

**Shaykh, Dr Diya ur-Rahmān bin Jameel ur-Rahmān as-Sāfi al-Afghānī**  
*(hafidhahullāh)*

# ON SALAFIYYAH IN AFGHANISTAN UNDER THE TALIBAN<sup>1</sup>

---

*In the Name of Allāh, the Most Beneficent, Most Merciful*

It could be understood from some of my comments that the situation of Salafiyyah in Afghanistan is one that is good. No! However:

1. The Ṭalibān have gone from being a movement which possesses power to that of presidential rulership over a state.<sup>2</sup> Salafiyyah is a part of the state so therefore they (the

---

<sup>1</sup> Written by Dr Diyā' bin Jameel ur-Rahmān on 9<sup>th</sup> Muharram 1443 AH/Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> August 2021 CE: <https://twitter.com/ziesafi2010/status/1427593893479174157>

Shaykh Diyā' bin Jameel ur-Rahman is the son of the Shaykh, Jameel ur-Rahmān (*rahimahullāh*) who was assassinated in Peshawar on August 30<sup>th</sup> 1991 by a wretched Egyptian Takfiri, Abdullah ar-Rūmī. Most likely under the orders of either Arab Takfiri-Jihadis or Hekmatyar's group *Hizbī Islāmī* who had slaughtered the Salafis of Kunar a few weeks prior and had launched a scud missile strike on Shaykh Jameel's HQ in Asadabad in April 1991) – both of which were not pleased with Shaykh Jameel's relations with Saudi Arabia and Kuwait during the Gulf War.

Dr Diyā' is the author of *Juhūd ul-'Ulama al-Hanafīyyah fī Tahdheer min al-Bida' fi'l-'Ibādāt* [The Efforts of the Hanafī Scholars in Warning Against Innovations in Acts of Worship]. Algiers: Dār ul-Mirāth an-Nabawī. 1441AH/2019 CE. He is also currently Associate Professor at the International Islamic University in Islamabad, Pakistan. His brothers are Huda ur-Rahmān, director of Imām Muhammad bin Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī University in Peshawar, and Hameed ur-Rahmān who attained an MA from the Islamic University of Madeenah. All are members of the teaching committee at Imām Muhammad bin Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī University in Peshawar.

<sup>2</sup> **Translator's Note [AbdulHaq]:** the main position of the Taliban against Salafiyyah was well-known in the past, Allāh knows best if their initial positions have been reviewed of late by them, out of

Tālibān) do not want there to be divisions at this present time. Likewise, they do not want the outside world to hold negative perceptions about them.

2. The Salafis are established and widespread throughout several provinces in eastern Afghanistan, such as Kunar, Nuristan and Jalalabad. This a key factor why they do not want to cause any harm to the Salafis in the regions where the Salafis are not established.
3. Just as it is not from *hikmah* [wisdom] to openly oppose the Tālibān after they have assumed control over the whole country, it takes priority for us as Salafis over others to strive toward the path of uniting the word and not causing any destabilisation, as this is

---

realpolitik. They were well-known for their adherence to the Deobandī School of the Hanafiyyah, renowned for its Madhhab fanaticism, being Māturīdī in creed and Naqshabandī in Sūfī Tareeqah. Mawlawī Hafeedhullāh Haqqānī stated in his book *Tālibān: Afghānistān min Hilim il-Mulā' ilā Imārah il-Mu'mineen* [The Taliban: Afghanistan from the Dream of the Mullah to Leadership of the Believers], p.138:

As for the stance of the [Taliban] movement towards the Wahhābiyyah, i.e. Salafiyyah, then their enmity against it is not hidden. They consider it, i.e. Salafiyyah, to be a deviant sect which opposes the Madhāhib and makes takfeer of Muslims. One of the writers from the magazine *at-Tālib*, who has an MA from the Islamic University of Madeenah in tafseer and Qur'anic Sciences, stated:

'It has been said that the Taliban movement are Qubūriyyah whose adherents oppose the 'aqeedah of the Salaf (Ahl us-Sunnah), and are innovators. Some of those who call themselves "Salafis" are the ones who regurgitate this myth. They have not even the furthest trace of the Salaf, rather they apply the texts of the Divine Legislation according to their desires, and look at the station of the Salaf with the eye of anger, and of them are those who regard the trusted Imāms as sinful. And from their misfortune is that they curse some of the Imāms. By Allāh, they are the vilest of creation according to Allāh, pose the worst danger to the deen from its enemies and view themselves as on par with the Muḥtāhideen when they have no scent of Ijtihād. They think they are doing good in what they do, however far [is the truth from such a claim!]...what will be the final end of those who claim Ijtihād while they are free of it?!

