



**The Devil's
Deception of
Sheikh Faisal**

درسات علمية
في
مناهج التكفيرية و الخارجية

SALAFIMANHJ.COM
RESEARCH DIVISION

تُلبِّسُ إبليسُ عبدَ اللهِ فيصَلُ
("شَيْخُ فَيْصَلُ")

THE DEVIL'S DECEPTION OF
'ABDULLAAH FAYSAL
AL-JAMAYKEE
("SHEIKH FAISAL")!

A CRITICAL STUDY OF HIS STATEMENTS, ERRORS AND EXTREMISM IN TAKFEER¹

Narrated 'Abdullaah Ibn 'Amr Ibn al-'Aas (*radi allaahu 'anhu*): "I heard Allaah's Messenger (*sallallaahu alayhi wasallam*) saying: "*Allah does not take away the knowledge by taking it away from (the hearts of) the people, but He takes it away by the death of the scholars till when none of the (scholars) remains, people will take as their leaders ignorant people who when consulted will give their verdict without knowledge. So, they will go astray and will lead the people astray.*"²

Aboo Hurayrah (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) narrated that the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said: "*There will come upon the people years of deceit wherein the liar will be regarded as truthful and the truthful will be considered a liar and the dishonest will be trusted and the trustworthy one will be considered dishonest and the Ruwaybidah will begin to speak!*" Then it was asked: "*What are the Ruwaybidah?*" He (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) replied: "*The foolish insignificant man who speaks about general affairs.*"³

¹ There have been contributions to this from those who used to actually listen to Faysal's lectures from eight years ago, so this should not merely be viewed as a mere 'slandorous attack' on Faysal, rather as an in-depth analysis and assessment of his very dangerous ideas, beliefs, views and assertions. As for the line of argument which states "They should not be spoken about as they are being oppressed by the kuffaar" then this is false as their horrific lectures and audios are still being widely circulated, disseminated, listened to and blindly followed, therefore a study and refutation of them is necessary.

² Saheeh al-Bukhaaree vol. 1, no. 100

³ Ibn Maajah, Saheeh

Ibn Taymiyyah (*rabeemahullaah*) said about the *khawaarij*:

“They have two well-known qualities which they separate the unity of the Muslims and their leaders with. One of them is that they leave out the Sunnah and declare evil that which is not evil or they declare good that which is not good.”⁴

He also said:

“The khawaarij are the most apparent of the people of innovation and fighting against the rulers.”⁵

Abu'l-Hasan al-'Ash'aree (*rabeemahullaah*) said:

“As for the sword, then all of the khawaarij speak of it and hold it, except the Ibaadiyyah...they hold removing the tyrannical leaders.”⁶

⁴ Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmoo' al-Fataawaa*, vol.19, p.27

⁵ *Ibid.* vol.7, p.217

⁶ Abu'l-Hasan al-'Asha'ree, *Maqaalaat ul-Islamiyyeen*, vol.1, p.204

CONTENTS

5 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

14 GLOSSARY OF TERMS OF FAYSAL'S MOST COMMONLY USED WORDS, TERMS AND EXPRESSIONS THAT HE REGURGITATES THROUGHOUT HIS LECTURES

17 SAMPLES OF LECTURES

115 THE CLEAR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE 'AQEEDAH AND MANHAJ OF THE SALAF US-SAALIH AND THE 'AQEEDAH AND MANHAJ OF ABDULLAH FAYSAL ("SHEIKH FAISAL"), OMAR BAKRI MUHAMMAD FOSTOK (FUSTUQ) AL-MUDALLIS, ANWAR AL-AWLAKI AND THE KHAWAARIJ OF THE ERA

117 STATEMENTS OF SCHOLARS ABOUT REVOLTING AGAINST A MUSLIM RULER

131 THE 'AQEEDAH OF IMAAM AHMAD IBN HANBAL (D.241AH)

132 THE 'AQEEDAH OF ABOO BAKR AL-ISMAA'EELEE (D.371AH)

138 THE 'AQEEDAH OF ISMAA'EEL BIN YAHYAA AL-MUZANEE (D. 264 AH)

INTRODUCTION

Indeed, all praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, we seek His aid, and we ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evil of our actions and from the evil consequences of our actions. Whomever Allaah guides, there is none to misguide and whoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is no god worthy of worship except Allaah and I bear witness that Muhammad is the servant and messenger of Allaah. To proceed:

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُمْ مُسْلِمُونَ﴾

“O you who have believed, fear Allaah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims (in submission to Him).”

{*Aali-Imraan (3): 102*}

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا

رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا﴾

“O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allaah through whom you ask things from each other, and (respect) the wombs. Indeed Allaah is ever, over you, an Observer.”

{*an-Nisaa (4): 1*}

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا﴾

﴿يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ وَمَنْ يُطِيعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا﴾

“O you who have believed, fear Allaah and speak words of appropriate justice. He will amend for you your deeds and forgive your sins. And whoever obeys Allaah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment.”

