



## Shaykh Abdul-Azeez ar-Raajihee on Secular Laws, Changing the Whole of the Deen, and the Accusation of Irjaa' Against Ahl us-Sunnah

Trans. Spubs.Com

Shaykh Abdul-Azeez Ar-Raajihee was asked, **“This person asks about the Sharee'ah ruling concerning the ruler who rules by the French secular laws alongside the knowledge that he claims Islaam, prayers, fasts and makes hajj. So what is to be said about him?”**

The Answer: When he believes in [their] permissibility (i'taqada al-jawaaz), when he believes that judgement by the French [secular] laws is permissible, then he is a kaafir. When he believes that it is permissible for him [to do that].

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

And some of the people of knowledge have held that when he alters the religion (ghayyara ad-deen) in all of the affairs of the state, then he is a kaafir, because he has changed (baddala) the religion, and al-Haafidh Ibn Katheer (rahimahullaah) has gone to this [view] in his tafseer, and also Shaykh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem (rahimahullaah) in his treatise “Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen”. So when he changes the religion, the whole of it, from head to heel (i.e. top to bottom), in all of the affairs of the state, in everything - not in part of it - then he is a kaafir, because he has altered the religion.

And then some others have said that it is necessary for the proof to be established against him, for he could be ignorant, or have some doubt (shubhah). Our respected Shaykh, Abdul-Azeez Bin Baaz (may Allaah's mercy upon him), chose this view.” [SA63 @ SalafiAudio.Com]

And the Shaykh was also asked, **“What is the saying of the respected Shaykh 'Abdul-'Azeez Bin Baaz (rahimahullaah taa'ala) concerning takfir on account of abandonment of judging by what Allaah has revealed, and is his saying, and the saying of al-Albaani, and Muhammad Ibn Uthaymeen (alaihim**

**rahmatullaahi) the saying of “the Murji'ah of the Era”? (i.e. as some people say).**

So the Shaykh replied:

“No. It is not the saying of “the Murji'ah of the Era”. Ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed has tafseel (detail) to it.

If he rules by other than what Allaah has revealed, believing (mu'taqidan) that it does not suite the times (i.e. what Allaah revealed), then this is the greatest of people in disbelief. This is great disbelief, when he judges by other than what Allaah revealed, believing that judging by the Sharee'ah does not suit the times, and that judging by the secular laws is suited to these times. So this is disbelief without doubt.

The second situation is that he rules by other than what Allaah has revealed, believing (mu'taqidan) that he has a choice between judging by the secular laws and judging by what Allaah has revealed, and that they are both the same. This is disbelief by agreement.

The third situation is that he rules by other than what Allaah has revealed and he believes that ruling by what Allaah has revealed is better than ruling by the secular laws, but that it is permissible to rule by the secular laws. This is disbelief by agreement also, since he declared ruling by other than what Allaah revealed to be permissible, and ruling by other than what Allaah revealed is haraam (forbidden), which is known in the religion by necessity, such as the one who declared fornication (zinaa) to be permissible, and said “I am not committing zinaa” or the one who declared usury (riba) to be permissible, and said “I am not consuming interest”. Then likewise, the one who declared ruling by the secular laws to be permissible and then said “Ruling by the Sharee'ah is superior”, then he disbelieves by agreement.

So these are three manifestations. Three situations.

The fourth situation is that he rules by the customs, habits, such as the bedouin, who judges by the (ancestral) customs, habits. This is major disbelief.

The fifth situation is that he changes the Sharee'ah, in that he judges, from head to heel, in that he changes the whole of the Sharee'ah, in all of the affairs of the state, all of them, from their first to the last of them, from head to heel. So some of the scholars have tended to this (view), in that he disbelieves because he changed the (whole) deen, and al-Haafidh Ibn Katheer (rahimahullaah) has tended to this, this is what has been said, (i.e. about Ibn Katheer). And this was also chosen by Shaykh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem (rahimahullaah) in his risaalah “Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen”.

However, others have said, that it is necessary for it to be explained to the ruler, because he could be ignorant, and could have some doubt (shubhah) with him, and this has been chosen by the respected Shaykh 'Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz (rahimahullaah) and likewise, Shaykh Muhammad bin Uthaymeen chose this also.

And this is in relation to the fifth situation, meaning, the one who said that he disbelieves because he changed the whole deen, from head to heel. This is when it is in all of the affairs of the state, and as for when it is partial, and in partial matters, then no. And then amongst them (who hold takfir of the one who changed all of the deen), are those who say that it is necessary for the proof to be established upon him.

**Questioner: “May Allaah be benevolent to you, what is the advice to those foolish ones and those groups of pretenders (to knowledge) who accuse those scholars of being Murji'ah?”**

The Shaykh replied, “The advice to them is that they repent to Allaah the Mighty and Majestic, and that they learn knowledge before they speak, and that upon them is to learn knowledge before they speak. And upon them is to repent to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic for that in which they have been neglectful in their words, and that they hold back their tongues from speakign without knowledge, and speaking about Allaah without knowledge is from the greatest of major sins, and Allaah put it above Shirk with Allaah.

**Say: “(But) the things that my Lord has indeed forbidden are Al-Fawâhish (great evil sins, every kind of unlawful sexual intercourse, etc.) whether committed openly or secretly, sins (of all kinds), unrighteous oppression, joining partners (in worship) with Allâh for which He has given no authority, and saying things about Allâh of which you have no knowledge.” (Al-A'raf 7:33)**

Meaning, that it includes Shirk and also other than Shirk, he also made it to be from the desire of Shaytaan (i.e. to make them speak without knowledge) in His saying:

**O mankind! Eat of that which is lawful and good on the earth, and follow not the footsteps of Shaitân (Satan). Verily, he is to you an open enemy. [Shaitân (Satan)] commands you only what is evil and Fahshâ (sinful), and that you should say against Allâh what you know not. (Al-Baqarah 2:168-169)” End. [SA20 @ SalafiAudio.Com]**

And finally, the Shaykh also mentioned, and this is recorded on cassette and in RealAudio format, “So we advise the youth away from these false explanations, and the state, walhamdulillaah, is a state of Tawheed and judges by the Legislation of Allaah. This is the state (dawlah) of Tawheed,

there is no other dawlah on the face of the earth that is a dawlah of Tawheed<sup>1</sup>, which judges by the Islamic Sharee'ah, except this dawlah, so I advised the youth away from these false explanations, and these erroneous presumptions..."

