before actually fighting them, and that this route ensures the pleasure of Allaah.

Then Shaykh ul-Islaam explains that sometimes fighting alongside the sinful might be the better out of two evils, since, if fighting is abandoned, then the harm resulting from the domination of the enemy might be more, than if

fighting alongside the sinful rulers, or an army full of sin, in order to establish some of the affairs of Islaam, even if all of them are not established.

Then Shaykh ul-Islaam explains, in light of this, that it is an established fundamental with Ahl us-Sunnah that they fight alongside every sinful or pious ruler, and that Allaah sometimes aids the religion by way of a sinful man. Thus, every group or faction who deserves Jihaad to be made against them, then all of these texts that come from the Sunnah are to be acted on, namely to make Jihaad alongside the rulers, be they pious or sinful.

**Thirdly:** From what has preceded, the context of the quotation from Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, is being made clear, and at this point we will quote the final part of the passage in full to give the intent of Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah:

...and other such texts concerning which Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah from all the factions are agreed upon with respect to acting upon them, in making Jihaad against those who deserve Jihaad, alongside the Rulers, both the pious and the sinful. In opposition to the Raafidah and the Khawaarij who exit from the Sunnah and Jamaa'ah. And this is alongside [the Prophet] (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), informing that, "There will soon be Rulers who

are oppressive, sinful, unreliable (i.e. deceitful). Whoever believes their lie and aids them, then he is not of me and I am not of him, and he will not pass by the Hawd. And whoever does not believe their lie and does not help them, then he is of me and I am of him, and he will pass by the Hawd". So when a man encompasses, in knowledge, whatever the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has commanded of the Jihaad that is undertaken by the Rulers, up until the day of Judgement, and what he has forbidden of aiding the oppressors in their oppression, then he will come to know that the moderate path, which is actually the pure religion of Islaam, is to make Jihaad against whoever deserves it, such as the those (i.e. the Tartars) who are being asked about, alongside every ruler (ameer), and faction, which is closer to Islaam than them, when it is not possible to make Jihaad against them except in this way. And at the same time avoiding helping the faction which one is fighting alongside, in anything which is disobedience to Allaah. Rather, he obeys them in the obedience to Allaah, and does not obey them in disobedience to Allaah, since there is no obedience to the creation, in what entails disobedience to the Creator. And this way is the way of the best (people) of this Ummah both of the past and of contemporary times, and this (way) is obligatory upon every mukallaf (i.e. one who is sane and mature, and bound by the Sharee'ah). And this (way) is moderate between the way of the Harooriyyah (the Khawaarij) and their likes, those who adopt the path of a corrupted type of piety which emanates from little knowledge, and between the way of the Murji'ah and their likes, those who adopt the path of absolute, unrestricted obedience to the Rulers, even when they are not pious."

So these are the words of Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah. Once we have them, we can now outline the talbees (deception) of the neo-Khawaarij:

**Fourthly:** In what they quote, from the end of this passage, the Qutubiiyyah, imply that giving obedience to the Rulers, when they are oppressive, sinful, and deceitful, is from the ways of the Murji'ah. And this is a lie upon Shaykh ul-Islaam. For Shaykh ul-Islaam is talking about the moderation in between two extremes. The first of which is the extreme of the Khawaarij, those who consider the ruler who is sinful, oppressive, to be a disbeliever, and who exit from obedience to him, completely, thus they do not obey him in anything, and rather revolt against him. And the second is the extremity of the Murji'ah. Those who obey the oppressive, sinful ruler, unrestrictedly, and aid him in sin and disobedience of Allaah, since to them, sins do not harm Imaan, thus they obey him in whatever is disobedience to Allaah, as well as what is obedience. Thus the first faction, rejects any obedience to the ruler, unrestrictedly, and the

second faction, affirms obedience to the ruler, unrestrictedly, until even in sin, oppression and disobedience. And both of them are in error.

**Fifthly:** The way of the Salafees, in all time and ages, is exactly what has been said by Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, “And this way is the way of the best (people) of this Ummah both of the past and of contemporary times, and this (way) is obligatory upon every mukallaf (i.e. one who is sane and mature, and bound by the Sharee’ah). And this (way) is moderate between the way of the Harooriyyah (the Khawaarij) and their likes, those who adopt the path of a corrupted type of piety which emanates from little knowledge, and between the way of the Murji’ah and their likes, those who adopt the path of absolute, unrestricted obedience to the Rulers, even when they are not pious.”