{*al-Abzaab (33): 70-71*}

The best speech is the book of Allaah and the best guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*). The worst of affairs are the newly invented matters, for every newly invented matter into the religion is an innovation, and every innovation (into the religion) is misguidance and all misguidance is in the fire, we seek refuge in Allaah from it (the fire). Then to proceed:

Born ‘Trevor William Forrest’, this Jamaican extremist has been responsible for issuing a number of erroneous and extreme rulings to the youth in London, the wider UK and in other English speaking countries such as the US and Nigeria. He was nicknamed ‘dictionary’ due to his academic progress at a young age and embraced Islaam at the age of sixteen after which he studied at an Islamic educational institute in Guyana. After migrating to the UK in the 1980s, he then applied to study at *Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University* where he was accepted to study, he later graduated from this university. When he returned to the UK he began to refer to himself as a ‘Shaykh’ and write this himself on audio cassette lectures which he used to produce (the well known ‘Sheikh Faisal’ brand of produced tapes). As a result, he was able to hoodwink some of the gullible youth into believing he was an authority in Islamic knowledge and a reference point, and so after being ousted out of the Brixton area by the *Salafees* he began to go more extreme. When Faysal realised that he was unable to get a blind-following from the community in Brixton, and from the youth of *Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah (Brixton Mosque)* in particular, he began to launch a vicious propaganda campaign against the *Salafees* and discredit them in the eyes of the Muslim youth around UK and the West in general. This is also exacerbated by the fact that Faysal was being abandoned in droves by those who used to be

with him for years, after they had come to realise his extremism. Additionally, it is worth adding here that Faysal was never ever the “Imaam of Brixton Mosque” insinuating that he was the Imaam of *Masjid Ibn Taymeeyah* aka *Brixton Mosque and Islamic Cultural Centre*, as some foolish non-Muslim journalists have claimed in their shoddy and poorly researched articles. For example, Robert Mendick writing in the London *Evening Standard* on Friday 22 July 2005 CE claimed this and so has Martin Bentham in a recent article on Thursday 12 April 2007 again in the London *Evening Standard*. One of their main reasons for associating him with the *Brixton Mosque* is purely on racial grounds and this is a false and simplistic conclusion. So for these out of touch journalists: **black+Muslim+convert to Islam = Brixton Mosque!!!** Yet had they actually bothered to contact *Masjid Ibn Taymeeyah (Brixton Mosque and Islamic Cultural Centre)* they would have found that this was not the case. Bentham thus states:

“His convictions followed the discovery of a series of venomous taped lectures in which the Brixton Mosque preacher had urged his followers to “fly planes, drive tanks, load your guns” and use nuclear missiles to kill “all unbelievers”.

Faysal is known for his extremist statements and blanket *takefeer*, including his *takefeer* of the *Salafee* scholars who he has labelled as being “kuffaar” and “Jews” as we shall see in this study. Currently, Faysal is in prison in the UK for his kindling of hatred amongst communities and *inshaa'Allaah* will be deported out of the UK upon release, like Aboo Hamza, his own ignorant lectures which were widely dispersed in the non-*Salafee* bookstores of London established the proof against his own self. His frustration with the *Salafee da'wah* led him to some very extreme and clear *khawaarij* statements which the reader will see straight from Faysal's own words.

Faysal's tapes were mainly sold in the bookstores owned by those who can be classified into three types of people: ignorant Muslims; those who sold them for money and the stores of the people of innovation. Indeed, the hardcore *Soofees* and *Deobandeers* of the UK used to stock, sell and promote the lectures of Faysal which demonstrates his reach. As for his so-called refutations of the *Brailwees*, this was scant in comparison to his vitriol and fighting against the people of *sunnah*, the *Salafees*, as we shall clearly see from his own words in this treatise.

The lectures of Faysal are online and one website in particular (entitled '*Street Dawah*')⁷ did actually put online all of Faysal's ignorant lectures, which actually made it easier to concisely

⁷ Named as such in order to create the impression that Faysal relates to 'the street' as it were, and this is just a ploy in order to gain credibility amongst the youth whom Faysal brainwashes and uses.

gather his calamitous errors and beliefs for this refutation. The following link, which we highlight immediately bombards you with an irritating loud *nasheed* when visiting it, is: <http://www.streetdawah.com/faisal.html> lists the lectures, yet this site is currently non-existent. Another site entitled 'Haqunspun' - <https://sslrelay.com/haqunspun.com/sess/utn;jsessionid=154541dc278a39f/shopdata/index.shopscript> by one of Faysal's blind followers named 'Amar Iqbal' of London, actually tries to make money from Faysal's lectures of *baatil*.

Another website: <http://inshallahshaheed.wordpress.com/lectures/>

Also promotes Faysal's lectures and utilises him as a reference point?! And also here: <http://darulislam.info/index.php?name=UpDownload&req=viewdownload&sid=15> other reserves of his lectures can be found here: <http://nadeem.lightuponlight.com/indexaudios3.html#Faisal> and here: <http://www.thepathtoparadise.com/pages/Left%20Menu%20Pages/Abdullah%20Faisal.html>

Before we analyse the ideas of 'Abdullaah Faysal ("Sheikh Faisal") it is important to note some recurring ideas that Faysal tries to brainwash his audiences with:

- ✓ Slander of the Islamic scholars and accusing them of treachery, selling-out and even *kufr*! These are scholars who have been actively involved in Islamic knowledge whilst Faysal was in the 'Salvation Army' with his mother in Jamaica! In fact, it has been suggested that Faysal abandoned his unfortunate mother and did not even visit her for over fifteen years! See: <http://www.jamaica-gleaner.com/gleaner/20060827/news/news7.html> So instead of calling the Muslim youth in English speaking countries to *takfeer*, erroneous ideas of *jibaad* and revolting against Muslim governments, the rule of Allaah with regards to the rights of the parents should have implemented first! So how on earth can a so-called "Shaykh" fail to implement the rule of Allaah with regards to looking after the mother? As there are many verses of Allaah wherein Allaah says,

﴿وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا﴾

“And fear Allaah, through whom you ask one another and the wombs.⁸ Indeed, Allaah is ever, over you, an Observer.”

{*an-Nisaa* (4): 1}

Allaah says in a verse which is particularly pertinent to this study:

﴿فَهَلْ عَسَيْتُمْ إِنْ تَوَلَّيْتُمْ أَنْ تُفْسِدُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَتُقَطِّعُوا أَرْحَامَكُمْ﴾

“So would you perhaps, if you turned away, cause corruption on earth and sever your ties of relationship?”

