



The Saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, Tabdeel and Genghis Khan: An Insight

Introduction

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.

We continue in earnest in advancing the Inquisition into the deeper recesses of the Qutubi School of Doctrine. In this instalment, we look at the use by neo-Qutubite elements of some of the sayings of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah to justify their unrestricted and absolute takfir in the issue of the rule and rulership. The general concepts of this absolutism are most commonly found in the writings of the fountain and spring of all neo-Kharijites, Sayyid Qutb and his works. The difference between Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, the Salafis, the Atharis and the Ahl ul-Ahwaa, the Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah and Khaarijiyyah ['Asriyyah], is that Ahl us-Sunnah research and then believe, but the Ahl ul-Ahwaa believe and then research for that which will support their beliefs. Inshaa'allaah, in what follows, this will be demonstrated in the most clear of ways.

It must be pointed out however, that we do not reject takfir of the Rulers on account of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, in its variety of forms. Rather, this is from the Sharee'ah and is an affair that assists and aids the religion. However, what we are speaking of here is the exaggeration and extremism that has been entered into this field by the Neo-Qutubites and their Theorists and Thinkers who have been nurtured upon the books of Sayyid Qutb and other Kharijite Theoreticians, and who have fled on their heels from adhering to tafseel and detail in this matter. And adhering to such tafseel and detail would actually prevent them from their hidden agendas and goals. The true realities become most clear when one understands their position and viewpoint in detail. And these realities indicate that they in fact apply the apparent meanings of the verses of al-Maa'idah, absolutely and without tafseel, just like the Khawaarij of old.

What also must be pointed out is that we make a distinction between the theoreticians, theorists and thinkers amongst them, those who propound the doctrines and who author works and write on these issues and who promote the heresy of Qutubism and between those who are not like that. Then amongst the latter are those who are followers of desires, filled with partisanship, and have become poisoned by the teachings of those whom they have followed and made into their leaders and guides, loving and hating for their sake. And also amongst the latter ones are those who are confused and intend good and think they are upon guidance, whereas they are upon other than that, for they have not truly understood

the reality of the position that they hold, and nor have they contemplated it well. And there is no rejection shown to them, and nor are they from the generality of Qutubiyyah, but we consider them to be in error and wish for them what we wish for ourselves, and hence naseehah (advice) is what is required. But as for the partisans, the followers of desires, those who, while opposing the way of the Salaf in these issues, at the same time make their wrath pour on the Salafis, the Atharis, mock and ridicule them, call them Murji'ah and Qadariyyah, revile their Imaams and accuse them with Innovation, senility, backwardness, perfect ignorance and so on, then they are from amongst the generality of Ahl ul-Ahwaa, and we seek refuge in Allaah from them and their evil.

THE STATEMENT

Stated Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah:

“And when a person makes the unlawful to be lawful, or makes the lawful to be unlawful **or (the one) who changed the Sharee’ah (baddala ash-Shar’)** - that [from it] which is agreed upon - he is a kaafir, an apostate by agreement of the jurists and it is regarding the likes of this that the [following] verse – **according to one of two sayings** – was revealed, “and whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the disbelievers (5:44)” - **meaning that it is the one who declares ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be lawful (man istihalla).**” (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 3/267)

POINTS TO NOTE:

[Qutubites Clip the Above Quotation]

ONE: This is the one of the texts that the neo-Qutubites and Kharijites have depended upon in order to justify the madhhab of Sayyid Qutb of unrestricted, absolute, generalised takfir, without tafseel, and without adherence to the well-known principles of making takfir of specific individuals. The first of their characteristics is to quote only the first half of the statement and leave the final sentence, “...**meaning that it is the one who declares ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be permissible (man istihalla)**”.

[The Meaning of Tabdeel]

TWO: Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah mentions here three types of action:

- 1) Making the unlawful to be lawful, and this is holding the belief that what Allaah has made unlawful is lawful.
- 2) Making the lawful to be unlawful, and this is holding the belief that what Allaah has made lawful is unlawful.
- 3) Changing the Sharee’ah.

The first two are not under any dispute. However as for the third, changing the Sharee’ah, as occurs in the words of Shaikh ul-Islam “baddala ash-Shar’, al-majma’ alaihi”, then what needs to be understood is what exactly is this tabdeel of the Sharee’ah or tabdeel of any specific aspect of it? And what gives us the answer to this is the following:

- a) What is stated by Ibn ‘Arabi al-Maliki, “Ahkaam ul-Quraan 2/642 “If he rules with [the rules he brought from himself] **holding that they are from Allaah**, then that is tabdeel of the [rule of Allah] and necessitates disbelief and if he ruled by them due to a desire and out of disobedience, then that is a sin and upon the principle of Ahl us-Sunnah regarding forgiveness for the sinners, he will be able to reach forgiveness.”
- b) What is reported in the two Saheehs, that “The Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said to them (the Jews), ‘**What do you find in the Tawrah for the one who commits adultery (zinaa)**?’ They replied, ‘We disgrace them and they are lashed’.” And in Saheeh Muslim in the hadeeth of al-Baraa there occurs, “A Jew who was being punished with scalding hot water and being lashed was

made to pass by the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), and so he called them over. He said, 'Is this what you find for the punishment of zinaa in your book?'. They replied, 'Yes'.

Hence, they ascribed what they themselves had invented of lashing and scalding to the Sharee'ah of Allaah, and they rejected the stoning to death that was mentioned in the Tawrah.

- c) What is stated by Abu Umar Ibn 'Abdul-Barr about this hadeeth, "**And in this hadeeth is evidence to show that they used to lie upon their Tawrah, and they would ascribe their lie to their Lord and to their Book**, since they said that they find in the Tawrah that the adulterers should be lashed and scalded, whether they are married or not married. Yet in the Tawrah is something different, that is stoning of the married fornicators (i.e. adulterers)." (at-Tamheed 9/14).
- d) What is stated by at-Tabari in the tafsir of al-Maa'idah (5:44) about the practise of the Jews in the above hadeeth, "...however they changed (baddaloo) and altered (ghayyaroo) his judgement..." and also, "...and some of them (the exegetes) have stated something similar to that which we have said in that the kufr alluded to in this verse is in reference to the Jews who distorted (harrafoo) the Book of Allaah and who changed (baddaloo) His judgement."
- e) And al-Jassaas said (regarding the verses of al-Maa'idah): "The intended (meaning) is opposing and resisting (juhood) the Rule of Allaah, or ruling by other than it **and then informing that it is the rule of Allah**. So this is the kufr which ejects from the religion, and its doer is an apostate, even if he was a Muslim before that - and built upon this is the interpretation of the one who said: "Verily, (these) verses were revealed against Banee Israa'eel and they apply to us (also)" so they mean by this: "That whoever rejects (jahada) the rule of Allaah, or rules by other than what Allaah has revealed and then says '**this is the rule of Allah**' then he is a kaafir, just as Banu Israa'eel disbelieved when they did the likes of this" (Ahkaam ul-Quraan 2/439).
- f) What is also stated by Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, "And the word Shar' it is used - in the understanding of men - with three meanings..." so he mentions Shar' al-Munazzal (that which is revealed -the Book and the Sunnah) and Shar' al-Mu'awwal (the opinions of the scholars etc...) and then said, "And the third: Shar' al-Mubaddal - and this is lying against Allaah and against His Messenger or upon the people with a false testimony and its likes, and clear oppression. So whoever says: '**Indeed, this is from the Shar' (Legislation) of Allaah**' (i.e. a particular ruling a law), then he has disbelieved - there being no doubt or dispute in this - such as the one who says: 'That consuming blood and the dead animal is lawful'." (Majmoo Fataawaa 3/268).
- g) What has also been explained by Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in "Kitaab ul-Imaan" (p.67), and this ought to be reflected upon carefully – so Shaikh ul-Islam said, "And those who have taken their priests and rabbis as lords – when they obeyed them in their making lawful what Allaah had made unlawful, and making