---

<sup>1</sup> Editor's Note: The Shaykh intends Tawheed in its complete sense, which involves Uloohiyyah and Asmaa' was-Sifaat, for there is no dawlah that is upon the aqeedah of Tawheed completely from all angles, including Asmaa was-Sifaat, and with absence of grave worship and tombs, and absence of Ta'teel and Tahreef and Tafweedh, and which on top of that judges by the Sharee'ah, and has law courts and establishes the hudood. So besides Saudi Arabia, there is no state found like this. Alongside our acknowledgement of whatever deficiencies and shortcomings exist.

Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked: "What is your advice to the one who says that this dawlah (state) wages a war against the religion and causes repression against the du'at (callers)?"

Answer: "The Saudi state ever since it began has always aided the religion and its adherents. And it was not founded except upon this basis. And whatever it does at the moment in spending material wealth to support Muslims in every place, setting up centres and mosques, sending du'at (to other countries), printing books – at the forefront of which is the Noble Qur'an -, opening centres of learning and faculties of knowledge, and its judging by the Islamic Shari'ah (Tahkeemuhaa lish-Sharee'at il-Islaamiyyah), and also setting up a separate body for enjoining the good and forbidding the evil in every city – then all of this is a clear and evident proof of it's aid to Islam and its adherents. And this is thorn (shajiiyun, lit. grievance, distress) in the throats of the people of hypocrisy (Ahl un-Nifaq) and the people of evil and dissension (Shiqaq). And Allaah is the Aider of His religion even if the pagans and the biased partisans may detest it.

And we do not say that this state is perfect from every single aspect and that it does not have any mistakes. Mistakes occur by every single person and we ask Allaah that he helps this state in correcting its mistakes.

But if this person (who makes such a claim) was to look at his own self, he would find mistakes that would prevent his tongue from speaking about others and make him feel ashamed of looking at others." (al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah).

## Notes and Comments

1. Some of the Ulamaa have spoken of the situation in which a ruler abolishes the whole Sharee'ah, from head to heel, beginning to end, and so alters the whole deen, and have tended to the view that it is major kufr. And as others explain, the reason for this is that this indicates that he either hates the Sharee'ah (as Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen points out), or that he did not do this except that he makes istihlaal and considers what he rules with to be better and superior (Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen points this out as well), or that this act of his of abolishing the Sharee'ah completely, and bringing something else, from head to heel, top to bottom, is an evidence (daleel) to show his belief that he considers it to be better, and that whoever holds this belief is a kaafir (as explained by Shaykh Fawzaan as being the explanation of the view of Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem)<sup>2</sup>.

As for what is less than this, of judging by the secular laws – in greater or lesser amounts – then the well-known tafseel of the Salaf applies to this, and the most correct view is that it is not major kufr unrestrictedly.<sup>3</sup> And this is

---

<sup>2</sup> The following discussion is found on the tape “Questions and Answers on al-Haakimiyyah”, and can be heard at MNJ050014 @ SalafiPublications.Com:

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

Shaikh al-Fawzan: [Laughs]... is it due to hawaa (desire)?... the words are clear, there is no ambiguity in them, the words are clear. The distinction (tafsil) that is mentioned (i.e. previously in the beginning of the chapter) relates to them. And it was then said after that that the one who banishes the Shari'ah entirely and puts another law in its place, that this indicates that he views the [secular] law to be better than the Sharee'ah, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir [emphasis given]. This is in the same book itself... however they only take [from the book] according to their own understanding of it and what is of benefit to them, yet they abandon the rest of the words. If they had read the words from the beginning, the matter would have become clear [to them].

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

Shaikh al-Fawzan: Yes, it is the same. His words mean that the one who abolishes the Shari'ah and puts in its place another law, then this indicates that he considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah. And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.”

<sup>3</sup> Shaykh Ibn Jibreen said, “It is known that al-kufr al-bawah (manifest, clear kufr) is an open, outward matter, such as when he abolishes the teachings of Islaam, or we see him for example, destroying mosques, or he fights the people of the mosques (i.e. those who frequent them), or he abolishes the [Sharee'ah] law courts, or he abolishes the religious

lessons, for example, or we see him burning the copies of the Qur'aan, or that he orders for them to be burnt, and he promotes, assists the books of misguidance, the books of the Christians, and whatever resembles them, and he spreads them and makes reading them to be binding, or we see him erecting those things that are worshipped besides Allaah, such as idols and the likes. This is considered manifest, clear kufr.

As for the [types of] matters in which ijtihaad can enter into, then we alluded to one of these types last night. **And this is what the majority of the rulers (wullaat) are upon, from that which is called “judgement by the secular laws” (hukman bil-qawaaneen)**, such as these laws, overwhelmingly, the affair pertaining to them is that they consider benefit (maslahah) in them, **but they did not abolish the Sharee'ah with a complete abolition**, such that they do not judge with anything from it at all. Since Allaah said, **“And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed they are the disbelievers”** (5:44), **so the likes of these, when they have this angle of approach, then we do not speak of their kufr, but we consider them to be in error, in this ijtihaad which involves changing something from the legislation, even if it was by the path of ijtihaad. So for example, their permitting of zinaa [i.e. in action, not as a matter of belief], when it is with the consent of both parties, and likes their abandonment, or the abolition of the hudood, the punishment for stealing, or the punishment for false slander, or the punishment for drinking alcohol, or permitting alcohol, and announcing the selling of alcohol, and whatever resembles that. There is no doubt, that this is a great sin**, however there could be, for example, excuses for them, those in which they consider themselves to be justified (i.e. excused in that). So for example, they excuse themselves from this by saying that in their land they have those people who are not Muslim, and that being severe upon them will make them flee. So when they have an angle of approach, then Allaah will reckon them, but, in any case, there is no doubt that if we judged by the Shar', and implemented its teachings, there would be sufficiency in this and much good.” Cassette: Sharh Lum'uat il-I'tiqaad, No 7, Tasjeelaat at-Taqwaa, Riyaadh.

The saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in his Fataawaa (1/80) dated 9/1/1385H – five years after Tahkim ul-Qawanin was published: “And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of ‘Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah’ is by judging to his Shari’ah and confining oneself to that whilst rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allaah gave no authority. And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement **whilst believing in the correctness (sihhah) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that **without belief (I'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion.”

Imaam Ibn Baaz was also asked, “What is the ruling upon [judging] by secular law [al-qawanin al-wad'iyyah]? And is it permissible to enact them? And does a ruler become a disbeliever by instituting these laws [sannihi lihadhihil-qawanin]?”