{*Mubammad* (47): 22}

﴿وَوَصَّيْنَا الْإِنْسَانَ بِوَالِدَيْهِ حَمَلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ وَهْنًا عَلَىٰ وَهْنٍ وَفِصَالُهُ فِي عَامَيْنِ أَنْ اشْكُرْ لِي

وَلِوَالِدَيْكَ إِلَيَّ الْمَصِيرُ﴾

“And We have enjoined upon man (to care) for his parents. His mother carried him, (increasing her) in weakness upon weakness, and his weaning is in two years. Be grateful to Me and to your parents; to Me is the (final) destination.”

{*Luqmaan* (31): 14}

- ✓ The *hadeeth* of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) from Abu Umru ash-Shaybaanee who said, “The owner of this house narrated to us,” and he indicated with his hand to the house of 'Abdullaah, that, “I asked the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), “Which action is the most beloved to Allaah?” He said, “Prayer at its correct time.” I said, “then which action?” “He said, “*Birr (good treatment, kindness) to the parents.*” I said, “Then which?” He said “*Jibaad in the way of Allaah.*” So before *jibaad*, the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) mentioned being good and dutiful to parents, yet a so-called

⁸ i.e. fear Allaah in regards to ties of kinship

⁹ Mentioned in *Saheeh Adab al-Mufrad*

- 'Shaykh of jihad', did not implement this at all himself! A man asked "O Messenger of Allaah who is most deserving of my birra?" He said, "Your mother." The man asked, "Then who?" He said, "Your mother." The man asked, "Then who?" He said, "Your mother." The man asked again, "Then who?" He said, "Then your father."¹⁰ From Taysala bin Mayyaas who said Ibn Umar said to me, "Do you fear the fire and wish to enter the Paradise?" I said, "Of course, by Allaah!" He said, "Are your parents alive?" I said, "I have a mother." He said, "Then by Allaah! If you were to speak gently to her and feed her, you would certainly enter paradise, as long as you stay away from the Major sins."¹¹ From Abdullaah bin 'Umar who said, a man came to the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) to give him the *bay'ah* for *hijrah*, and he left his parents crying. So the Prophet said, "Return to your parents and make them laugh as you have made them cry."¹² In a *sabeeh hadeeth*, the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) was informed by Asmaa bint Abee Bakr as-Siddeeq (*radi Allaahu 'anhaa*) that her disbelieving mother was about to visit her saying, "My mother came to me, and she was a *musbrik* at the time of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*). I asked the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), "My mother has come to me and needs my help, so should I help her?" He (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said, "Yes, keep in touch with your mother and treat her well."¹³ Yet it maybe due to the fact that 49 minutes into the lecture entitled 'Jihad' by Faysal he claims that the cockroach has more dignity than a non-Muslim and that the Qur'aan teaches this!!?
- ✓ By slandering and discrediting the scholars he subliminally and indirectly puts his own self forward. He launches tirades against the Muslim scholars even saying that some of the senior scholars are **"more befitting to be called Rabbis"** (!) as he states in the question and answer session of the lecture *Treachery from Within*. This is also aggravated by referring to himself as being a "Shaykh" who has some Islamic credentials. Indeed, from the characteristics of the *khawaarij* is that the first of them did not believe that the people of knowledge have any kind of virtue, so they viewed

¹⁰ Saheeh Bukhaaree and Muslim

¹¹ Saheeh

¹² Saheeh

¹³ Bukhaaree, *hadeeth* no.2620 and Muslim, *hadeeth* no.1003; See *Sharh us-Sunnah*, vol.13, p.13, *Kitaab al-Birr wa's-Silah, Baab Silat al-Waalid al-Mushrik*.

themselves as being more knowledgeable than 'Ali Ibn Abee Taalib, Ibn 'Abbaas and the other companions (*radi Allaahu 'anhum*).

- ✓ He aligns himself with those who are seen as being against the status quo. So in the nineties he used to praise Safar, Salmaan, Aa'id et al. then from 2001 CE began quoting and referring to Bin Laadin, from whence he never ever used to mention anything about him, as he did so in the lecture *'Rules of Jibad.'* Faysal also did this with his futile defence of 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan and referring to him as **“his Shaykh”** when he never even knew him!? In fact, in Faysal's lecture of *takfeer* and extremism entitled *'21st Century House Niggers'*, Faysal purposefully left out the fact that 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan praised the *rawaafid shbee'ah* pseudo-revolution in 'Iraan as being **“a blessed revolution”** yet Faysal did not see any problem in praising the *Raafidee* al-Khomyaynee?!
 - ✓ A pre-occupation with politics and trying to get his audiences into casting aspersions and having evil suspicions against Muslim countries.
 - ✓ *Tadlees* (deception in narrating and relaying information)¹⁴ – So it has been noted by some of the elder *Salafee* brothers in London that Faysal used to purposefully refer to

¹⁴ The scholars of *hadeeth* have noted that there are five main types of *tadlees*:

1. *Tadlees ul-Isnad* – this where a narrator claims to have heard a *hadeeth* or a narration from a Shaykh who he usually narrates from and studies with, but in this case he did not hear anything at all from the Shaykh. There is a degree of meeting and correspondence yet in this case he ascribes something to the Shaykh which he did not actually directly hear from him. Ibn 'AbdulBarr (*raheemahullaah*) states **“As for tadlees it is when a man narrates from a man who he met and lived in the same time as and took from him and narrates from the man what he did not directly heard from him”**, *at-Tamheed*, vol.1, pp.15-16. So here the narrator will say **“Anna”** (certainly...), **“an”** (from...) or **“Qaala”** (he said) so it is not necessarily a clear and blatant lie.
2. *Tadlees ut-Taswiyah* – this is the most serious type as it is when a narrator purposefully leaves out and drops someone in his chain of transmission because he is weak and it will weaken his narrations. So for example, a Shaykh who is *thiqah* heard from one who was weak who heard from one who is *thiqah*, yet the weak one is dropped and left out of the chain in order to make it seem as if the two *thiqaat* heard directly from each other without anyone in the middle.
3. *Tadlees ul-Qat'* – this when the narrator of a *hadeeth* pauses and then just mentions any name as if the name mentioned actually relayed the *hadeeth*. This is also known as *Tadlees us-Sukoot*.
4. *Tadlees ul-'Atf* – this is when a narrator narrates from 2 Shaykhs but actually only heard from one of them.
5. *Tadlees ush-Shuyookh* – this is when a narrator uses a name of a person in a chain of narration that is well known by the people as being credible, when in reality it is a person who is da'eef but with the

- fabricated *hadeeth* all in order to further his own agenda and beliefs. Furthermore, he pieces together whatever suits him without a detailed or critical assessment of the sources, it is thus clearly evident that he is motivated by a personal agenda in many cases. He also makes out as if he was one of the main students of Shaykh Ibn Jibreen, when Ibn Jibreen has no idea who Faysal even is!!?
- ✓ A lack of condemning extremism, in fact Faysal hardly ever mentioned the many Qur'anic verses and *ahadeeth* related to extremism. This in itself indicates the dangerous methods as either he was ignorant of all of this or he purposefully refrained from warning against extremism. For example, in a lecture entitled *Jihad*' Faysal states 20 minutes into the lecture (which we analyse on page 103 as 'Sample Lecture no.23'): **"Now is there any peace treaty between us and the Hindus? No! So you can go India and if you see a Hindu walking down the road you're allowed to kill him and take his money. Is that clear?"** (!!?) Hereby neither distinguishing whatsoever between the guilty and the innocent nor between

same name. So for example, the *mudallis* states **"I heard Aboo 'Abdullaah say..."** trying to deceive the people that it is Ahmad ibn Hanbal who is well known for the name "Aboo 'Abdullaah" when it is really someone else. Or using "Aboo Saalih" will be used for Ahmad ibn Hanbal in order to make it seem as if the narrator is narrating from someone else so as not to be repetitive in narrating from Ahmad ibn Hanbal. Al-Khateeb al-Baghdaadee states in *al-Kifaayah* (p. 365) that **"...it is where a muhaddith narrates from a Shaykh who he heard from yet changes his name, kunyah or nisba or alters his well known condition to one which is unknown."** This is prevalent today especially with the explosion of the worldwide web and internet forums wherein people use false names, hide behind false identities and use fake pseudonyms. In any case in the modern era it is still practiced in relation to knowledge and Omar Bakri Muhammad Fustuq as-Sooree al-Lubnaanee is the best example of contemporary *tadlees*. Not only did he claim to study in *Umm ul-Qura'* and the *Islamic University of Madeenah* but he also claimed to study with "az-Zuhaylee", insinuating by this the famous Wahbah az-Zuhaylee. But when one of the brothers in London went to Syria in the late 1990s and asked Wahbah az-Zuhaylee directly if Omar Bakri was his student Shaykh Zuhaylee denied even knowing Bakri. When Bakri was confronted over this, Bakri said **"No, no, not that Zuhaylee, another Zuhaylee"!!** Clear *tadlees*!

For more on *tadlees* in the science of *hadeeth* see Dr. Misfar bin Ghirmullaah ad-Dameenee (Professor at the Department of Sunnah at *Imaam Muhammad bin Sa'ud University*, Riyadh, KSA), *at-Tadless fi'l-Hadeeth: Haqeeqatuhu, Aqsaamuhu, Maraatiibuha wa'l-Mawsoofoon bihi* [Tadless in the Hadeeth Literature: Its Reality, Types, Reasons and Those Described as Doing it], Riyadh: n.p., 1996 CE/1416 AH.

the aggressors and the peaceful. We assess this in light of the statements of Islamic scholars past and present. See page 35 of this study for example.

- ✓ Making *takfeer* of all of the Muslim countries without exception, and even when he does make an exception it is only the rule of the 'Taalibaan that he respected. Indeed, he made *takfeer* of most of the Muslims in the UK saying in the lecture on 'Knowledge' (!?), sample lecture no.13 in our study, Faysal stated: **“So the Muslims in this country (i.e. the UK), the majority of them, they have no eemaan and no taqwaa, the average Muslim you meet on the street he has no eemaan and no taqwaa...”**
- ✓ An avoidance of referring back to detailed explanations of Islamic scholars of the past and instead putting forward his own odd and extreme views forward instead.
- ✓ His lack of condemnation when members of his audience shout “Takbeer! Allaahu Akbar” three times, as occurs 59 minutes into the lecture *What's Your Aim-What's Your Objective?*¹⁵ Also in the lecture *Ideological Warfare (1)* with Sirraaj Wahhaaj present!? And in the lecture *Islam Under Siege*.
- ✓ His hyping up the audience not based on knowledge, encouraging the audience to agitation, revolt, rebellion and *fitna*.
- ✓ What is also noticeable that he opposes the *Salafees* the most due to the spread of the *Salafee da'wah* amongst those whom Faysal himself wishes to reach, namely the Muslim youth and revert Muslims. This explains Faysal's hatred, vitriol and enmity against the *Salafees* in the West, *Brixton Mosque (Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah)* in London in particular. So while Faysal's *da'wah* is completely crushed, squashed and destroyed the *Salafee da'wah* is still spreading!

¹⁵ This also occurs four minutes after this again! Also 8 minutes after the hour within this lecture again!