unlawful what Allaah had made lawful, then they are of two types: The first of them: that they know that they (the priests and rabbis) have made tabdeel (baddaloo) the religion of Allaah **and hence they follow them in this tabdeel believing (ya'taqidoona) in the lawfulness of what Allaah had made unlawful and in the unlawfulness of what Allaah had made lawful**, following their leaders in that, alongside their knowledge that they have opposed the religion of the Messengers, then this is kufr (disbelief), and Allaah and His Messenger have also made it Shirk – even if they (the followers) do not pray or prostrate to them. Hence, whoever followed other someone else in something that opposes the religion **while knowing that it opposes the religion, and believes (i'taqada) in what he said, as opposed to what Allaah and His Messenger said, then such a one is a Mushrik, just like them**. And the second type: that their belief (i'tiqaad) and faith (imaan) in the lawfulness of what is lawful and the unlawfulness of what is unlawful is established, however, they follow them (the priests and rabbis) in disobedience to Allaah, just as a Muslim does when he commits a sin and believes that he is a sinner, so these ones have the same ruling as those like them from the people of sin.”¹

- h) What is reported by at-Tabaree in his tafseer of the aayah in al-Maa'idah (5:44) from Yunus Ibn Abd al-A'laa, from Ibn Wahb, from Ibn Zaid – about this verse – that he said, “Whoever judges by the book which he wrote with his own hand and abandoned the Book of Allaah, **and then claimed that his (own) book (that he had written) is from Allaah, has disbelieved**”. (Tafsir at-Tabari no.9411).
- i) What has been authored by Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in refutation of the Christians who made “tabdeel” of the deen of Eesaa (alaihis salaam) entitled, “Al-Jawaab as-Sahih Liman Baddala Deen al-Maseeh”, translating as “The Correct Reply to the One Who Changed [Altered] the Religion of the Messiah”. And it is known that the religion of Islaam that Eesaa (alaihis salaam) came with was corrupted and disfigured by the Innovators, who ascribed beliefs of Kufr and Shirk to it, and who also introduced many innovatory practices into it, most of them having their basis in the culture and religion of the pagans of the time. And they ascribed all of what they innovated to Allaah Most High and to what He had revealed.
- j) Supporting the above, what has been stated by al-Qurtubi, “So whoever changed (baddala) (i.e. made tabdeel) or altered (ghayyara) or innovated into the religion of Allaah that with which Allaah is not pleased with and for which He has granted no permission, then he will be amongst those who will be repelled from the Hawd, distanced from it, and whose faces will be blackened. And those who will be repelled and distanced most severely are those who opposed the Jamaa'ah of the Muslims (i.e. those upon the Straight Path), and who separated from their

¹ Compare this statement and explanation of Shaikh ul-Islam with the very first statement quoted from him in this discourse. Imaam Ibn Uthaimin also quoted this fatwaa of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in his own Fataawaa (2:145-146). As for the Khariji Manhaj of Sayyid Qutb which has been imbibed by neo-Qutubite theoreticians and some of the Jama'aat, then it necessitates that mere obedience in itself is major kufr and shirk and expels from the religion absolutely. And inshaa'allaah, this will be refuted in a future discourse from the words of Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh, Minister of Islamic Affairs of Saudi Arabia.

path, such as the Khawaarij in all their varying sects, the Raafidah in the variety of their misguidance and the Mu'tazilah in the varying desires found amongst them. **All of these are Mubaddiloon (Changers, Disfigurers) and Mubtadi'oon (Innovators)**². And likewise (those repelled from the Hawd are) the Oppressors, whose who indulge excessively in oppression and tyranny and who efface the truth and fight its people, humiliating them..."³ (Tafseer al-Qurtubi, 4/168).

- k) Also what has been mentioned by Ibn al-Qayyim - explaining the types of rule - so he mentioned the Shar' al-Munazzal (the hukm of the Sharee'ah) and the Shar' al-Mu'awwal (and this is the hukm of the scholars and mujtahids) - and then he said: "And as for the replaced law (al-hukm al-mubaddal) - **and that is ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed** - then it is not permissible to implement it nor to act by it, and it is not permissible to follow it, and the one guilty of it (saahibuhu) is between (the states) of kufr (disbelief), fusooq (rebellion) and dhulm (oppression)." (Kitaab ur-Rooh p.394). And the evidence in this statement is that if the tabdeel being referred to here was the type of tabdeel in which it is claimed that the judgement that one has acted upon in opposition Allaah's judgement, is actually Allaah's judgement - as occurs in the quotation's above - then Ibn al-Qayyim would not have mentioned at the end that the person is in between the states of kufr, dhulm, or fisq. Rather such a one would only be in

² And as for those who constantly revolve around this issue of tabdeel, we ask them and request them, "Would you also make takfeer of the Innovators who make tabdeel of the deen of Allaah, those who invent affairs of aqidah and ibaadah, ascribe them to Allaah and what He has revealed and then impose and spread them amongst the People? Rejecting the Haakimiyyah of Allaah in all of that, since they have not judged to the Qur'aan and the Sunnah and to what Allaah has revealed in their aqeedah and their ibaadah. Are these not worse than those do not judge by what Allaah has revealed in the social dealings between the people without even ascribing what they judge by to Allaah, whether it be the laws of the British or the French?!". Let us hear your answer, and speak with sincerity and a truthful heart. Yes, the Innovators do not have their share of tyranny and oppression and harming the Muslims physically, but we are not talking from this perspective. We are talking from the perspective of this "tabdeel" with which you are fascinated and around which your religion (of takfir and khurooj) and your political activism and shurocratic work has come to revolve!! May Allaah reward you for your jealousy and concern for the Sharee'ah of Allaah, but leave aside this extremism, this pretence, this false understanding of the affairs, this pseudo-intellectualism which you have but borrowed from that unfortunate doctor who neither knew the reality of Irjaa' and nor the Imaam that he accused with it, or which you have merely parroted from the Innovator of Hizbiyyah, the Hardened Bannaawite, or which you have but imbibed from the Contemporary, New Sayyid Qutb of our times. Abandon all of that which has in reality come to you from the direction of the teachings of the original Sayyid Qutb, through those who, although originally sound, were misguided by these teachings and entered them into the ranks of Ahl us Sunnah, raising controversy, dissension, tribulation and splitting in all of that.