Shaikh Bin Baz's answer: “When these laws are in agreement with the Shar'iah then there is no harm in that, such as when he institutes laws regarding the paths [of travel] and streets and other things which benefit the people and in which there is no opposition to the Shari'ah, - and [when] these things assist in the smooth running of the affairs, then there is no harm in them. As for those laws which oppose the Shari'ah then no [it is not permissible]. When he institutes these laws, the meaning of this is that there would be no hadd punishment for the fornicator and nor any punishment for the thief or the one who

what is found in many of the Muslim lands today, after centuries of colonisation by the Kuffar, who imported their laws into the Muslim lands, as well as the Muslim countries themselves adopting secular laws in aspects of their state and the organisation of its affairs.

However, there are those who disagree with the conception of this matter and state that this situation of a Muslim ruler who abolishes the Sharee'ah completely, from head to heel, and changes the whole deen, has never existed or been observed in the history of the Ummah (Genghis Khan, and Ataturk, both being non-Muslims, the latter a Macedonian Jew). Rather, what exists and has existed is the presence and adoption of secular laws in the Muslim lands, in greater and lesser amounts, and the vast majority of these laws were brought into the Muslim lands and instituted by the Colonialists and Imperialists. And they state that arriving at a ruling for this conceived situation ought to be based on the basic rule and principle in this matter which is that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is minor kufr, and becomes major kufr in the presence of juhood, istihlaal, i'tiqaad and so on, and that it is not differentiated between judging by one secular law and hundreds of them. Amongst those who hold this view is Shaykh al-Albaani, Shaykh Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad<sup>4</sup>, and also in the last of the views expressed by Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen (refer to MNJ050017). For a more detailed discussion of this issue (of total and partial replacement) refer to MNJ130016.

2. The originators of the accusation of Irjaa' against Ahl us-Sunnah were the followers and stooges of Sayyid Qutb, who under the influence of Qutb's

---

takes intoxicants. This is falsehood, and these laws are falsehood. When the one in charge declares them to be permissible (istahallahaa), then he has disbelieved, when he states (qaala) that they are lawful (halaal), and there is no harm in them, this is what becomes kufr (disbelief). Whoever declares to be lawful (istahalla) what Allaah has made unlawful has disbelieved". (Muraaji'aat Fi Fiqh ul-Waqi' as-Siyasi wal-Fikri (12) by 'Abdullaah ar-Rifa'ee)

<sup>4</sup> Shaikh 'Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad, in the Islamic University of Madinah, during his lesson, "Sharh Sunah Abu Dawood" on 16/11/1420H, was asked, "Is Istibdaal (replacing) the Islamic Sharee'ah with the Secular Laws (al-qawaneen al-wad'iyyah) kufr in and of itself? Or does it require the Istihlaal of the heart of belief (I'tiqaad) in its permissibility? And is there a difference between ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one instance, and between making the secular laws (al-qawaneen) as general legislation (tashree'an aammaan), while one believes that this is not permitted?"

So the Shaikh replied, "It is clear that there is no difference between ruling in a matter, or ten or a hundred or a thousand, or less or greater than that. There is no difference as long as a person considers himself to be in error, that he is doing what is evil (munkar), and that he is committing disobedience, and that he is fearful of sin, so this is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr). And as for Istihlaal, even if it was only in one matter, so he makes it lawful to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed, and considers it to be lawful, then this is kufr."

brother, Mohammad Qutb, got poisoned by the absolute and generalised takfir of Sayyid Qutb, which is his takfir based upon the absence of complete Sharee'ah rule, in every sphere, and in every aspect. Meaning, that to Qutb, either there is total Sharee'ah rule established, in all affairs, in which case there is sound Imaan, otherwise, in any situation less than complete Sharee'ah there is nothing but kufr. Hence, upon this he made takfir of all nation states, all Muslim societies, and claimed that the Ummah of Islam had been non-existent for centuries, due to their rejection, as he opined, of the principle requirement of Islaam, which he called "Haakimiyyah", having acquired this concept from Mawdoodi's own concept of the "Imaamah", which he made the principle aspect of the deen, and Mawdoodi himself took this concept from the Rafidee Shi'ites.

3. The stooges and frontmen of Aal Qutb, such as Safar al-Hawali and his firqah of Qutubiyyah, then resounded this doctrine of the Khawaarij, by employing some of the verdicts of the scholars who speak of the situation of the one who abolishes the whole of the Sharee'ah, from beginning to end, head to heel, top to bottom, in their apologetic works for the establishment and proliferation of the Qutubi doctrine. The generic objective and goal is to implant the same doctrine of Qutb into the minds of the general populace, which is that all nation states are states of kufr and apostasy, and to mobilise the masses or general populace into some sort of revolution. The stooges of Aal Qutb, like Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah, were only minor functionaries, at the practical level, whereas the ideologists of this methodology were often hidden behind the scenes, the likes of Mohammad Suroor, Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Abduh, Mohammad al-Ahmaree and others, who provided the ideological and inspirational framework for the lower level stooges and frontmen. Most people are unaware of this, until even many of the ignorant Qutubis themselves.

The following broad framework has been used in an attempt to achieve that objective:

- a) Approaching Ahl us-Sunnah first and foremost with the verdicts of some of the scholars that have spoken on the issue of the ruler who changes the whole of the deen, the whole Sharee'ah from top to bottom, indicating it is major kufr. Often this is intertwined with quotations from the likes of Mohammad Qutb, Sayyid Qutb, and others who have revived the madhhab of the Khawaarij in recent times. While noting that there are differences amongst the scholars in this issue, from the point of view of the conception of the matter, and also the tatbeeq (application) of the hukm (judgement) of kufr, as has preceded.
- b) Once, this has been achieved, or sufficiently proliferated, two separate paradigms (clusters of concepts and ideas) are deliberately confused in the minds of the audience, and this helps the neo-Qutubi Think

Tank to lay the foundations to enter the concepts of Sayyid Qutb, in an insidious, hidden, covert manner. And the explanation of this is as follows: Some of our scholars speak of a situation in which a Muslim ruler abolishes the Sharee'ah completely, from head to heel, top to bottom, such that nothing of it remains, and then changes it, and brings something else. This to them is major kufr for this ruler. Sayyid Qutb speaks of a situation in which perfect Sharee'ah rule does not exist, but that there is some deviation from this perfection. Thus, merely by the presence of some secular, non-Islamic laws in an Islamic country, he makes takfir of the ruler, the government, and also the subjects, when they live under this government, since to him, there is only Imaan or kufr, one or the other. So these are two separate concepts and ideas. The difference between them is clear. However, the neo-Qutubi Think Tank, using emotional methods and other intrigues, strive to remove the clear difference from the minds of the audience, so that the judgement of major kufr in the first situation (of total, complete abolition) which some of the scholars hold, can be transferred upon the situation in which Sayyid Qutb, wrongfully, passes the judgement of takfir upon whole nation states and governments and Muslim societies<sup>5</sup>. By this method, the doctrines of

---

<sup>5</sup> On Wednesday, the 22nd of Safar, 1422, Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan (hafidhahullaah) was asked the following question regarding the following saying of Salmaan al-'Awdah, "Eminent Shaykh, some of them say, "The banners which are raised in the length and width of the Islaamic world are but secular banners" (Taken from Salmaan al-'Awdah's well known cassette 'Yaa liJiraahaatil-Muslimeen'). What is the ruling regarding this saying?"