**A GLOSSARY OF FAYSAL'S MOST COMMONLY USED
WORDS, TERMS AND EXPRESSIONS THAT HE
REGURGITATES THROUGHOUT HIS LECTURES**

There are some terms and expressions that Faysal frequently regurgitates and drones on about repeatedly. These are:

“shirk al-haakimiyyah”	This concept is innovated which only gained ground after the ideas of Sayyid Qutb spread and is not found at all in any of the early works of the scholars. Shaykh 'Uthaymeen said about this 'haakimiyyah' concept: “This statement is a newly-invented, innovated, evil saying, making the one who uses it repugnant...and it is indeed a misguided innovation.” ¹⁶
“dismantling the sharee'ah”	Faysal constantly refers to this in doing so attempting to show that those Muslims who

¹⁶ *Liqaa `ul Maftooh* (no. 150) 20th *Shawwaal* 1417 AH

	<p>have shortcomings in regards to applying Islaam are therefore <i>kuuffaar</i> as they have 'dismantled' the Divine Legislation, when the reality is only the case that they have shortcomings or are sinful, not that they have purposely 'dismantled' the Divine Legislation of Allaah.</p>
<p>“signing on with the apostate leaders”</p>	<p>He uses this to discredit the scholars, mainly the scholars of Saudi who are popular with the youth. By extension, Faysal thus impugns the scholars with <i>kuufr</i> and as being apostates as he said about some of the senior scholars, as will be highlighted in this treatise. He also uses this mode of expression to encourage the youth through suspicion against the scholars for receiving finances and support from countries such as Saudi Arabia mainly. Yet when Faysal studied at <i>Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University</i> in Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia, the students also receive a stipend and other financial benefits when studying there, as is well-known. It is interesting that Faysal never at all admits, acknowledges or refers to this within his tirades against the <i>Salafee</i> scholars of Saudi!</p>
<p>“Saudi salafee”</p>	<p>He uses this in a rather odd sense, so for example he does not refer to Safar, Salmaan and Aa'id as being 'Saudi Salafees' even though currently these scholars who Faysal makes much reference to throughout his</p>

	<p>lectures, even though they other errors and have become <i>ikhwaanee</i>, have apparently freed themselves from <i>takfeer</i>, <i>ghuloo</i>, bombings and ideas of the likes of Faysal and now claim to be pure <i>Salafees</i>! So it looks as if Faysal's own scholars are Saudi <i>Salafees</i>, in both senses of the words!</p>
<p>“dodgy scholar”</p>	<p>Another abusive term that he uses to incite the youth against the scholars and to drive a wedge between the youth and the senior scholars. In doing so, Faysal attempts to put himself forward as one who is seen as one who does not “water down” Islaam and as one who “speaks the truth” even though Faysal speaks <i>baatil</i>, extremism and falsehood and none of it whatsoever should be regarded as being “a brave stance in speaking the truth” it is rather better for the likes of Faysal to remain silent as he has only contributed to <i>fitna</i>, controversy and incitement.</p>
<p>“kaafir” and “kaafirs”</p>	<p>Even though these words are totally legislated in the <i>deen</i>, Faysal is extreme in referring to these words and articulates these words in a vile manner within his lectures, and this is well known to the people! In the first lecture which will be analysed below Faysal states: “Kaafirs will always be kaafirs, every kaafir will always find</p>

	<p>a time to make you feel ashamed of your religion, every kaafir!...Kaafirs will always be Kaafirs”!! All of this in one small sentence!</p>
--	--

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.1

‘AL-WALAA WA’L-BARA’ (a)’

www.archive.org/stream/alwala1/alwala.rmvb

He states just before four minutes into the lecture, referring to and meaning himself first:

“Any shaykh, maulana, mufti who seeks to revive this concept¹⁷ in the ummah of the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wassallam) such a person would be slandered viciously. He will be called derogatory names “extremist”, “khawaarij” and people will warn others to stay away from that person, “that person has deviated, he has now become a khawaarij”, why? Because you are embedding in the Muslims, you are teaching the Muslims the importance of loving and hating for the sake of Allaah.”

Faysal then states about eighteen minutes into the lecture;

“...Most Muslims¹⁸ find it extremely difficult to reject faith in the taaghoot! Look how many of you believe in democracy, look how many of you believe in socialism, look how

¹⁷ i.e. *al-walaa wa'l-baraa*

¹⁸ Herein Faysal states “most Muslims”, not even “a few”, “some” or “a small number” but rather “most Muslims” find it difficult to reject faith in *Taaghoot*!! So what do “most Muslims” believe in then??!

many of you¹⁹ believe in capitalism...we believe in some false deity whether it is socialism, capitalism, democracy, which is the greatest shirk..."²⁰

Hereby describing Muslims with having major *shirk*, and not even minor *shirk* Faysal says that most Muslims believe in what he considers to be, with no one at all from the scholars of the past or present who have concurred this, the greatest *shirk*!! Indeed Faysal even accused his own audience of *jubaal* of believing in *tawaagheet*. Allaah says,

﴿أَمْ نَجْعَلُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ كَالْمُفْسِدِينَ فِي الْأَرْضِ أَمْ نَجْعَلُ الْمُتَّقِينَ كَالْفُجَّارِ﴾

“Or should We treat those who believe and do righteous deeds like corrupters in the land? Or should We treat those who fear Allaah like the wicked?”

{*Saad (38): 28*}

Allaah also says,

﴿أَفَنَجْعَلُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ كَالْمُجْرِمِينَ﴾

“Then will We treat the Muslims like the criminals?”

{*al-Qalam (68): 35*}

Then twenty-five minutes into the lecture he states:

“The taghoot of today they even control what you learn about Islaam...”