³ And often the Rowdy Hooligans amongst those with the affectations of the Qutubi Doctrinal Heresy try to imply or hint at Takfir by their well known slogans, "They imprison the du'aat", "They fight against Islaam and its people", "They are in league with the CIA", "They are in league with Iblis", "They are funded by the Kuffaar" and so on. We are not interested in the ramblings of the rowdies, we are interested in Sharee'ah rulings upon Sharee'ah proofs. We desire clarity in our rulings and our judgements, free from desires and emotions and sentiments and so on. Yes, there is great oppression and tyranny, and so on and we hate it for the sake of Allaah, and we do not believe that there is a Muslim with Imaan in his heart who does not(!), but we adhere to tafseel on the issue of takfir. We do not make unrestricted, absolute, generalised takfir. We do not negate and deny takfir, since it is a Sharee'ah ruling. But we are not led by emotions and sentiments unlike the neo-Kharijites and those with their affectations. We adhere to tafseel and take care and caution, and this is what guides us.

the state of kufr that expels from the religion. So this proves that the tabdeel alluded to in the words of Ibn al-Qayyim is of a different type and it is in relation to merely judging by other than what Allaah has revealed, as he himself stated. And we shall see later that some of the contemporary scholars have also used the term tabdeel with this particular understanding.⁴

And all of this indicates that tabdeel is to rule by other than what Allaah has revealed, and then claim it is what Allaah has revealed!! This is the meaning of tabdeel, even if it enrages

⁴ Hence, the word tabdeel is used with two intended meanings. The meaning which it actually indicates, which is bringing laws foreign to the Sharee'ah and then claiming that they are from the Sharee'ah, as has preceded, and the other meaning which is synonymous with merely not ruling by what Allaah has revealed. The first is major kufr absolutely, there is no dispute about the kufr of such a person. As for the second, then the well known tafseel of the Salaf on this issue applies to it, meaning that such a one is not guilty of kufr unless he accompanies his act with juhood, istihlaal, i'tiqaad and the likes. And this will be made clear in what is yet to come.

And this type of tabdeel (in which a claim is not made that the new and invented laws are from Allaah) is also what is being alluded to in the fatwa of Imaam Ibn Baaz, which has given every Revolutionary Takfiri endless nightmares, for in the days of old, the neo-Qutubites would use some of the general and unqualified statements of Imaam Ibn Baaz to portray him as making takfir of those who rule by secular laws in absolute terms.

CONCERNING REPLACEMENT OF THE SHAREE'AH AND KUFR DOONA KUFR

Imaam Ibn Baaz was asked: "Is replacement (of the Shari'ah) with the secular laws (tabdeel ul-qawaaneen) considered to be major kufr that expels from the religion?"

He replied: **"When he makes it permissible (istibaaha). When he makes it permissible to judge with a law other than the Shari'ah he becomes a disbeliever with the major kufr – if he makes that permissible.** As for when he does that for specific reasons, out of disobedience to Allaah, for the sake of bribery, or pleasing somebody, and knows that this is haraam, then this is kufr doona kufr (the minor kufr).

As for when he does it while declaring it lawful (mustahillan lahu), then this is major kufr. As Ibn 'Abbaas said concerning the saying of Allaah the Most High, "And whosoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed, such are the Kāfirūn (i.e. disbelievers - of a lesser degree as they do not act on Allāh's Laws)". (Al-Ma'idah 5:44) – so he said, "This is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah, **but it is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr)**".⁴ Meaning, "when he declares it lawful (istahalla) to judge by the secular law, or declares it lawful to judge with such and such, and likewise, [when he makes it lawful] to judge with such and such Sharee'ah, then he is a kaafir."

Then the questioner said: "Is there a difference between replacement (tabdeel) and between ruling in a particular issue? Tabdeel O Shaikh?" To which the Shaikh replied: **"If he does not desire (lam yaqsud) Istihlaal (making it lawful) by that,** but did it due to some other reasons, then this is kufra doona kufr (the minor kufr). As for when he says, 'There is no harm in judging by other than what Allaah has revealed', even if he said that the Sharee'ah is better, however, he says, 'there is no harm in this, it is permissible', he is declared a disbeliever on account of that with the major kufr, regardless of whether he says that the Sharee'ah is still better, or it is equal to the Sharee'ah, or that it is better than the Sharee'ah, then all of this is (major) disbelief."

The questioner said: "Meaning, this ruling (that you have explained) encompasses both tabdeel (replacement of the Sharee'ah) and other than tabdeel. It covers all of the types?" The Shaikh replied: **"It encompasses all of the forms, it is in all of the forms."**

Refer to the book, "Hiwaar Hawla Masaa'il it-Takfeer Ma'a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz" and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine (no. 94)

the Lords of Qutubiyah and Khaarijiyyah [‘Asriyyah], its Theoreticians, Loyalists and Supporters, and even though they may detest it.

[The Two Opinions Alluded To In the Words of Shaikh ul-Islam]

THREE: After we have understood all the above it is now necessary for us to consider carefully the saying of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in the quote under discussion, “...and it is regarding the likes of this that the [following] verse – **according to one of two sayings** – was revealed...”.

So here Shaikh ul-Islam is saying that the verse in al-Maa’idah (5:44) was revealed in relation to the likes of the three actions he mentioned, a) making something unlawful to be lawful, b) making something unlawful to be lawful and c) changing (tabdeel) the Sharee’ah, **according to one of two opinions**.

The opinion that Shaikh ul-Islam then quotes and uses for the three actions he mentions **is the one in which a person makes istihlaal of his ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed**. As for the other opinion then it is the opinion that states that these verses in al-Maa’idah are specifically for the Kuffaar.

Ibn Jareer at-Tabari narrates numerous narrations from the Salaf to show that the verses in al-Maa’idah are specifically in relation to those who are Kuffaar originally. And at the end of his tafseer of the verse – and after having discussed numerous other views – he says, preferring this particular viewpoint:

“And others have said, the meaning of that is that whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed while rejecting it (jaahidan bihi). As for dhulm (oppression) and fisq (sin), then it is for the one who affirms it (i.e. what Allaah has revealed). Amongst those who said that: (9423): Al-Muthnee narrated to me, saying: Abullaah bin Saalih narrated to us, saying: Mu’aawiyah bin Saalih narrated to me, saying: From Ali bin Abi Talhah from Ibn Abbaas, concerning his saying, “And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the disbelievers” (5:44), Ibn Abbaas said, “Whoever rejects (jahada) what Allaah has revealed has disbelieved, and whoever affirms it but does not judge by it then he is an oppressor, a sinner.” And the first of all of these sayings is most correct in my view, the saying of the one who said, “All of these verses were revealed for the Kuffaar amongst the People of the Book”, because the verses before and after them were revealed about them as well and they are the ones meant by them, and these verses (i.e. the three that mention al-kaafiroon, al-faasiqoon, adh-dhaalimoon) come in the course of the discussion of them, hence, that these verses also refer to them is naturally so.

But if someone should say that Allaah, Exalted is His remembrance, has made this general for everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, so how have you made it specific (for the Kuffaar amongst the People of the Book)?”. It is said in reply, “Allaah the Most High has generalised this for a people who rejected (jaahideen) the judgement of Allaah that He had decreed in His Book (the Tawrah). So he informed them that by their

leaving this judgement **in the manner that they did**⁵ they are Kuffaar. And this is the same saying (i.e. view) concerning everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed due to rejection (juhood) (i.e. rejecting it is from what Allaah has revealed), for such a one is a disbeliever in Allaah, just as Ibn Abbaas said, "Because in his rejection (juhood) of the judgement of Allaah after his knowledge that He revealed it in His Book, he is equivalent to one who rejects the Prophethood of His Prophet after having knowledge that he (Muhammad) is His Prophet". End of quote from at-Tabaree.