Shaykh Saalih (hafidhahullaah) said, "This saying is falsehood, passing general rulings upon people that they are disbelievers and secularists. That is mass Takfir, and Allaah's refuge is sought. Amongst the people are the believers, and amongst them are the disbelievers, and amongst them are the munaafiqoon (hypocrites), so we do not make generalized rulings upon them.

That's absolutely not permissible, to generalize kufr upon the people hence it be said, All of the people are Muslims. That is not true. Or that it be said; all of the people are disbelievers. That's not true. Or that it be said; all of the people are munaafiqoon. That is futile speech. Rather, we say: amongst the Muslims are truthful ones, and amongst them are hypocrites, and amongst them are disbelievers. (Taken from his Sharh of Kitaabut-Tawheed (22/02/1422)

Stated Sayyid Qutb, "The Ummah (of Islaam) has ceased to be in existence (ghaabat al-Ummah) and has not been perceivable for a very long time." (Ma'aalim fit-Tareeq p.8, 17th edition, 1991)

A Cassette Lecture entitled "Al-Ummah al-Ghaa'ibah" (The Absent Ummah) by Salman Awdah propounding the same concepts and being based upon the above quote from Sayyid Qutb. [Note Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan considers the use of this term to be Takfir of the whole Ummah – which is actually the intent of Sayyid Qutb. Refer to al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah]

Qutb have been entered into the minds of Ahl us-Sunnah, such that what follows of generalised takfir, and an Activist based methodology (as opposed to the Prophetic Methodology), with a narrow and restricted understanding of “Haakimiyyah”, can be quite easily set into motion, such that the true priorities, and starting points of da’wah and true rectification can be made secondary to the priorities of the methodologies and starting points devised by the Innovators. Reflect upon this well, as it will help you to understand many realities with respect to the confusion present today.

- c) Alongside all of this, the people will not suspect that they are upon the manhaj of Qutb, and think that they are upon the methodology of Ahl us-Sunnah and with the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah, whereas the reality is otherwise. For this reason you see that those from the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah whose viewpoints the Qutubiyyah and those affected by their doctrines think they are following, are actually the very same Scholars who oppose them and refute them for their generalised takfir and their opposition to the manhaj of the Salaf in many affairs (such as their method of dealing with and rectifying the rulers, their innovation of Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah, their thawree, revolutionary ways, their accommodation of the Innovators in their da’wah and many other issues).
- d) It is in this scenario (i.e. after poisoning the audience with the doctrine of Qutb) that the foundations for the accusation of Irjaa’ can be layed down. And this was worked upon by the neo-Khaarijee Think Tank from numerous angles of devised, calculated deceit in knowledge based issues. Amongst them (as well as the issue discussed above):

---

Shaykh Saleh al-Fawzaan was asked: What do you say about the one who applies the term “the Absent Ummah” to the contemporary Islamic Ummah?

The Answer: The saying that the Muslim Ummah is absent, then the takfir of all of the Islamic nations is necessitated from it, since its meaning is that there is no Islamic state, and this is in opposition to the saying of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), “There will never cease to be a group from my Ummah upon the truth, uppermost. They will not be harmed by those who desert them or those who oppose them, until the affair of Allaah - the Blessed and Exalted - arrives, and they are in this state.”

So regardless of how much the misguidance, and differing, and disbelief might occur, then this safe and secure group will always remain.

Hence, there is no such thing as the absence of the Islamic Ummah, and all praise is due to Allaah, and nor is it a required condition for this Islamic Society, or this Aided Group that it is devoid of sins, since sins were found in the time of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and also in the time of his Khulafaa, however, they were faced and were rejected.” (al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah p. 151).

- i) Accusing those who did not make takfir of the one who abandoned the prayer to be upon the thought of Irjaa', despite this matter being an issue of difference within Ahl us-Sunnah, and despite this accusation itself being the legacy of a sect of the Khawaarij called the Mansooriyyah, who first made this accusation of Ahl us-Sunnah centuries before the stooge and beguiled frontman of Aal Qutb, Safar al-Hawaali<sup>6</sup>, would later revive it, in order to support the

<sup>6</sup> Stated Safar al-Hawali in his book "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa", "And no one says that the one who abandons it (the prayer) is not a kaafir except one who has been affected by the (thought of) al-Irjaa', whether he realises it or not."!! (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa pp.650-651). And also, "...without their knowing that the source of this doubt (of the absence of takfir of the one who abandons prayer) and its foundation is actually from Irjaa'!!" (p.419). He also said, "Rather, one who fights against partisanship for madhhabs (i.e. al-Albani) has himself fallen into it (Irjaa)" (p.658). And also, "And the Shaikh (i.e. al-Albani) – may Allaah preserve him – is amongst the most severe of people in fleeing and making others flee from the blind-following of the Hanafees in the subsidiary issues (furoo', i.e. fiqh). So how can that be when this (i.e. Irjaa') is from the major matters (usool, i.e. aqidah)" (p.726).

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (rahimahullaah) was asked: "The questioner asks that some people say that Shaikh al-Albani – rahimahullaah – his position on the issues of Imaan is that of the Murji'ah. What is your view on this?"

Answer: The Shaikh paused for a while, remaining silent and then replied, "...I say, just as one who has preceded has said... Al-Albani is a scholar, a muhaddith, a jurist – even if he is greater in being a muhaddith than a jurist – and I do not know of any of his statements which indicate Irjaa, ever. **However, it is those who want to perform takfir of people, they are the ones who accuse him and those like him of being Murji'ah, and this action of theirs is by way of ascribing evil names [to him].** I testify for Shaikh al-Albani – may Allaah have mercy upon him – with uprightness, (istiqaamah), a sound creed, and good intention... " (Cassette: Questions to Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen on Imaan, Irjaa, and al-Albaani, from Qatar)

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (rahimahullaah) also said: "Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa' has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa'.

Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. **However, some people – and we ask Allaah's pardon – have jealousy in their hearts. For when [one of them] sees that a person has been met with acceptance [by the people], he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers]. So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity!**

We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them. Then they claim that**

doctrines of the Innovator who mocked Moosaa (alaihi salaam), cursed and reviled Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) accused some of the Companions with nifaaq (hypocrisy), ghish, khiyaanah, khadee'ah (deception, treachery, deceit, etc.), and revived the aqeedah of the Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah, Ash'ariyyah, Ittihaadiyyah, Hulooliyyah, and of course, the Khawaarij.