And this is exactly what has come in the Prophetic narrations, as the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, “Upon a Muslim man is to hear and obey both in that which he loves and that which he hates, unless he is ordered with disobedience. So if he is ordered with disobedience, then there is no hearing and no obeying”. (Reported by Bukhaaree and Muslim).

And this exactly what the Salafees are upon, as their madhhab is none other than the madhhab of the Salaf who have preceded them, including Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah.

And what indicates that **the ruler is to be obeyed in everything** in what a person likes or dislikes, **except whatever is disobedience** is the saying of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), “Upon you is to hear and to obey, in both times of ease, and times of difficulty, and in times of happiness and in times of dislike” (Reported by Muslim from Abu Hurairah). And an-Nawawi explains, quoting the scholars on this, “Its meaning is that it is obligatory to obey those in authority in whatever entails difficulty, hardship and what is hated by the souls, and other such things, and which do not entail any disobedience. For if it entails disobedience, then there is no hearing and no obeying. And “al-Athirah” (which occurs in some of the narrations) is preferring (oneself) and specifying oneself with the affairs of the world, above and over you (i.e. the Rulers, take advantage and give priority to themselves and do not give the rights to their subjects). Meaning, hear and obey, even if they give preference to themselves in the affairs of the world, and do not give you your due rights which are with them”. (Sharh Muslim 12/225).

This is because some people do not give obedience in those things that are not pleasing to them, but which do not entail disobedience to Allaah, and thus by

not obeying in these affairs, they disobey the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and disobey the judgement of Allaah. This is because the exception in obeying the rulers, is only with respect whatever entails disobedience to Allaah, and not with respect to what one finds difficult, or hard, or dislikeable and so on. Since the judgement of Allaah and His Messenger is that they are to be obeyed in all circumstances, with only one exception, which is if it involves disobedience to Allaah.

Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah himself said:

وَأَمَّا الَّذِينَ هُمْ أَهْلُ الْعِلْمِ وَالْإِيمَانِ وَالْإِحْسَانِ  
فَلَيْسَ لَهُمْ جُورٌ فِي ذَلِكَ، وَكَذَلِكَ  
(12/35 عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ)

Which translates as, “And as for the People of Knowledge, Religion and Excellence, then they do not permit, allow anyone in that which Allaah forbade of disobeying those in authority, and being deceitful to them, and revolting against them, from any angle whatsoever, as is known from the habitual ways of the People of the Sunnah and Religion, both of the past and of contemporary times, and from the way (seerah) of those besides them” (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 35/12).

And this clarifies the way of Ahl us-Sunnah which is to obey the rulers, even if they be sinful, oppressive, tyrannical, do not fulfil the rights of their subjects, beat them, confiscate their wealth, then they are to be obeyed in all circumstances, unless it involves disobedience to Allaah, and these circumstances include those in which one is pleased or displeased, which one likes or hates, which one finds easy, or difficult, burdensome. And this is what all of Ahl us-Sunnah are united upon, of all times and ages, in opposition to the Kharijites and Murji'ites. Those who either prohibit any obedience at all, or who enjoin unrestricted obedience, until even in that which involves sin and oppression.

And this exposes yet another cheap attempt by the neo-Kharijiyyah, the Qutubiyah, at attempting to accuse Ahl us-Sunnah of Irjaa', by reviling the judgement of Allaah, reviling the Sunnah, reviling the Aathaar, reviling the way of the People of Knowledge, Religion and Excellence, and labelling it as Irjaa', by twisting, distorting the intent behind the words of the people of knowledge.



The Third Doubt: Using A Narration Concerning al-Ma'moon

As for the third doubt that is used, then its cheapness is even more apparent than what has preceded, and it was first used by the Qutubiyyah of Arabic descent, then to be championed, by the non-Arabic Qutubiyyah, who with an unclear translation of the words, sought to use this narration to revile the well-known established, mutawaatir Sunnah, that has already been explained in what has preceded.

So the narration, which is mentioned bin Ibn Katheer, in al-Bidaayah wan-Nihaayah, reads as follows:

وَأَبْنُ أَصَاكِيرٍ أَخْبَرَ أَنَّ نَادِرَ بْنَ شُمَيْلٍ قَالَ: "دَخَلْتُ عَلَى مَعْمُورِ بْنِ مَعْمُورٍ فِي بَيْتِهِ وَهُوَ فِي حُلِيِّهِ يَتَمَلَّأُ بِالْحُلِيِّ وَالْحُلِيُّ الْمَسْجُودُ الَّذِي يُرِيدُ بِطَرَفَيْهِ أَنْ يَجْعَلَ سَيْدَةً لِأَكْبَادِهِمْ وَأَنْ يَجْعَلَ رِجْأً لِأَسْوَاقِهِمْ" فَسَأَلْتُهُ عَنْ رِجْأِهِمْ فَأَجَابَ: "رِجْأُهُمْ أَنْ يَخْتَارُوا فِي دِينِهِمْ مَا يَرْضَوْنَ مِنْ مَلِكٍ أَوْ يَخْتَارُوا فِي دِينِهِمْ مَا يَرْضَوْنَ مِنْ مَلِكٍ" (276/10 oedaeuue ü öecj me)