[The Reality of Genghis Khan the Wicked Kaafir]

FOUR: After having understood all of the above, we now come to our next point of discussion. The issue of Genghis Khan. For the neo-Qutubites and Takfiris attempt to equate between Genghis Khan and the Rulers of today, in absolute generalised terms, like for like.

- Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "As the greatest of the Ministers (Spokesmen of the Tartars) to the Muslims – of ash-Shaam - said, while he is addressing the messengers of the Muslims and seeks to get closer to them by saying 'We are Muslims' and then says: **"These two great signs (aayataan adheemataan) came from Allaah, Muhammad and Genghis Khan."** So this is what those who were sent forth (to the Muslims) used in order to get closer to the Muslims - by making the Messenger of Allaah and the most noble of creation and the chief of the sons of Aadam and the Seal of the Messengers - equal to a king who is a Kaafir, a Mushrik - one who is the greatest of the Mushriks in his disbelief, corruption, and enmity, such as Bukhtunassar and his likes"⁶
- He also said, "...And that is because the belief (I'tiqaad) of those Tartars in Genghis Khan was mighty indeed - **for they used to believe that he was the Son of Allaah similarly to what the Christians believe regarding the Maseeh...**"⁷
- And he continued, "...**And they along with this (knowing that he is an illegitimate child, born of zinaa), make him the greatest of Messengers from Allaah in their adoration and aggrandisement of what he prescribed for them and legislated for them from his thoughts and desires** - until some of them said regarding the wealth they had : 'This is the sustenance of Genghis Khan' and they would offer thanks to him for their food and drink, **and they would make permissible the killing of the one who showed opposition to what this cursed kaafir prescribed for them** - this opposer to Allaah, His Prophets and His believing slaves."⁸
- The statement of Imaam adh-Dhahabi concerning him, "He is the tyrant ruler of the Tartars, and also their very first king... **they obeyed him in the manner the companions**

⁵ And the manner in which they did that (i.e. the Jews) has already preceded in what has occurred above. And that is that they rejected the judgement of Allaah in the Tawrah out of Juhood (rejection, denial), invented their own judgement, and then ascribed it to Allaah.

⁶ Majmoo' al-Fataawaa (28/521)

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

of a prophet would obey their prophet, in fact in same way that that the sincere servants would show obedience to the Lord of the Worlds... and he died upon their religion and their disbelief.”⁹

- And adh-Dhahabee also said, **“And he did not used to adhere to the religion of Islaam and nor to other than it,** and killing a Muslim was more insignificant to him than killing a flea.”¹⁰

So all of these narrations show that Genghis Khan was born a Kaafir, lived a Kaafir, was pleased as a Kaafir, celebrated himself as a Kaafir, died a Kaafir, will be raised a Kaafir, judged a Kaafir, sentenced to Hell as a Kaafir and will burn and roast as a Kaafir. And of Islaam and the Muslims he is free as they are of him. For he never adhered to Islaam, or any other religion for that matter, and wallowed in beliefs of Kufr and Shirk, dying upon that, wilfully and out of persistence, and the cursed Kaafir imposed all of that upon the people. This is the reality of Genghis Khan. And this is the reality, the ignorance of which is feigned by neo-Qutubite elements. So beware.

[Understanding And Applying the Saying of Shaikh ul-Islam]

FIVE: When the above is established then we gain insight into the saying of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah which is the subject of our discussion. If Genghis Khan is not a Muslim, but an original Kaafir, then using his example and then making it parallel to the Rulers of today who are originally Muslim or affiliate themselves with Islaam, but who may be in the state of either fisq, dhulm or kufr – according to what is with them of the negations of Imaan in accordance with the tafseel of the Salaf in the issue of takfir – is incorrect.

If the Rulers of today fall into what Genghis Khan fell into in the issue of legislation (leaving aside his beliefs of Kufr and Shirk), like for like, and claimed that their own judgement (or that of others that they had adopted) was from Allaah, then they are guilty of his tabdeel (as defined by the Scholars, as mentioned above) and so they are Kuffaar, even if they are originally Muslim. But none of the Rulers of today do that. So the comparison from this perspective is negated and is futile.

For, in the case of those who associate themselves with Islaam, and who adopt the secular laws, or a mixture of secular laws, then what is required for takfir in their case is juhood (as occurs in the saying of at-Tabaree above) or istihlaal (as occurs in the saying of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah at the beginning) or i'tiqaad (an associated belief that necessitates kufr). Hence, in the case of a Ruler who is originally Muslim, the well known tafseel of the Salaf – as occurs in the saying of Shaikh ul-Islam above – applies¹¹.

⁹ Taarikh ul-Islam (p.128)

¹⁰ Siyar (22/234) and in Taaj ul-'Aroos there occurs, that “he would not subscribe to any of the religions of the earth” (7/98)

¹¹ As Shaikh ul-Islam stated, **“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**

And the sayings of the contemporary Salaf on this are well known, they make takfir of the one who claims that a rule other than Allaah's is better than it, or equal to it, or that it is permissible to judge by it, or that the rule of Allaah is not applicable today and is outmoded and so on. These affairs are well known from the Salaf past and present.

Hence, those who use the example of Genghis Khan in order to make absolute and unrestricted Takfir of the Rulers of today are in error, since they are applying this situation out of context from three different angles.

Firstly, the tabdeel that Genghis Khan and the Tartars were guilty of, was that which is defined above from the sayings of the Scholars, in that they would claim that their judgement was that of Allaah's. None of the Rulers of today claim this. Rather, they judge by other than what Allaah has revealed and then say that these are laws of the British, or the French and so on, but they do not say these are the laws of the Lord Most High and that they are revealed in His Book.

Secondly, Genghis Khan is an original Kaafir who made juhood (rejection, denial) of Islaam in general and of the judgement of Allaah and of His Book and of His Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and performed tabdeel (in the manner that the Salaf understood it, i.e. claiming one's own laws or those of others to be from Allaah). He shares with the Jews about whom at-Tabaree spoke of in his tafseer (refer to the quotations from him above) and about whom he said that they rejected of judgement of Allaah with juhood (denial, rejection), save that the Jews made juhood of specific laws and replaced them with their own, whereas Genghis Khan (and his people, the Tartars) made juhood of the generality of the religion of Islaam¹², being an original Kaafir in all of that. And this is also why Ibn Katheer states about

Islaam judge by their customs that Allaah has not revealed, 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 usSunnah (5/130)

¹² Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, “And we have come to know with the witness of our own eyes and overwhelming successive transmission as to what occurred in our time, when Genghis Khan emerged, the King of the Turks, the Unbelievers and what great evil befell Islaam. So no intelligent person will doubt that the domination (over the Muslims) brought about by the Unbelieving Mushriks, those who do not affirm the two testimonies of faith, and nor any of the other five pillars, and nor do they fast the month of Ramdaan, nor perform pilgrimage to the ancient House (the Ka'bah), nor do they believe in Allaah, or in His Angels, or in His Books or in His Messengers or the Last Day...” (Minhaaj usSunnah 6/372).

Shaikh ul-Islam also said, “They make the deen of Islaam equivalent to the deen of the Jews and the Christians, and that all of these are ways to Allaah, at the same level as the four madhhabs with the Muslims - and then amongst them are those who favours the deen of the Jews or that of the Christians and amongst them is one who favours the deen of the Muslims” (Majmoo' Fataawaa 28/523).