- ii) Accusing those who did not make takfir of the one who had no outward actions with Irjaa', despite this also being an issue of difference, and this being one of the two sayings of Ahl us-Sunnah. And those who have spoken of this include Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali, Ibn Hazm<sup>7</sup>, and Imaam Ibn Baz<sup>8</sup>

---

**whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji' – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication.** Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!" (Cassette: Makaalmaat Ma'a Mashaayikh ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4) Dated 12/6/2000CE.

And Abul-Fadl Abaas Ibn Mansoor as-Saksakee (d. 683H), in his powerful Sunni, Salafi treatise said concerning Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, "And every sect has called them with a name that is not in agreement with the true reality, out of envy of them and as a fabrication against them. And they ascribed to them (Ahl us-Sunnah) that which they did not hold as their doctrine. So the Qadariyyah labelled them "the Mujbirah". The Murji'ah called them "the Shakkaakiyyah" (the doubters). The Raafidah called them "the Naasibah". The Jahmiyyah called them "the Mushabbihah". The Ash'ariyyah called them "the Mujassimah". The Ghaaliyyah called them "the Hashawiyyah" (the worthless ones). The Baatiniyyah called them "the Muswaddah". **The Mansooriyyah (a sect of the Khawaarij), and they are the associates of Abdullaah Ibn Zaid, labelled them as Murji'ah due to their saying that the one who abandons the prayer, without rejecting its obligation, is a Muslim based upon the correct view in the madhhab. And they (the Mansooriyyah) say that this saying of their's (i.e. that of Ahl us-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imaan is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them.** Rather, they are the Firqat al-Haadiyyah al-Mahdiyyah (the Guiding and Guided Sect) and its creed is the correct creed and the clear and manifest Imaan (faith), that with which the Qur'aan was revealed and which has come in the Sunnah, and that which the Ulamaa of the Ummah from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah have agreed upon." Al-Burhaan Fee Ma'rifat Aqaa'idi Ahl il-Adyaan, (pp.65-66)

<sup>7</sup> Ibn Hazm had errors in the issue of Sifaat yet was praised by the likes of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in the issues of Imaan and for refuting the Murji'ah comprehensively. He said, "**And he (alaihi-salaam) explained that whoever has a seed's weight of goodness will be removed from the Hellfire, then one who has an atoms weight of goodness, and then what is less than that and so on. Until one who had never performed any good at all, except having the testimony of faith for Islaam will be removed from it. Hence, it is obligatory to halt at the texts, since all of them explain each other.**" (al-Fisal 4/90).

Ibn Hazm also said, "He did not declare a disbeliever one who abandoned action, but he declared a disbeliever the one who abandoned the saying (i.e. the testimony of faith). This is because the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) made the judgement of kufr upon the one who refused to make the saying (the testimony), even if he knew of its correctness in his heart. And he also judged that the one who knew with his heart and

pronounced with the tongue to be removed from the Fire, even if he did not do a single deed of goodness.” (Ad-Durrah Feema Yajib I’tiqaaduhu p.337)

Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali said in explanation of the saying of Allaah’s Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) “And then a group of people will be taken out from the Fire who had not done any good whatsoever”, he said, “...And what is meant by his saying, ‘who had not done any good whatsoever’ is the actions of the limbs, even though they have the foundation (asl) of Tawheed with them...” (at-Takhweef Min an-Naar p.255). And he also said (p.256), “This proves that those whom Allah will remove through His Mercy, without any intercession (shafaa’ah) from anybody else from the creation, are the people of Tawheed who had not done a single deed of goodness with their limbs.”

And also, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen words on the issue of “Jins ul-Amal” are known, when he said, in response to the question, “[The statement] the one who abandons outward actions generically speaking, (jins ul-‘amal) is a disbeliever. The one who abandons solitary actions (aahaad ul-‘amal) is not a disbeliever”?

He replied, “Who mentioned this principle?! Who said it?! Did Muhammad the Messenger of Allaah say it?! These are words have no meaning. We say, whoever Allaah and His Messenger declare to be a disbeliever is a disbeliever and whoever Allaah and His Messenger do not declare to be a disbeliever is not a disbeliever. As for ‘jins ul-‘amal’, or ‘nau’ al-‘amal’ or ‘aahaad al-‘amal’, then all of this clangor (i.e. useless talk), which has no benefit.” Cassette: Questions from Qatar on the Issues of Imaan, 25<sup>th</sup> Muharram 1421.

These phrases “taarik jins ul-‘amal kaafir, taarik aahaad ul-amal laysa bi kaafir” were spoken of by Safar al-Hawali.

<sup>8</sup> Shaykh Ibn Baaz, was asked the following question: “Are the scholars who speak with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves all of the actions of the limbs while at the same time professing the two testimonies with his tongue and having the basis of Imaan present in his heart from amongst the Murji’ah?”

Imaam Ibn Baaz: “**No. This one is from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah.** Whoever speaks with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves fasting or zakaat or hajj – this one (i.e. the one who leaves these matters) is not a kaafir. However, he has committed a great sin. In the view of some scholars he is a kaafir, however the correct view is that he does not become a disbeliever with the major kufr. As for the one who leaves the prayer then the most correct view (al-arjah) is that this is major kufr when it is abandoned deliberately. As for when he abandons zakat, fasting or hajj, then this is the lesser kufr (kufr doona kufr), and a major sin from amongst the major sins. And the evidence for this is the saying of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) concerning the one who withheld the zakat, “He will be brought on the day of Judgement and be punished by his wealth...” just as the Qur’aan has also indicated, “On the day when that (Al-Kanz: money, gold and silver, etc., the Zakât of which has not been paid) will be heated in the Fire of Hell and with it will be branded their foreheads, their flanks, and their backs, (and it will be said unto them):-”This is the treasure which you hoarded for yourselves. Now taste of what you used to hoard”.” (Tawbah 9:35). So the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) informed that he will be punished on account of his wealth, his camels, his sheep, his herd (of cows), his gold and his silver (that he hoarded). Then after this he will see his path, either to Paradise or to Hellfire, after that. This shows that he does not become a disbeliever (by withholding zakat), and that he will be shown his path, either to Paradise, or to Hellfire. So this shows that he is threatened, he may enter the Hellfire, or he may just be punished in the Barzakh alone, and not enter the Fire. And he could be in Paradise after having the punishment which is in the Barzakh.”

affirmed that this is a matter of difference within Ahl us-Sunnah.