*at-Tālib* magazine, January 1997.

If these are the words of one who studied at the Islamic University of Madeenah, a Salafi institution, then what about others?!

See Haqqānī, Mawlawī Hafeedhullāh (1997). *Tālibān: Afghānistān min Hilim il-Mulā' ilā Imārah il-Mu'mineen* [The Taliban: Afghanistan from the Dream of the Mullah to Leadership of the Believers]. Islamabad: Ma'had ud-Dirāsāt as-Siyāsiyyah, First Edition.

what is initially to be sought after. The Manhaj of the Salaf is not to oppose the ruler, even if he came to power by force and dominance.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> **Translator's note [AbdulHaq]:** Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī transmitted **an Ijmā'** on **not rebelling against the tyrannical and oppressive leaders** in his book *Fath al-Bārī* vol.13, p.7 from Imām Ibn Battāl, who has an explanation of Saheeh Bukhārī which has been published:

"وفي الحديث حجة على ترك الخروج على السلطان ولو جار، وقد أجمع الفقهاء على وجوب طاعة

السلطان المتغلب والجهاد معه، وأن طاعته خير من الخروج عليه لما في ذلك من حتن الدماء

وتسكين الدهماء" فتح الباري (7/13)

**In the hadeeth is proof for avoiding revolting against the leader even if he transgresses. The fuqhā (Islamic jurists) have reached consensus that obedience must be made to the leader who becomes dominant (mutaghalib) and making jihād with him and that obeying him is better than revolting against him due to the blood which would be spilt in that and this would not be permissible unless there was clear kufr from the leader.**

Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī (*rahimahullāh*) noted to us in a lesson at the Imām al-Albānī Centre in Amman in 2006:

Here we must stop at this word "**mutaghalib (the one who overpowers and becomes dominant)**" for a while. In the next session it will be made apparent to us that the paths for a ruler acquiring power are numerous and from the paths are in the case of a ruler who becomes dominant and overpowers others (*al-Mutaghalib*). It is when a person opposes the Divine Legislation and revolts against the Muslim leader and thus becomes dominant, and this has happened in Islamic history and the scholars noted that this opposes the Divine Legislation. However, the one who revolted against the Muslim ruler has established and settled security and command now and is able to control the Muslim lands as he obviously is a Muslim yet has opposed the consensus of the Muslims by revolting in the first place yet has seized the reins of power from the first bearers of it. The scholars have reached agreement that the leader who overpowers the reins of authority from another leader is to be obeyed and this is Divine Legislated. Why? Because it is feared that revolting against this one again will only cause a worse tribulation. For that reason, the greatest intents of the Divine Legislation is that preventing the harms takes precedence over enforcing the benefit.

The indicates that the Salafis are really for peace and stability. This is in contrast to the likes of the ignoramus Omar Bakri in an article with the Arabic newspaper *ash-Sharq al-Awsat* on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2001. In the article a letter was referred to which he had written to the head of the Taliban at the time, Mullah 'Umar, saying that Afghanistan under the Taliban was 'Dār ul-Kufr' ["state of disbelief"]?! The article stated:

*We ask Allah for security accompanied with steadfastness.*

---

**A fundamentalist movement has launched an attack on the Taliban movement which controls over 90% - at that time – of the areas of Afghanistan by stating that it does not implement the rulings of Islam in its foreign affairs and relations with other states and that Mullah ‘Umar the ruler of the Taliban does not deserve the title ‘Leader of the Believers’ because he does not have the pledge of allegiance of the Ummah by consensus and that it is obligatory for his followers to call him with the title ‘Leader of the Taliban’ only. ‘Umar Bakri, the leader of the fundamentalist group ‘al-Muhajirun’ in a copy of a letter obtained by *Ash-Sharq al-Awsat* which he sent to Mullah ‘Umar, the powerful ruler of the Taliban along with three of his followers: that the lands of Afghanistan under the control of Taliban rule is a ‘State of Disbelief’ and not an abode of Islam.**

*Ash-Sharq al-Awsat*’ newspaper; no. 2 August 2001 CE

What has also been noted over the last 10-12 years however, is that some who ascribe to Salafiyyah will begin cursing and defaming those leaders who have assumed dominance and are affiliated to misguided groups, and this is not really the correct approach.