He also said, “Even their leader, this vile, infidel, munaafiq authored a book in which is contained: 'that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) was pleased with the deen of the Jews and the Christians and that he did not

the Jews, in ascribing kufr to them, **“because they rejected (jahadoo)¹³ the judgement of Allaah, doing that intently, out of resistance and wilfulness”** as he said himself in his tafseer (2/61).

And it is here we understand the words of at-Tabaree quoted earlier, “...But if someone should say that Allaah, Exalted is His remembrance, has made this general for everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, so how have you made it specific (for the Kuffaar amongst the People of the Book)?”. It is said in reply, “Allaah the Most High has generalised this for a people who rejected (jaahideen) the judgement of Allaah that He had decreed in His Book (the Tawrah). So he informed them that by their leaving this judgement **in the manner that they did¹⁴** they are Kuffaar. And this is the same saying (i.e. view) concerning everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has **revealed due to rejection (juhood)** (i.e rejecting it is from what Allaah has revealed), for such a one is a disbeliever in Allaah, just as Ibn Abbaas said, **“Because in his rejection (juhood) of the judgement¹⁵ of Allaah after his knowledge that He revealed it in His Book¹⁶, he is equivalent to one who**

reject them (for that) and that they were not rebuked nor forbidden from their religion and nor were they commanded to convert to Islaam.” (Majmoo’ Fataawaa 28/523).

He also said, “So such a one, and those like him from among those who have preceded them, his aim after accepting Islaam was to make Muhammad (sallaahu alaihi wasallam) at the same level as this cursed one (meaning Genghis Khan) and it is known that Musaylamah al-Kadhhaab was less harmful to the Muslims than this one - and he claimed that he was a partner to Muhammad in Messengership - and for this reason the Sahaabah declared it permissible to kill him and to kill those apostates with him. So how then for the one who - from what he displays from Islaam - makes Muhammad like Genghis Khan?” (Majmoo’ Fataawaa 28/522).

¹³ AN IMPORTANT NOTE ABOUT JUHOOD

The Qutubi and Suroori School of Doctrine asserts that Juhood (rejection, denial) is the not to act upon something, or to abandon something, and this is baatil (false), since it is not necessarily the case that refusal to act upon something or the abandonment of something necessitates Juhood absolutely. If the abandonment of something necessitated Juhood absolutely, then why have the Salaf differed concerning the takfir of the one who abandons the prayer, while they are unanimously agreed that the one who leaves it while rejecting (juhood) its obligation is a Kaafir. What is the point of difference then, and why should there be a difference amongst them if they had understood Juhood to be what the Qutubiyah and Khaarijiyah Asriyah have understood it to be? (Refer to the tapes “Al-Fawaariq al-Jaliyyah Bayna ad-Da’wah as-Salafiyyah wal-Madrasah al-Qutubiyah as-Surooriyyah” of Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri who explains this point.). And perhaps what explains the meaning and concept of Juhood is what is quoted by at-Tabari from Ibn Abbaas, “Whoever rejects (jahada) what Allaah has revealed has disbelieved, and whoever affirms (aqarra) it but does not judge by it then he is an oppressor, a sinner.”

¹⁴ And the manner in which they did that (i.e. the Jews) has already preceded in what has occurred above. And that is that they rejected the judgement of Allaah in the Tawrah out of Juhood (rejection, denial), invented their own judgement, and then ascribed it to Allaah.

¹⁵ And rejection or denial (juhood) of the judgement here does not mean “not to act upon it”, but it means to reject it as being from Allaah. And the Qutubiyah have attempted to twist and distort this statement of at-Tabaree and tried to convey that juhood here means in terms of action, i.e. that one merely resists it in his action. But this very saying of Ibn ‘Abbaas quoted by at-Tabaree refutes this distortion, when one reflects upon it.

¹⁶ Like the Jews knew the judgement of Allaah in the Tawrah(!!)

rejects the Prophethood of His Prophet after having knowledge that he (Muhammad) is His Prophet". End of quote from at-Tabaree.

And compare what at-Tabaree has stated to what has been said by Imaam al-Albaani, "...In conclusion: the verse was revealed with regards to the Jews who rejected (jahadoo) what Allaah had revealed, **so the one who associates with them in this rejection, then he is a kaafir, with kufr in belief. And the one who does not associate with them in this rejection then his kufr is in action, because he has performed an action of theirs.** And he is a sinful criminal (mujrim aathim), but he is not ejected from the religion due to this as has preceded from ibn Abbaas (radiallaahu anhu). And al-Imaam Abu Ubaid al-Qaasim bin Sallaam explained this and increased upon this explanation in 'Kitaab al-Eemaan', chapter "leaving faith due to sin" (pg. 84- 96 with my tahqeeq), so the one desiring further research should refer to this. After writing what has preceded I saw ibn Taymiyyah, may Allaah have mercy upon him, saying in the explanation of the verse in his 'Majmoo al-Fataawaa' (3/268), "meaning he regards it permissible to rule by other than what Allaah revealed." Silsilah as-Saheehah (vol 6. no.2552)

Thirdly, what Genghis Khan concocted by mixing various laws and legislations together and what he called al-Yasaa or al-Yaasiq, then if any of the Rulers of today do the same, and bring a new Sharee'ah **and claim it is from Allaah**, then they are like him (leaving aside his other beliefs of Shirk and Kufr), since they have now fell into the Juhood (wilful denial and rejection) that the Tartars and Genghis Khan fell into, and also what the Jews fell into. And if they do not claim it is from Allaah, then the well-known tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of making takfir of the ruler who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed applies. Because now their action is no longer representative of tabdeel as it is correctly understood, rather it is synonymous with ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, and so they share with the Kuffaar in their action of not ruling by what Allaah has revealed, but they are different to the Kuffar, from the point of view of their belief. Unless, they hold other beliefs which entail kufr, whether in relation to the law of Allaah or to other than it.¹⁷

And hence the tafseel of the Salaf applies to this situation. And this is what occurs in the saying of Ibn al-Qayyim, "And as for the replaced law (al-hukm al-mubaddal) - **and that is ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed** - then it is not permissible to implement it nor to act by it, and it is not permissible to follow it, and the one guilty of it (saahibuhu) is between (the states) of kufr (disbelief), fusooq (rebellion) and dhulm (oppression)." (Kitaab ur-Rooh p.394). And as we have explained here, the tabdeel referred to here by Ibn al-

¹⁷ And when we look at why some of the contemporary scholars have made takfir of the likes of al-Gadaffi and Saddam Hussain, then we can see that it is due to what they have professed with their tongues of statements of kufr and their beliefs concerning Islaam, that it is not suitable for our times, or that what they invented of laws and constitutions (or what they are upon of Communism and Ba'thism) are better and superior and more suited to the times, or that they can choose between Islaam and Communism. So this is takfir based upon Juhod, or Istihlaal, or I'tiqaad and the likes, and it is not what neo-Qutubism imagines. So again we re-iterate that we do not negate takfir of the rulers as is falsely claimed about us, but we negate the extremism and exaggeration in this respect, which has led people to wallow in the madhhab of the Khawaarij and make takfir without adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf. And this is what actually happens with all the Groups of Innovation, that when they innovate and are then refuted, they accuse Ahl us-Sunnah of the other extreme of what they themselves are upon, and this is why the neo-Kharijite Think Tank has accused Ahl us-Sunnah of being Murji'ah, because they do not perform takfir of the one who abandons prayer out of laziness and neglect and because they do not perform absolute unrestricted takfir of the Rulers of today.