- iii) Spreading disinformation about the position of some of the scholars (i.e. Imaam al-Albaani) in the issue of takfir, by claiming that he only makes takfir, by way of what is in the heart – when in reality, these ignoramuses could not differentiate between speaking about the application of the judgement of takfir which means discussing the conditions for and barriers to takfir, and in which al-Albaani makes it clear that the person’s qasd (intent) for the action must be established before making takfir, such that it is known that his action is tied to his heart (i.e. he wilfully, deliberately chose it, without compulsion), and such that the judgements of kufr that are made upon those who fall into acts of kufr, are actually made while they deserve them – all of which has no bearing to the belief of the Murji’ah who restrict kufr to the speech of the heart only – so differentiating between this, and between speaking about whether an action is major kufr or not, from the point of view of the Sharee’ah ruling upon it. The latter is *takfir bil-wasf*, whereas the former, which is the arena in which al-Albaani mostly speaks, is *takfir bil-‘ayn*. While noting that there are many statements of al-Albaani in which he explains that certain actions expel from Islaam, along with the two conditions for takfir, which are knowledge (ilm) and intent (qasd). (Refer to articles MSC060017, MSC060015, MSC060014, MSC060006, MSC060005, MSC060001 for the Scholars’ defence of al-Albaani on this issue).
- iv) Attempting to illustrate that the asl (basis) in the verse pertaining to those who do not rule by what Allaah has revealed (5:44) is that it is major kufr for this Ummah, and that this is general rule, and that the exception is only those matters which the Salaf called “the lesser kufr”. And this is a great lie, which has been refuted by the Scholars, both past and present. (Refer to GRV070017, GRV070027). There is great deceit involved in this attempt by the Qutubiyyah to change the understanding of the Salaf and to replace it instead with a qutubised understanding. However, the intent behind it all is to strengthen the accusation of Irjaa’ against Ahl us-Sunnah, those who do not make unrestricted takfir.

---

Taken from “Hiwaar Hawla Masaa’il at-Takfir”, from a lecture given by the Shaykh (rahimahullaah) in 1418H. Prepared by Khalid al-Kharraaz and published by Maktabah al-Imaam adh-Dhahabee, Kuwait, 1420H (2000CE).

- v) Arguing the case for the open rejection, revilement against the Rulers, and amassing the common-folk against them, and alluding to the demonstrations of the Chinese Communists as a model for the Muslims, and using the open rejection of the father of the Khawaarij, Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tameemee, against the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) as a proof to justify open rejection of the rulers (all of which came from the direction of the stooges and frontmen of Aal Qutb, al-Hawali and al-Awdah and others). Thus, when this idea was proliferated amongst the people, those who then propounded the Sunnah, and clarified what is in the books of the aqeedah of the Salaf concerning the behaviour with the Rulers, and how to advise them, and how to be patient over their tyranny and oppression, and the absence of open revilement and so on, were labelled “Murji’ah with the Rulers” – because they did not share in the takfir of the neo-Khawaarij and nor their causing tribulation and commotion in the land by involving the common folk in demonstrations, and open revilement competitions on the pulpits and public forums<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen spoke over two and a half years ago about this accusation against Ahl us-Sunnah that they are “Murji’ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du’aat, Qadariyyah with the Jews and Raafidah with the Islamic Groups”. He explained that is “slander, and making insults by name-calling” and that it is the way of those who wish to cause commotion and strife in the land, by way of their open rejection of the evils coming from the Rulers, all in the name of “rectification”. This type of accusation first came from the direction of those who got poisoned by the Innovators of Ikhwaan al-Mufliseen and was championed by Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayjee (of Kuwait), a caller to democracy and collaborator with the Raafidah Shi’ah. And this is the condition of Ahl ul-Bid’ah, they slander and revile the true adherents to Salafiyyah, most of the time not even knowing where the slanders and revilements originate from in the first place.

Question, “Our Shaikh, may Allaah protect you, some of the students of knowledge who see others that are fearful of and withhold (out of wara’, piety) from making unrestricted takfir of the rulers (i.e. without tafseel), so when they see words from others which are in opposition to what has occurred amongst some of the du’aat of today, from another angle, they say about them, “You are Murji’ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du’aat, Qadariyyah with the Jews”, meaning that you submit yourselves to everything that comes from the Jews and you have submitted yourselves to them, and you do not wish or intend to change anything that has come from the Jews (of plotting and planning etc.). And likewise they say, “Rawaafid with the Islamic Groups”, when they call them to enter into their Islamic groups, but they reply that this is hizbiyyah (partisanship) and this is splitting, we will not enter into it, however we call to the Qur’aan and the Sunnah and we co-operate with everyone upon piety and righteousness, without any ascriptions and membership to parties and to these slogans and mottos. So in return they reply to them in this manner. And I had read a fatwaa of yours in this regard, so perhaps if you make mention of it as well, if Allaah wills, on this cassette, then perhaps Allaah will bring about benefit through it for the one who hears it?”

- e) So all of the above angles were worked upon, such that the accusation of Irjaa' against those who do not a) perform unrestricted takfir of the rulers b) revile the rulers in public c) base their methodology of reform mainly around rectification of the rulers and governments – could be justified, strengthened and spread, so that as a result, the Salafi manhaj, the Prophetic manhaj, the manhaj of Nubuwwah, in the rectification of the servant and the land, could be abandoned and forgotten, and so that the Qutubi manhaj, the manhaj of Aal Qutb of generalised takfir and clashing with the authorities, could be propagated and spread, with the aim of amassing the public upon an ideological platform.

4. And it is actually in this manner that we have arrived at the situation we are in today, when those who are upon extremist methodologies (in the sense that they contain exaggeration in certain fields), accuse all those who do not share in their takfir, and their open revilement and slandering and cursing of rulers, and governments, to be Murji'ah. And in reality, it was these people who began these accusations of Irjaa' and of attacking the Salafees, not the other way around. And the greatest proof of this is that can you find a single statement from any of the major scholars accusing the Salafis of being Murji'ah because they do not make takfir of the Rulers? On the contrary, you find numerous statements from the Major scholars, accusing those who are upon this Qutubi methodology of being Khawaarij, and amongst them Imaam al-Albaani (GRV070001), and Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen (GRV070021), and refuting the takfir that is with these people (Shaykh al-Fawzaan in NDV110003). It was actually these Qutubiyyah, under the influence of Mohammad Qutb, who back in the eighties, began this orchestrated attack, in order to promote the Ikhwani manhaj amongst the Salafis, and then to accuse those who did not succumb to their plot as