This translates, as close to the meaning as possible, as follows, “And Ibn ‘Asaakir narrates from the route of an-Nadir bin Shumayl who said, “I entered upon al-Ma’moon and he said, “How did you awake (this morning) O Nadir?” So I said, “In goodness, O Chief of the Believers”. So he said, “What is Irjaa'?” I replied, “It is a (form of) religion that is agreeable, favourable to the Kings, by which they [seek and] acquire (the portions) of their worldly [life] and by which they reduce [what is due upon them] from their deen.

Unfortunately, the Jahalah (ignoramuses) have attempted to use this narration, and the particular English translation that we have been sent of it, in order to “define Irjaa'”. And as has preceded already, the concern of the neo-Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah, is to seek out and find anything that will support their innovation. And amongst the greatest of what they have attempted is to revile the Sunnah and revile what Allaah revealed and to describe it with Irjaa', exactly as their predecessors from the sects of Innovation fell into, when they reviled the Sunnah with their opinions and intellects.

So here, they attempt to portray, by way of this narration, and a flawed translation and understanding of it, that obedience to those in authority, and which for the most part is in relation to kings, since after the first thirty years of Khilaafah, kingship emerged and has remained until this day of ours, that it is Irjaa'.

So in reply to this we say:

**Firstly:** The translation that has been sent to us and brought to our attention is as follows:

“Found in al-Bidaayah wan-Nihaayah for al-Haafith Ibn Katheer, vol. 10/276; on the authority of Ibn ‘Asaakir, an-Nidr bin Shumayl said: “I entered upon al-Ma`moon, so he said: ‘How have you awoken oh Nidr?’ So I said: ‘In goodness, oh Ameer al-Mu`mineen’ He asked: ‘What is irjaa`?’ I replied: ‘A religion that agrees with the Kings, they gain from the dunya with it, and lose from the aakhirah’ So he said: ‘You have spoken the truth’”.

Whoever translated this, cannot read properly, and does not understand the constructs in the sentences and whether a verb is transitive or intransitive, and what occurs in this narration at the end is  $\times\text{æl}é\text{i} \text{ Ū} \text{ Ō} \text{ çl} \text{ Ø} \text{ Ý} \text{ ;} \text{ ¿} \text{ Ú} \text{ é} \text{ Ū}$  which refers to the deen, and the translation above actually uses the word “aakhirah”, so how a person can mistranslate an actual word from “deen” to a completely different word in the Arabic itself, even compared to the original Arabic, is rather surprising.

Further, the words chosen do not accurately portray the meaning of this narration, just compare this translation to the one provided above, and by which the actual meaning is clearer. So whoever translated this has not done justice to say the least, and when this is being portrayed and presented to others, who might not know better, then this is dangerous and can amount to twisting and distorting the words and meanings.

**Secondly:** The meaning of the words of an-Nadir is that Irjaa', which is a religion that requires no actions, and which does not admit to any decrease in Imaan by way of sins, and which holds that a person will enter Paradise without being punished and other such affairs, that this religion therefore is one that is suitable and favourable and agreeable and likeable to the Kings, meaning that this false belief concerning Imaan and what follows on from it, is favourable to them and their interests, since by this, they can acquire the shares of the world, even if that be by oppression and misappropriation and sin and disobedience and falsely taking the rights of others, since their Imaan, to them, will not be affected or harmed. And on the other hand, they can reduce their deen, and what is due upon them from it of obligations and prohibitions, to a bare minimum, since actions do not have any real effect upon a person's Imaan, according to the doctrine of Irjaa', and nor do they increase it. Thus, they can reduce their religious observance to a minimum, and this is the meaning of the

statement  $\times\text{æ}\text{ú}\text{é}\text{i} \text{ Ū}\text{Ō} \text{ ç}\text{l} \text{ Ø}\text{Ý}\text{j} \text{ ç}\text{ú}\text{é} \text{ ù}$  which is that they remove [affairs] from their religion, to reduce the sum total of it, to something that becomes easy for them.