Qayyim is not synonymous with that which has been defined earlier from the quotations on the understanding of tabdeel with the Salaf.

And this is also alluded to by Imaam ash-Shanqeetee who stated, “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).

This section from Imaam ash-Shanqeetee’s tafseer is often omitted and not quoted by the Neo-Qutubites and those of their ilk, since it only further supports what we have tended to and it also clarifies his statements made elsewhere, in which he makes a generalised or absolute statement. And likewise ash-Shanqeetee also said in the course of his tafseer of the verse in Surah Kahf (18:26), “And He makes none to share in His judgement”, he said, “And as for the legislative code 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).**”¹⁸

And then also reflect, O Sunni, upon 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.** Similarly 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 Mufassiroon 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).

¹⁸ Refer also to “Juhood ash-Shaikh ash-Shanqeetee Fee Taqreer Aqeedat is-Salaf” (pp. 182-183), a treatise of Abdul-Azeez Bin Saalih at-Tawiyaan released by the Centre for Knowledge-Based Research at the University of Madinah, and which also has an introduction by Shaikh Saalih al-Ubood, and Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbaad, in which the author explains that Imaam ash-Shanqeetee tends to the tafseel of the Salaf in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, and that the various statements made by Imaam ash-Shanqeetee are not to be applied and understood unrestrictedly.

Finally, in all of what we have discussed, we neither support the tyranny of the tyrants and nor the oppression of the oppressors. Rather, we support only the Sharee'ah and what is requires of exactness, care and caution and of submitting to the truth, no matter how difficult it may be to accept.

For we, like all Muslims, hope and aspire for the day when the Sharee'ah reigns supreme. But we know of a surety, that the Qutubi Khaarijee way, or the Suroori way, or the Turaathi way is certainly not the way that the Sharee'ah will be made to return. Indeed it will return on account of the implementation of the Manhaj of Nubuwwah, the Prophetic Manhaj, that about which Imaam Maalik said, "The latter part of this Ummah will not be rectified except by that which rectified its earlier part". The very manhaj that the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Salman al-Awdah, Muhammad Suroor, Safar al-Hawaali, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and others have made subject to Ijtihad and to either acceptance or rejection!!

As for the so-called Ijmaa' that is supposed to exist (concerning the kufr of the one who rules by secular laws), then it exists only in the mind of the neo-Qutubites and those like them. Rather, they twist and distort the statements of the scholars and selectively quote from them, in order to prove this so called Ijmaa'. And inshaa'allaah, this will be dealt with in some future papers, if Allaah wills, but the essence of the matter and the reply to them lies in knowing their false understanding of what is tabdeel, and that when we bring together all of the sayings of the scholars on these issues, put them side by side and analyse them, we find that they all emanate from the same lamp and same fountain, and that they are indeed based upon the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard, and that some of them explain others and so on, even though some of them may be absolute, or unrestricted ambiguous in their import. And none of this was disputed until the neo-Qutubites thrust the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb upon the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah, the manhaj, the innovated manhaj that revolves around al-Haakimiyyah alone, not the all inclusive al-Haakimiyyah, but the narrow, restricted Haakimiyyah which entails takfir of Rulers, Nation States and Civilians with absolutism, and this will be made clear in a future paper inshaa'allaah.

SUMMARY

It is important to make careful note of the following points:

1. The wording of the saying of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah
2. The Partisans amongst the Qutubiyyah and others often clip the last part of the quote which makes mention of Istihlaal (making the unlawful lawful).
3. The two opinions alluded to by Shaikh ul-Islam
4. The meaning of tabdeel as understood by looking into the incidents for which the verses in al-Maa'idah were revealed, how the Mufasssireen, such as at-Tabaree have explained these verses, and how numerous Scholars, Shaikh ul-Islam included, have explained the meaning of tabdeel.
5. That tabdeel has been used by some Scholars (i.e. Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn Baaz) with a meaning that is actually synonymous with ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. This is also observed by contemporary scholars such as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (rahimahullaah) who uses the words Istibdaal and calls it ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.¹⁹
6. The true nature and reality of Genghis Khan, the fact that he was not Muslim at all, and the various beliefs of Kufr and Shirk that he was upon.
7. The incorrectness of judging the present day rulers to be equivalent to Genghis Khan from the point of view of being the same as him in his beliefs and what he was upon in terms of belief and religion in general.
8. The incorrectness of judging the present day rulers to have fallen into the tabdeel of Genghis Khan, that is the tabdeel understood and explained by the Scholars quoted above, since none of the Rulers of today are upon that.
9. The plausibility of judging the present day rulers to be equivalent to Genghis Khan from the point of view of action, if what is meant by tabdeel is synonymous to what Ibn al-Qayyim intended by it in Kitaab ur-Rooh, and to how it has been mentioned in the fatwaa of Imaam Ibn Baaz quoted earlier on tabdeel, since they do take from other constitutions and judge by them (but they do not claim they are from Allaah!).

¹⁹ Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, "And ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is of two types: The first type: that the ruler **replaces (yastabdilu)** the law of Allaah the exalted by this law whilst he has knowledge of the law of Allaah but he holds that the opposing law is more befitting and more beneficial for the servants than the rule of Allaah or that it is equal to the law of Allaah or that turning away from the law of Allaah is permissible (jaa'iz) - so therefore, he makes this law (qaanoon) the one that it is obligatory to refer back to for judgement (yajib at-Tahaakum ilaihi) - so the likes of this one is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion and that is because he is not pleased with Allaah as his Lord, Muhammad as his Messenger and Islaam as his religion..." (Fataawaa 2/145).

10. The necessity of adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard, since though the actions of the Muslim rulers bear resemblance to those of the Kuffaar in from the point of view of action, they are not similar to them in their belief, unless they are holding beliefs of kufr.

CLOSING REMARKS

The Khawaarij of the Era twist and distort and lie in order to run away from this tafseel, so that they can be left free to act upon their plan and agenda, takfir and khurooj and to occupy the youth with takfir of the Rulers, studying the constitutions, looking at fiqh ul-waaqi' etc. This is the starting point and end point of their da'wah, and this is what they become engrossed with. Then they accuse Ahl us-Sunnah of being ignorant and not knowing the true state of affairs. However, they have failed to understand what is actually in dispute here.

Takfir of the Rulers is not in dispute, but how do we arrive at that? The way of the Salaf, past and present, is adherence to the tafseel (clarification, distinction) that has been covered in this discourse, and then based upon that where takfir is applicable it is applied, with recourse to the Ulamaa and bearing in mind the benefits and harms resulting from applying this ruling and causing commotion about it. So the Salaf treat these affairs seriously, because serious consequences result from them. As for the neo-Qutubites and those poisoned by them, then they make absolute, unrestricted and generalised takfir, as if it is being served on a plate to all and sundry. So they have fallen into extremism in this regard.

The da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah is different to theirs. There are none from the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah who are actually with the Takfiris or the Khawaarij in their manhaj. Since as we have seen the Ulamaa have opposed them in all of the various points of methodology that they deviated in (refer to SLF010004 and MSC050003). But what they do is they use the words and statements of some of the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah to prove their positions and viewpoints, and then accuse everybody else of falling into taqleed!! But they twist and distort these statements and apply them in a manner – that after careful investigation and analysis – cannot be applied.