Hereby seeking to promote his own self as one who Islaam can be acquired from, as with this statement he has discredited many of the scholars, he continues:

“You don't know an ayah of the Qur'aan or a hadeeth or an aspect of Islamic history unless we give our scholars the permission to preach that on the minbar. When we give them the permission to preach that on the minbar then you learn about it. But if we don't give them the permission...so what we don't want you to learn of Islaam you will

¹⁹ This is another common method of Faysal, he talks as if he is talking directly to his audience and uses terms such as **“you...”** and this technique is to pressurise the audience and listeners into believing whatever Faysal tells them in the name of Islaam.

²⁰ See the lecture here: www.archive.org/stream/alwala1/alwala.rmvb

not learn of Islaam” so the taghoot of today²¹, even the very Islamic education they have monitored and they have controlled.”

So does this also refer to Faysal, who himself studied in a Saudi university? Did he learn in a **“taghoot institution”** which is controlled? If so, then that means that his own credentials are in question according to his own views!! He continues:

“And they didn’t stop there, they set-up bookshops all over, all over the world and they have their hypocritical scholars writing books and when they talk about the seven conditions of shahaadah it is watered down and when they talk about al-walaa al-baraa’ it is watered down, when they talk about shirk it is watered down, they will never mention shirk al-haakimiyyah, the shirk of dismantling the Sharee’ah and they water down, they water down, they water down, every single book of theirs is watered down, but people rush to by it because the cover is glossy, a glossy cover.”

Clear *ghulool*! As for the claim that what is in the books has been changed and watered down this is absolute nonsense as in the last few years *kniffaar* have tried to get Saudi for example to take things out and really water things down. So Faysal is just trying to hoodwink the listener, as for *‘shirk al-haakimiyyah’* which Faysal drones on about like a broken record, then which scholar or Imaam from the *Salaf* mentioned it? We are still waiting for those influenced by Sayyid Qutb to produce the *daleel*! Let’s see what the scholars of Riyadh, where Faysal himself studied, have to say on the issue. Shaykh Saalih as-Sadlaan said:

Whoever makes *haakimiyyah* a fourth category from the categories of *tanbeed*, then he is either an ignoramus or an innovator taking an opinion from the opinions of the philosophers. These are opinions that are not known in the Creed or the *sharee’ah*. He could also be a human being who is relating things and he does not know what he is relating.²²

Shaykh Naasir al-’Aql stated:

Likewise is the claim that *haakimiyyah* is the most important characteristic from the characteristics of *uloohiyyah*: there is no basis for this. It is an innovated claim.²³

Faysal then states around forty-five minutes into the lecture that:

²¹ Making *takfeer* here of Muslim governments, and in Faysal context he insinuates Saudi first and foremost above any other country.

²² *Al-Muslimoon* newspaper, issue no. 639

²³ *Ibid*.

“This drives home to you the importance of the Islamic Sharee’ah, the importance of hating the taghoot, the importance of hating those who dismantle the Sharee’ah, the importance of condemning the system, the importance of killing the taghoot...”

So if Faysal has already described certain Muslim governments as being **“taghoot governments”** what is the logical deduction to be made from this, if not to incite and endorse assassinations of Muslim governments or others who Faysal defines as being “a taghoot”? He continues, in his injustice:

“And if you are living in this country and a person approaches you and ask you “what do you think about the system” and you say to yourself, or you say to the person, “Alhamdulillah, it’s not a bad system, it’s a good system, even though my name is Muhammad I’m allowed to sign on and on top of that I live in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, I can’t complain.” Now you are in this system and you can’t see anything wrong with the system you say “it’s okay”! Just to give that answer “it’s okay” you become a kaafir!” (!!!)

Reflect on this *khawaarij manhaj*! Faysal then goes on to say that it is due to one not having perfected rejection of the *taghoot*, yet in another lecture Faysal himself encourages his blind followers to take welfare state benefits and British government hand-outs, as occurs in the lecture *Challenges Facing the Youth!!?* Furthermore, Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah notes that:

Civilisation is rooted in justice, and the consequences of oppression are devastating. Therefore, it is said that Allaah aids the just state even if it is non-Muslim, yet withholds His help from the oppressive state even if it is Muslim.²⁴

Ibn Taymiyyah also noted that some Christians are equitable, just and ‘okay’ as it were, he said (*rabeemabullaah*)

What is clear is that, all those who have done good towards the Muslims and leaned towards them, were never harmed by the Muslims. Indeed, the result of such work is good and a lasting relationship repaying the extent of the service received.²⁵

Faysal also states:

“Kaafirs will always be kaafirs, every kaafir will always find a time to make you feel ashamed of your religion, every kaafir!...Kaafirs will always be Kaafirs!”

²⁴ *Ibn Taymiyyah Letters from Prison*, (Middlesex, UK: Message of Islam, 1419 AH/ 1998 CE), p.7

²⁵ *Ibid.* p.55

What a pathetic remark from one who used to be “a kaafir” himself! Indeed, from one who used to be in the Christian Salvation Army! What is Faysal trying to insinuate here? He makes no distinction whatsoever here and this is an example of his blanket generalisations which are filled with error and injustice. In the question and answer session, about an hour and twenty-nine minutes into the lecture, Faysal is asked if Omar Bakri Muhammad al-Fostok (Fustuq) al-Lubnaanee al-Mudallis,²⁶ another deviant, should be killed!! This was due to Bakri being

²⁶ A Syrian of dubious background, his name ‘Fustuq’, sometimes spelt ‘Fostok’, is the Arabic word for ‘Pistachio nut’ in Shaam. According to the Islamic researcher ‘AbdurRahmaan ibn Muhammad ad-Dimishqiyyah has noted: he is from Halab (Aleppo) and is Lebanese by residence (before and after his time in the UK). He was one of the main symbols of *Hizb ut-Tahreer* in the 1990s despite his ignorance of the Arabic language in general and of the Qur’aan specifically, in terms of reading, understanding and application; not to mention his hastiness in delivering *fataawaa*! He is a pseudo scholar and a person of false propaganda and proof of this is that he claims in his book *Essential Fiqh* (London: Islamic Book Company, 1996) that he graduated from numerous universities, the most of important of which being *Umm ul-Qura*’ in Makkah, the *Islamic University of Madeenah* and *al-Azhar* in Egypt, along with the *College of Sharee’ah* in Damascus!!? As he knew how honoured the names of Makkah and Madeenah were with the non-Arab Muslims, he claimed that he spent his life studying between these two holy cities.