---

The Shaikh answered, "I hate that this [slander] should occur from one set of brothers to another. And I consider this to be slander, and making insults by name-calling. Those ones (who are accused) do not like to speak against the rulers on top of the pulpits, since that does not bring about any rectification, as is evident. However, this does not mean that they justify everything that occurs from the Rulers. They actually consider that some of what occurs from the Rulers is an error and some of it is correct. **However, this does not mean that we now stand on top of the minbar and in the midst of the societies and the lectures, or in specific (private) gatherings – since in all of this there is not benefit.** The intent of the one who wishes to give advice is to bring about real correction in the leaders, **not just releasing one's anger, seeking vengeance.** So whoever intended rectification of the leaders, **then it is necessary for him to tread upon the path in which there is true rectification. As for the one who merely wishes to vent his anger and to quench his thirst and to treat his disease – then the affair of such of one is to Allaah the Mighty and Majestic,** and we are not in need at this moment to give examples of those who wish to rectify the Rulers, yet they stand on top of the pulpits and revile and abuse them, in front of all of those in the gatherings and lectures . We do not wish to mention any examples of this because the reality bears witness (to what already occurs from the likes of these). (Cassette: "Questions to Shaikh Ibn Uthaymeen and Ibn Baaz").

“Muri’ah”! And unfortunately, there are many confused individuals today, who are in reality, caught up in the da’wah of Qutb and Banna without even realising, while they claim that they are upon Salafiyyah! This is because this da’wah came to them through people whose deviation did not become apparent to them (i.e. the likes of Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq, Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and others), and so they thought that these people were preaching Salafiyyah, when in reality, they were preaching the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna. This state of confusion has unfortunately, overcome a great number of people who claim Salafiyyah for themselves. And the reason for this was that the major scholars did not become aware of the reality of these people except in more recent times (1417H onwards), hence during the time that the Qutubiyyah came out openly (after the Gulf War), and until we observed the words of the major scholars warning from them (al-Albani, Ibn Uthaymeen, al-Fawzaan, and others), much confusion was spread by the Qutubiyyah themselves, much disinformation and slanders and lies against the Salafi Shaykhs, who first knew exactly what they were upon (i.e. Shaykh Rabee’ and the Madinan Shaykhs), and many of the youth got caught up in this, and also got affected by the methodologies that these people were preaching, which were in reality, the same methodologies as Sayyid Qutb and Hasan al-Banna, but in a more refined and disguised way.

## Important Closing Note

It is necessary here to explain a very important matter, by which the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah is differentiated from the manhaj of the Khawaarij, neo-Qutubiyyah.

We hate secularism and detest non-Islamic laws, and hate their presence in the Muslim lands, since in the Sharee'ah laws, there is true, inherent justice, and in these laws there is true life, and in these laws there is safety and security in the land, and in these laws are the rights of the people maintained, and justice prevails in the society. And all of this, is from the blessings and favours of Allaah, which He bestows upon the Muslims and grants them this security, and safety, after they had been in fear, and this is when they have the correct, sound Imaan, with correct, righteous actions, and based upon Tawheed and the absence of the various forms of Shirk, and this is what Allaah has said, in Surah Nur 24:55.

In light of this, when we see that over the past centuries, due to the Colonialists and Imperialists, that many of the extant Islamic laws were replaced, and the laws of the British, French and others were introduced (by the British, French and others), and alongside this, the safety and security, and justice amongst the people that these (Islamic) laws provided were also removed, as a result of which the people lost what Allaah had favoured them with, then you should know that this is not except as a result of the oppression of the people of their own souls, and their distancing themselves from Allaah. This is a result of the actions of all of the people, of all the nation and society. It is not something that is blamed upon the rulers alone.

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

some of the (revealed) Books of Allaah there occurs, “I am Allaah, the King of Kings. The hearts of the kings are in My Hands. So whoever obeyed Me, I will make them (the Kings) a mercy upon him, and whoever disobeys Me, I will make them (the Kings) a retribution upon him, so do not busy yourselves with reviling the Kings, but rather repent (to Allaah), and I will make them soft, affectionate to you.” (Sharh Aqeedat ut-Tahaawiyah).

And the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah is to trace the source of harm upon the Muslims to its proper source, and indeed Ahl us-Sunnah, taking from the verses of the Book, and statements of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and from the sayings of the Salaf are granted success by Allaah in identifying the true causes and sources, as a result of which they are able to build the correct and true methodology of rectification and repelling this harm. In opposition to the Innovators (such as the Khawaarij and others) whose tracing of the source and cause of harm, is back only around 58 men (and one or two women) who are heads of state in the Islamic lands, and as for the 1.2 Billion remaining Muslims, then it is as if they are not to be blamed in the least, alongside what is found with them of Shirk and Innovation and in some cases, outright kufr.

Ibn Sa’d relates in his *Tabaqaat al-Kubraa* (7/163-165), “A group of Muslims came to al-Hasan al-Basree seeking a verdict to rebel against al-Hajjaaj [a tyrannical and despotic ruler]. So they said, “O Abu Sa’eed! What do you say about fighting this oppressor who has unlawfully spilt blood and unlawfully taken wealth and did this and that?” So al-Hasan said, “I hold that he should not be fought. If this is a punishment from Allaah, then you will not be able to remove it with your swords. If this is a trial from Allaah, then be patient until Allaah’s judgement comes, and He is the best of judges.” So they left al-Hasan, disagreed with him and rebelled against al-Hajjaaj – so al-Hajjaaj killed them all. Al-Hasan used to say, “If the people had patience when they are being tested by their unjust ruler, it will not be long before Allaah will give them a way out. However, they always rush for their swords, so they are left with their swords. By Allaah! Not even for a single day did they bring about any good.”

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

Stated al-Hasan al-Basri, “Know – may Allaah pardon you – that the tyranny of the kings is a retribution (niqmah) from among the retributions of Allaah the Most High. And Allaah’s retributions are not to be faced with the sword, but they are to be faced with taqwaa and are repelled with

supplication and repentance, remorse (inaabah) and abstention from sins. Verily, when the punishments of Allaah are met with the sword, are more severe. And Maalik bin Deenaar narrated to me that al-Hajjaaj (Ibn Yoosuf) used to say, "Know that every time you commit a sin Allaah will bring about a punishment from the direction of your ruler (sultaan)". And I have I have also been told that a person said to al-Hajjaaj, "Do you do such and such with the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)?" So he replied, "**For the reason that I am the punishment of Allaah upon the people of Iraaq, when they innovated into their religion whatever they innovated, and when they abandoned the commands of the their Prophet – alaihis salaam – whatever they abandoned.**" (Adaab Hasan al-Basri, of Ibn al-Jawzee, pp.119-120, by way of Mu'aamalat ul-Hukkaam, of Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis).