Let the Qutubiyah bring a knowledge-based reply, not the usual whimsical sentiments and emotions and half-quotations and false understandings and statements out of context and so on, let them bring a reply...let them research first, then hold their belief, not the other way round.

No doubt the Qutubiyah will attempt to bring their replies, but they are all devoid of knowledge and justice and they have already been anticipated and they will be dealt a death-blow in what is yet to come, if Allaah wills. And all of this is from the perspective of safeguarding the correct understanding of this noble Religion and this pure Manhaj, not for the sake of "supporting the thrones of the tyrants", as the Kharijite Renegades have accused the Salaf with ever since the time of Abu Mijliz. So understand!!

So inshaa'allaah in what is yet to come the issue of Tashree' ul-Aaam will be discussed as well as the issues relating to Juhood, and this will repel what has been advanced by the Madrasah of Qutubiyah (the Qutubi School of Doctrine) and what has been presented to the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah by this School, leading them to confusion.

May prayers and peace be upon the Messenger of Allaah, his family, his companions and whoever follows him upon Tawheed and the Sunnah till the affair is established.

ADDENDUM: THE ROAD TO QUTUBISM

Stated the Qutubist of the West, Ali Timimi –in his mockery and ridicule of the People of the Sunnah, their Imaams and Mashaayikh, “Also among their deviant concepts was that the removal of the sharia and its replacement by secular law was only a sin, albeit kufr duna kufr, and not apostasy and moreover to preach to the necessity of Allah's sharia being supreme and that all judgement be by His sharia and to His sharia was among the ways of the Khawarij and an innovation in the religion”.

BENEFIT:

Aboo Qulaabah said: “Do not sit with them and do not mix with them for I do not feel safe that they will not drown you in their misguidance and confuse you about much that you used to know.” Laalika’ee in Sharh Usul ul-I’tiqad (244).

And unfortunately, this is what happened to this Qutubi, for aforesaid he was rightly guided and adhered to the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyah. But then the Innovators got access to his hearing and thus he became beguiled and it was only a short while later that he began to beguile others.

As for his saying, “...Also among their deviant concepts was that the removal of the sharia and its replacement by secular law was only a sin, albeit kufr duna kufr, and not apostasy...”, then what does he mean by replacement? Either he is confused, and does not know the way the Salaf have used the word tabdeel, or he holds on to an understanding of tabdeel that is erroneous. So if he means by tabdeel that a Ruler replaces the Sharee’ah with something else and claims that this new rule or law is from Allaah and from His Sharee’ah, then this tabdeel is no doubt major kufr absolutely. No one disputes this. So in this case, what the Qutubi has stated above is a fabrication and a mighty lie against Ahl us-Sunnah. And if what he means by replacement is what has been referred to by Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn Baaz, al-Albaani and many others, in that it is synonymous with ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, when one judges by the secular laws instead of the Sharee’ah laws and refers to them, then in this case the well-known tafseel of the Salaf applies in this case. So if this action is accompanied with juhood, or istihlaal or beliefs which necessitate kufr, then this is major kufr, otherwise it is minor kufr, or kufr less than kufr.

And as for his saying, “...and moreover to preach to the necessity of Allah's sharia being supreme and that all judgement be by His sharia and to His sharia was among the ways of the Khawarij and an innovation in the religion”, then we say:

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 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.²⁰ End of Shaikh ul-Islam's words.

So we say to this Qutubi, 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 mentors and leaders of this Qutubi 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 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-Islam, 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. So we say, yes O Qutubi, you indeed were affected by the methodology of Qutubism, which came to you from the direction of these people, after you mixed with the Innovators of IANA, and yes, your preaching the superiority of the Sharee'ah was from the perspective of which Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab has mentioned above, and this was the perspective that your mentors and leaders, the likes of Sayyid Qutb and Muhammad Qutb, Muhammad Suroor, Salman al-Awdah and Safar al-Hawali were actually coming from.

²⁰ 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.

Now, O Sunni, to close this chapter, reflect very carefully on the following and bear in mind that the reason why this Qutubi wages a war against us is because we tended to tafsil, clarification on the issue of the takfir of the ruler who judges by other than the Sharee'ah.

The Qutubi was asked (in 1993) in one of his lectures in the UK:

Question: "You mentioned an issue [earlier on in the lecture] but, I don't think you went into it [enough]. [It concerns] the issue of Ahl Sunnah wal Jama'ah not revolting against... the legitimate rulers - you said: 'rulers'. In this sense [then, concerning] the rulers nowadays; is there consensus of opinion (ijmaa) from the 'Ulamaa concerning the rulers [as to] whether they are Kuffaar or not Kuffaar?... and if they're not Kuffaar... how is it for us to sit with those people - not [necessarily] scholars - but those people who call themselves 'students of Knowledge', and who make takfeer of the rulers?"

Answer: "This is a good question... The question now, is concerning the rulers of today. And the only way we can understand this issue is to understand, what?... When does a ruler become a disbeliever, by not ruling by the Sharee'ah, and when is he not a disbeliever, [but is] considered sinful in this matter?..."

Whenever a ruler believes, that ruling by the Sharee'ah is something which is... optional for him - whether he [feels that] he can do it if he wants to, or not - [he feels that] it's not something that is obligatory on him - he is a disbeliever, he is outside Islam; [just] like the Jew and the Christian.

Likewise, **if he believes that the law which he is ruling by, whether it's French law... Anglo law, American law - whatever [it may be]²¹ or [even] something which he's devised himself - [if he believes that this] is better than Allah's Sharee'ah, or [even] equal to Allah's Sharee'ah, he has left the fold of Islam.**²²

But, if the ruler says that the Sharee'ah is the best way, and that we're obligated to follow the Sharee'ah... to rule by the Sharee'ah - **yet he doesn't do it in some instances, or [even] in most of his instances²³, or in few instances** - then this person is not a disbeliever. [And] I'll give you an example:

²¹ And this is what we continue to hold in light of the decisive proofs and evidences contained in the words of the Ulamaa of the Salaf, past and present, and with a correct knowledge-based understanding, inshaa'allaah, that ruling by the secular laws is not kufr akbar to begin with, but only becomes so when accompanied with the beliefs mentioned above.

²² And this is the tafsil that the Salaf of our times, the likes of Imaam al-Albani, Imaam Ibn Baz and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimin have tended to on this issue.

²³ Now consider this well, the former Sunni turned Qutubi explains that a Ruler may be ruling by French, American or English Law but if he does not hold the associated beliefs which necessitate kufr, but rather rules by these laws in some instances, **or most instances**, or a few instances, then he is not a Kaafir. And this is what the vast majority of the Muslim Rulers of today are upon with respect to the Sharee'ah. Hence, whoever amongst them is upon this in their action, then takfir is not to be made of him, unless there appears what

The person who says that 'khamar': wine, is haraam – 'it's haraam.' - however, he still drinks it... we say that he is not a disbeliever - [according to the belief of] Ahl Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah - even if he drinks [all] night and day, and he's a drunkard. But, if he says that khamar is not haraam – 'is not haraam' - and that 'it's lawful for me'²⁴, that [for instance, he believes that] he has reached a stage of 'piety', [and] that these rules no longer apply to him, or [he believes that] this was something for the 'old days' [but], as for now; there's no problem with that [anymore]... then, this person is a disbeliever.²⁵

[So], the only way to know about the ruler - [as in], if he's a disbeliever or not - [is] if he expresses his belief.²⁶ So, if the ruler says: 'Socialism is the way for the Ummah to go, and

indicates that what he judges by is considered by him to be superior, and better, or that it is permissible and lawful to judge by the secular laws that they judge by and so on.