**Thirdly:** The meaning afforded in this narration has no connection whatsoever to what is established with Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah of giving obedience to those in authority from the rulers and kings in everything, except what involves disobedience to Allaah. And it is clear that the Qutubiyoon and Hizbiyyoon who attempt to use this narration are attempting to make a link between this well established Sunnah of obeying those in authority, even if they be sinful, tyrannical, and take the rights of others, and between Irjaa'. And there is no link whatsoever, as anyone with intellect can see. Rather, this is another cheap attempt at reviling the judgement and command of Allaah and reviling the Sunnah of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and reviling the madhhab of the People of Religion, Knowledge and Excellence of all times, and opening up the door to the Khawaarij, in the midst of whom, in the later times, Dajjaal will appear, as is narrated from the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), **“and every time a group appears (i.e. from the Khawaarij), it is to be cut off, until the Dajjaal appears within them”** (in Ibn Maajah, and see Silsilah as-Saheehah no. 2455).

**Fourthly:** Some questions should be asked to the neo-Makhaarijah who use this statement:

When the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) says to you, “hear and obey, even if he beats your back and takes your wealth”, and when he says to you, “upon you is to hear and to obey, in both times of ease, and times of difficulty, and in times of happiness and in times of dislike” then is this the deen of Irjaa' which is favourable to the kings? So if you say yes, then know that you have uttered an enormity, and refuge is from Allaah from your sick state and condition, and if you say, no, certainly not, since the Messenger only commands what is of benefit and rectitude to the people, and from the knowledge revealed to him, then you have spoken the truth, and your argument is falsified.

The essence of the matter is that there is no link at all, rather the meaning of the above narration is very clear indeed, and it is exactly the same thing that the majority of the common-people are upon, of Irjaa', not in the sense that they believe in the detailed doctrines and arguments of the Murji'ah, as they do not know them, but in their actions and behaviour, they have elements of Irjaa', since they do not act and abide by the obligations or refrain from the prohibitions, and then justify all of this by saying, Allaah is most-Forgiving,

most-Merciful, and that Imaan is here, pointing to his heart. So to a lot of people, this is convenient since this form of religion allows them to pursue their worldly objectives with few impediments (despite it involving compromises and sins and disobedience), whilst at the same time, reducing the affairs of the deen for them, such that they hardly need to practice the outward affairs, such as prayer and fasting and other such issues, both obligations and prohibitions.

And perhaps this is sufficient to make the affair clear.

## Closing Remarks and Conclusion

The manhaj of the Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah and those traversing upon their path, from the generality of those who have allowed themselves to be nurtured upon the doctrines of the Ash'arite, Mu'azilite and Sufic individuals, such as Qutb, Mawdudi, and Bannaa, then it is aimed at rectifying the ruling authorities by ways that oppose what Allaah has revealed upon Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and they begin from a starting point, which is other than the starting point from which the da'wah of all the Messengers began.

To this end, they use certain doubts and misconceptions, by which they can arrive at unrestricted takfir, and following on from that to justify revolution and rebellion. And this is indeed what they are upon. The only problem is that a lot of people, who are caught up with these ideas and movements, are not truly aware of where this da'wah is going to take them, and the reality of what they are upon. Thus, this da'wah appeals to them, and add to that the lies, deceptions and distortions of the Qutubiyyeen, Hizbiyyeen, in attempting to defend, justify and promote their manhaj, by revolving around the issues of takfir and khurooj, and then reviling the Sunnah and its people.

Therefore, the likes of these people seek out and find statements from the people of knowledge that can be twisted to support the false principles that they have actually taken from the Innovators, and this methodology was laid down for the generality of the people of takfir by Safar al-Hawaali, in the book inspired by Mohammad Qutb, "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa", since in this book, al-Hawaali, merely seeks out the words of Shaykh ul-Islam, as subsidiary and ancilliary arguments to justify the actual foundations and broad principles of methodology he is trying to justify which originate from Banees Qutb and Aal Mawdoodee.

So this has seen the proliferation of this type of activity amongst the generality of the Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah and those who are loyal to the teachings of the Ash'arite, Mu'tazilites like Banees Qutb and Aal Mawdoodi, and the Soofee Mufawwidhs, like Hassan al-Bannaa. And so we have seen them attempting to bring their doubts and misconceptions to justify their particular methodology, whilst at the same time, using them to attack and demonise the people of the Sunnah, rather the very Sunnah itself, as is clear from what has preceded, and this has always been the way of the Innovators.

Prayers an peace be upon the Messenger, his family and Companions.d