So by now, the intent is clear. That the removal of the Islamic laws is something that Allaah willed upon this Ummah, and this is the removal of the safety and security that Allaah had once provided us, and the presence of these secular laws, is a punishment for us, because we departed from Allaah's obedience, away from His Tawheed, and away from the Sunnah, and away from the right methodology, and this is the result that we see. We now no longer live under safety and security (except in some countries where the Sharee'ah rule is to be found) and we can actually feel and perceive the effects of this.

However, the way to rectify this, and change this situation? We do not simply sit back and do nothing! But what is the way, and how is it known? And it is here that great deviation is observed in the methodologies employed by people in order to establish the judgement of Allaah.

We leave the final words to the Scholars:

Stated Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, "So whichever call is not built upon these foundations, and whose manhaj (methodology) is not the methodology of the Messengers - then it will be frustrated and will fail, and it will be toil without benefit. The clearest proof of this are those present day Jamaa'at (groups) which set out a methodology and programme for themselves and their da'wah, which is different to the methodology of the Messengers. These groups have neglected the importance of aqeedah (correct beliefs and creed) - except for a very few of them - and instead call for the correction of side issues. So one group calls for the correction of rule and politics and demands establishment of the hudood (prescribed punishments), and that Sharee'ah (Islaamic Law) be applied in judging amongst the people - and this indeed is something very important, but it is not what is most important: **Since how can one seek to establish and apply Allaah's judgement upon the thief and the fornicator, before seeking to establish and apply Allaah's judgement upon the mushrik - the**

**one who attributes worship to others besides Allaah. How can we demand that Allaah's judgement be applied to two men disputing about a sheep or a camel, before demanding that Allaah's judgement be applied upon those who worship idols and graves, and those who deny or hold heretical beliefs with regards to Allaah's Names and Attributes - divesting them of their true meaning, or distorting them. Are these people not greater criminals than those who fornicate, drink wine and steal?! Since those are crimes against mankind, whereas shirk and denial of Allaah's Names and Attributes are crimes against the Creator - the One free from all imperfections - and the right of the Creator has precedence over the rights of creation.**

Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728H) says in his hook: al-Istiqamah (1/466): "So these sins along with correct tawheed are better than corrupted tawheed in the absence of these sins."

Then another Jamaa'ah (group) affiliates itself with da'wah, except that their methodology is also at variance with the methodology of the Messengers. They give no importance to correct aqeedah, rather they give importance to some acts of worship and practicing dhikr (remembrance of Allaah) in the way of the Soofees. They concentrate upon khurooj (going out) and touring the lands, and what is important to them is that they manage to attract the people to join them without caring about their aqeedah. And all of these are innovated ways, taking as their starting point, matters which were left until last in the call of the Messengers. This is just like the case of someone who seeks to cure a body whose head has been decapitated - since the place of aqeedah in the religion, is like the head with regard to the body.

**Thus it is necessary for these groups to correct their concepts and understanding, by referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to know the methodology of the Messengers in calling to Allaah.** For indeed Allaah - the One free from all imperfections - informed that correct rule and sovereignty, which is the central part of the call of the former jamaa 'ah whom we mentioned, cannot be achieved except after correcting aqeedah, such that all worship is for Allaah alone and worship of everything else is abandoned. Allaah - the Most High - says:

**Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan (true faith and belief) and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those before them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating**

**anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors.** Soorah an-Noor 24:55

So these people wish to establish the Islaamic State before purifying the lands of idolatrous beliefs which take the form of worship of the dead, and devotion to the tombs - such as is no different to the worship of al-Laah, al-Uzzaa and the third of them Manaah, rather it is worse. **So they are attempting that which is impossible:**

And whoever seeks greatness without effort and exertion,  
Will only be wasting his life in seeking something impossible.

**Indeed, establishment and application of the Sharee'ah and the prescribed punishments, and the establishment of the Islaamic State, and avoidance of whatever is prohibited, and achievement of whatever is obligatory - all of these things are from the rights of Tawheed; and matters which perfect it and follow on from it. So how can we give attention to that which is subsidiary whilst neglecting that which is of primary importance?"** (Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa fid-Da'wah Ilallaah pp.14-16)

And a prime example of what the Shaykh has alluded to is the Bankrupt Brotherhood in Egypt! The vast majority of the callers to Qutb's Haakimiyyah are Ash'ari Soofees, and in the land of Egypt are the graves of Badawee, Zinjar, Dusuqi, Zaynab, Hussayn and others all of which are flocked to, and worshipped besides Allaah. And then we have the callers to Haakimiyyah, attempting to seize the thrones of power, either by khurooj or by entry into and working through the politics of the state, which they consider to be one of kufr to begin with!

And another group are in Kuwait, who try to use democracy by which to seize the thrones of power, and work with the Raafidah Shi'ah and sell themselves for a miserable price.

And another group in Syria, tried to seize power by an underground attempt at a coup, and which only resulted in 40,000 or more being butchered, once the authorities found out what they were planning. And this in the land where graves are travelled to, the presence of extreme Soofees and worship of others besides Allaah!!

And another group in Algeria, tried to establish Haakimiyyah by way of the democracy of the Infidels, and it all but crumbled, as Allaah did not bless it, since the promise of Allaah, as occurs in Surah an-Noor 24:55 clearly did not occur, and the Khawaarij in that land who called for revolution and

rebellion, let loose the reins of discord and tribulation upon the generality of the society, and to date in excess of 100,000 people have been killed.

The gradual removal of the Sharee'ah in the ways that Allaah willed over the past centuries, by way of the Colonialists and Imperialists, is a symptom of underlying causes. Unfortunately, today, the groups of innovation and deviation have attempted to remove the symptoms while forgetting (and sometimes knowingly) the root causes.

And then everyone who does not agree to their methodology are labelled "Murji'ah with the Rulers"!

So in summary, there are groups and movements today, who are actually upon the thought of Sayyid Qutb, however, they masquerade as Salafis, by taking some of the verdicts of our scholars in an issue of complete replacement of the Sharee'ah from head to heel, top to bottom, and changing the whole deen, and all of this is a shield behind which they hide. And at the same time they reject many of the other verdicts of these scholars on other affairs of manhaj. Then, when they have got people to think that this ruling is an Ijmaa' (which is not true) and that this is what the Rulers of today are guilty of (and this certainly is not true), they then take them slowly to the application of the principles of Sayyid Qutb, and end up with generalised takfeer. Something, that those same Salafi scholars whose viewpoint they quote on the issue, refute them for, and accuse them of being Khawaarij, and also refute them on many of the other issues of methodology they have deviated in.