The way of the Khawaarij is to make binding from a person's action that which is not binding. So they say, a person would not have committed zinaa' or drunk wine, while he knows it to be forbidden, unless he declared it lawful. So they make binding from a person's action that which is not actually binding. And this is what the likes of Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah fell into of the madhhab of the Khawaarij (refer to GRV070003, Elementary Qutubism), and for which they still have not repented.

Then on top of that they are confused about the meaning of tabdeel, so they then say that the ruler who "replaces the deeds of the Sharee'ah with other deeds then he is a kaafir". And what they merely mean is that he does not rule by other than what Allaah has revealed in most of his instances, but instead adopts other laws. So they are utterly confused about the issue of tabdeel, and in their confusion, utter falsehood. But they use these kinds of words and phrases which is but beautified speech that is full of vanities, in order to portray something that is other than the true reality. And inshaa'allaah we will explain this in detail in another paper, exposing the misguidance of the Qutubist of the West, Ali Timimi, and his affectation to innovation and its people – after he had been upon guidance.

²⁴ Perhaps this Qutubi might compare these words of his in which he outlines the doctrine of Ahl us-Sunnah with what has been said by Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah concerning the sinners, those who fall into zinaa, drinking and singing and the likes. Refer to these quotations in GRV070003 "Elementary Qutubism". And perhaps he might ask them to give sincerity of purpose to the Salafi Aqidah and repent for their wallowing in the madhhab of the Khawaarij by condemning the sinners to eternal damnation in Jahannam, as was verbally stated by them. Perhaps he might see it fit to spread the verdicts of Imaam Ibn Baaz and those of the Permanent Committee on this issue, which are known, so that the youth are not misled by this doctrine – just like he did with the verdicts of the Permanent Committee on the books of Shaikh Ali Hasan. Let him show sincerity of purpose and abandon his partisanship which has led him into this pitiful state and of which he has made an exemplary display of in recent times.

²⁵ Note how he has used the example of "khamr" to illustrate the understanding of the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. And this is in conformity with the view of the Salaf that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is like the other sins such as drinking, fornicating, stealing and so on, with some of its forms being of greater sin and closer to kufr than the others, but not reaching the level of major kufr, unless accompanied with the beliefs listed above, or out of juhood (denial) and the likes. And this is what we continue to hold as our religion concerning ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, following our Ulamaa in that, the likes of Imaam Ibn Baz, Imaam al-Albani and others, while rejecting the Imaams of Qutubiyah, the likes of Sayyid and Mohammad Qutb.

²⁶ And this is the very reason for which we and our Mashayikh and Imaams are now accused of being Murji'ah, Jahmiyyah!!

the Sharee'ah is barbaric²⁷, or [he says that it] is 'backward' - or [that] 'it does not achieve justice'... then this man is a Kaafir. He's outside the fold of Islam.

But, if the ruler says, that we must apply the Sharee'ah, and [that] the Sharee'ah is Truth, and Justice and the right way - but yet, in some things he (the ruler) does not apply the Sharee'ah - [then, in this case] he is sinful, he's a faasiq.

So this is the difference ²⁸..." End of the Qutubi's words.

Well what can we say? We can but say that his words were in conformity to those of Imaam Ibn Baz when asked, "Is replacement [of the Shariah] with the secular law considered the kufr that expels from the religion? Shaikh Bin Baz's answer: **"When he declares this to be permissible (istibaaha) then he is considered a disbeliever with the major kufr (kufr akbar).** However, if he does this due to specific reasons, such as bribery, to please certain people, whilst knowing that this is forbidden, then he has disbelieved with the lesser kufr (kufr doona kufr)²⁹. **As for when he does this while declaring it to be permissible (mustabeehan), then this is the major kufr, meaning that he has declared it lawful (istahalla) to rule by the secular law and not the Shari'ah. Then such a one is a kafir (disbeliever).**

However, when he does this due to certain reasons such as bribery, or enmity (to someone, a group of people, etc.), or to please certain people and matters similar to this, then this is the lesser kufr (kufr doona kufr). **This ruling covers all the various manifestations [of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed], whether it is tabdeel (replacement [of the Shari'ah]) or other than tabdeel. And it is obligatory upon the wali ul-amr (the ruler) to refrain from that and to rule by the shari'ah of Allaah.**" (Hiwaar Hawla Masaa'il it-Takfeer Ma'a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz).

But as for now... then the affair is not like that, because the Innovators took him away from Imaam Ibn Baz and the remainder of the Salaf.

The final question that must be asked:

Which of the two is it? Either the Qutubi used to be a Murji' [and Jahmi] himself as he now calls us³⁰ (being so due to the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albani and Imaam Ibn

²⁷ It is interesting to note that Sayyid Qutb (as do many of the Ikhwanis) calls for the adoption of Socialism and also calls for the abolition of slavery for the reason that it was only a prevailing custom in the earlier times and Islam merely adopted it(!). And for this he was refuted by Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan who said that this is a statement of kufr. But justice is very rare to find these days.

²⁸ And this is what we continue to say is the difference.

²⁹ This tafsil, clarification, used to be the way of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah in the days of old to this Qutubi and now it has become a deviant concept, as he stated, "Also among their deviant concepts was that the removal of the sharia and its replacement by secular law was only a sin, albeit kufr duna kufr".

³⁰ For claiming that the Ruler can only become a disbeliever due to what is in his heart, or by verbally expressing his belief. The Qutubi came out of the closet in recent times (after concealing his true manhaj for a number of years) and openly expressed his hatred and enmity towards the Salafi Mashaayikh and the general

Uthaimen and others who are the source of this teaching on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed) and then he became a Sunni and Salafi at the hands of Sayyid Qutb, Hassan al-Banna, Mohammad Qutb, Mawdudi, Salman al-Awdah, Safar al-Hawali and others from the neo-Qutubite Think Tank, from amongst those who entertain the doctrine of the Khawarij.

Or the Qutubi used to be a Sunni and Salafi (at the hands of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albani and others) and then he became a Qutubi, Takfiri and Harakiyy (Activist) at the hands of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and the remainder of the activists.

We'll leave the reader to make the judgement.

This is what happens when you abandon the Salafi Manhaj of Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimen and of the Salaf before them, the likes of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim and others, start mixing with the Innovators, debating with them, lending an ear to them, prying into their books, and instead turn to the manhaj of the Heretical Innovators, walking around with the books of Muhammad Qutb at-Takfiri under your armpits. This is also what happens when you make your leaders and guides the likes of Salman al-Awdah, Safar al-Hawali, Muhammad Sa'eed al-Qahtani, Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid and other neo-Qutubites, whose Qutubi manhaj is all but apparent to anyone with the slightest understanding of the Salafi Manhaj, and whose praising and aggrandising of the Innovators is all but apparent, wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

O Allaah protect us from misguidance after guidance and ignorance after knowledge and establish our hearts upon Sunnah and Salafiyah, O Turner of the Hearts, and protect us from the deviant concepts and cancerous teachings.

body of Ahl us-Sunnah, by calling them "Murji'ah Not Salafis", as he said in his own words, and other extreme words similar to these – may Allaah guide him back to his senses and to the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyah which he used to be upon.