His biography is not unknown as during his time in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia he did not study Islamic knowledge in any of the universities, rather he was an employee for the company *Eastern Electric* owned by Shamsaan and ‘Abdul’Azeez as-Suhaybee in Riyadh. Then he went to the branch in Jeddah and during that time he did not study in any university, rather he went to America for a few months to study English and suddenly left and went to London and became the *muftee* of *Hizb ut-Tahreer*. Therefore, if he studied at these institutions he has to produce his certificates from the universities of *Umm ul-Qura*’ in Makkah and the *Islamic University of Madeenah* if he is truthful! He used to be entrenched in *tashayyu*’ (Shi’ism) and used to teach the “Ja’fari madhab” saying that it was from *Ahl us-Sunnah*, and Bakri thus held that it was okay to say in the adhaan “Come to the best of actions”. Yet at the same time he used to slander the *salafees* and brand them as being “Wahhabis”, like the *Sufis*, indicating his simplistic and erroneous stances.

Bakri, like Abdul-Qadeem Zaloom one of the former heads of *HT*, used to curse the *da’wah* of Muhammad ibn ‘AbdulWahhaab and accused him of being in the service of the British to bring down the Ottoman state, which as we shall see is what Bakri is guilty of himself. But what is odd is that they used to accept the narration of a non-Muslim spy and consider that as trustworthy yet reject the conditions for trustworthy narrators in regards to ahad narrations!! So for Bakri and his followers in *HT* during the nineties, and the same is still the case for *HT* today, spies, enemies of Islaam and journalists are trustworthy to relay and report from yet a single companion of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) is not! See ‘AbdurRahmaan ibn Muhammad Sa’eed Dimashqiyyah, *Hizb ut-Tahreer* (Istanbul, Turkey: Maktabah al-Ghurabaa’, 1417 AH/1997CE), pp.63-66

After 9/11 Bakri claimed to be *salafee* in *’aqeedah* (!?) yet this was a mere claim as he never once used to refer back to the *salafee* scholars and still preceded giving his own extremist and erroneous, he rather became more fervent in his *khaarjiyyah*. He is also known for making very extreme statements via the media yet

never ever was apprehended by the British government for his incitement and agitation. So for example, on 19 April 2004 in an interview with a Portuguese magazine called *Publica*, Bakri stated;

“It’s inevitable. Because several attacks are being prepared by several groups...one very well organized group in London calling itself ‘al Qaeda Europe’ appears has a great appeal for young Muslims. I know that they are ready to launch a big operation.”

In January 2005 CE Bakri, via live internet broadcasts urged British Muslims to join *al-Qaeda* and that the British government had violated the ‘covenant of security’ due to their anti-terror legislation. He asserted that the UK had become *Daar ul-Harb*. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed highlights:

Bakri’s statements clearly suggest that he had advance warning of the plans to conduct a domestic terrorist attack in London by a British-based group, al-Qaeda in Europe. This, in turn, suggests that he was in a position to be directly acquainted with the relevant terrorist planning; and by implication that being so acquainted, he must have had sufficient contact with the planners and/or their terrorist associates.

See Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, *The London Bombings: An Independent Inquiry* (London: Duckworth, 2006), pp.54-55. Ahmed also mentions;

Further firm evidence of a direct connection between the bombers and al-Muhajiroun came in the form of a confession made by al-Qaeda suspect Muhammad Junaid Babar, detained in New York for attending an al-Qaeda terror summit in Pakistan. Babar admitted to US authorities that he knew the chief London bomber, Mohammed Siddique Khan. Babar was a member of the Queens branch of al-Muhajiroun. Reportedly part of a terrorist network in Pakistan, Babar was also connected with the March 2004 plot uncovered by the police. After pleading guilty in June 2004, he turned informant for the security services. See Ahmed, *op.cit.*, pp.58-59

Bakri boasted in a 2002 interview: **“The British government knows who we are. MI5 has interrogated us many times. I think now we have something called public immunity.”** Ahmed, *op.cit.*, p.72

Also, *al-Muhaajiroon* published *‘fataawaa’* from Bakri inciting acts of violence and terrorism against governments including a death threat against the Pakistani military leader Musharraf, after making *takfeer* on him after 9/11 on *BBC* news in September 2001 and also a call to kill Boris Yeltsin and even a call to assassinate Tony Blair in 2004!!? Bakri had already made *takfeer* of the Taalibaan regime in August 2001 CE in a letter that Bakri wrote to Mullah ‘Umar wherein he branded Afghaanistaan as ‘Daar ul-Kufr’ under the Taalibaan and not an abode of Islaam!? See: *‘Ash-Sharq al-Awsat’* newspaper; no. 2 August 2001 CE

Bakri also boasted that his brother had joined *al-Qaeda* and had received a one year course in weapons and evasive vehicle maneuvering in Texas and Scotland!!? More recently, Aboo ‘Izzaddeen ‘Umar Brooks and Aboo ‘Uzayr stated on national British TV (*BBC2’s Newsnight* programme) last year after 7/7 that **“martyrdom operations are completely praiseworthy”** (!) and Aboo ‘Uzayr described the 9/11 bombers as being **“the magnificent 19”**!!? Then they wonder why police raid as they do in East London!? They only do so due

involved in a ridiculous documentary about himself entitled *'The Ayatollah of Tottenham'* and was aired on Tuesday 8 April 1997 CE on *Channel 4* in the UK. The documentary can be

to the agitation and negative image of Islaam that they hear from the likes of the blind followers of Bakri Lubnaanee! With regards to all of this Nafeez Ahmed states:

These selected citations are only a small representative sample of hundreds of inflammatory anecdotes, documents and speeches made by Bakri and other leading members of al-Muhajiroun. Inciting people to violence breaks existing UK law and under normal circumstances would lead to arrests, charges, prosecution, and in appropriate cases, deportation. After the London bombings, the government called for new legal powers to tackle terrorism. But this only highlights the question of why the government failed to use the powers it already had? See Ahmed, *op.cit.*,p.76

Nafeez Ahmed then superbly notes;

The security and intelligence services knew that al-Muhajiroun was recruiting aggressively and successfully in the UK. They knew that individuals radicalized by the group had fought and died in Afghanistan. By consistently refusing to arrest and charge members of al-Muhajiroun for their post-9/11 terrorist training and recruitment programme, which by their own proud admission allowed British Muslims to be trained in al-Qaeda camps in Afghanistan in preparation for future terrorist operations on UK soil, British authorities left intact the networks that radicalized Siddique Khan and his companions. We have had no explanation for this apparent lapse... Ahmed, *op.cit.*,p.82

As a result, Nafeez Ahmed states:

In other words, Bakri and his al-Muhajiroun organization have not merely been tolerated by British authorities despite involvement in al-Qaeda recruitment, terrorist training, and incitement to violence, murder and terrorism; they were actively protected by British security services in the late 1990s, operating as recruiting agents for British covert operations... Ahmed, *op.cit.*, p.153

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zOv5X18SDgw>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zxA4lmxjIbk&mode=related&search=>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7paINhyXmk4>

http://news.bbc.co.uk/newswatch/ifs/low/newsid_4740000/newsid_4742600/4742625.stm

The results of these stunts have only lead to mockery of the *deen* (with Aboo Istihzabideen for example being exposed as living off welfare state benefits and the *National Health Service*), increased distrust of Muslim communities in the UK, led to even more draconian measures against the Muslims and using the likes of "Aboo 'Izzaddeen" to show that the Muslims are extreme like him and therefore must be monitored and suspected even more.

viewed here at the following link of this *takefeere* website of blind followers of Omar Bakri:
http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=category§ionid=5&id=100&Itemid=183

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.2

'EXPOSING THE HYPOCRITES'

http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=491&Itemid=181

Faysal states in the lecture entitle '*Exposing the Hypocrites*', which is a lecture based on the works of 'Aa'id al-Qarnee (!!):

“Another sign of the hypocrite is that he's very pessimistic, so he says...“how can we fight America, it's impossible let us throw our towel in the ring and give-up, we'll never fight America. We don't have the ability to build submarines and planes and tanks, tomahawk cruise missiles and patriot missiles and so on and so on. It doesn't make sense that we declare war on these people, we don't have the weapons” this is a hypocrite speaking. He's very pessimistic and he spreads this da'wah around to convince the other Muslims to give up jihaad “don't fight the enemy because you don't have the technology they have” this is a real hypocrite, very pessimistic. Then he (the hypocrite) has another point which is called Irjaa.”

So just because a Muslim says that armed *jibaad* should not be fought at a particular time this necessitates that Muslim being a hypocrite according Faysal's corrupted analysis! Let's us refer to what Muslim scholars actually say on the very important issues that Faysal ignorantly delved into. Shaykh *al-'Allaamah* Muhammad bin Saalih al-'Uthaymeen (*rabeemabullaah*) said in response to a question which was put to him:

ولهذا لو قال لنا قائل : الآن لماذا لا نحارب أمريكا وروسيا وفرنسا وانجلترا ؟؟؟! لماذا؟؟ لعدم القدرة الأسلحة التي قد ذهب عصرها عندهم هي التي في أيدينا وهي عند أسلحتهم بمنزلة سكاكين الموقد عند الصواريخ ما تفيد شيئاً فكيف يمكن أن نقاتل هؤلاء ؟ ولهذا أقول: إنه من الحمق أن يقول قائل: أنه يجب علينا أن نقاتل أمريكا وفرنسا وانجلترا وروسيا كيف نقاتل هذا تأباه حكمة الله عز وجل ويأباه شره لكن الواجب علينا أن نفعل ما أمر الله به عز وجل

““Today, why don't we wage war against America, Russia, France and England??!!”²⁷ Why not? Due to the lack of military power which time has passed by all for them. The weapons that are in our hands are kitchen utensils like kitchen knives against rockets; this would not benefit a thing! So how is it even possible for us to fight those? For this reason I say: It is from foolishness to say that it is obligatory for us to fight America, France, England and Russia, how can we fight those when we disobey the wisdom of Allaah and shun His Divine Legislation. What is rather obligatory for us to do is do what Allaah has instructed us to do,

﴿وَأَعِدُّوا لَهُمْ مَا اسْتَطَعْتُمْ مِنْ قُوَّةٍ﴾

“And prepare against them what you are able to from power...”

{*al-Anfaal* (8): 60}

هذا الواجب علينا أن نعد لهم ما استطعنا من قوة، وأهم قوة نعددها هو الإيمان والتقوى ... ا.هـ

This is obligatory for us, to prepare ourselves what we are able to from power and the most important form of power is eemaan and taqwaa.”²⁸

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Ra'ees ar-Ra'ees notes that from the particular affairs in comprehending the condition of the Muslims is that if they are weak due to their numbers of due to their lack of preparation in relation to their enemies it is not correct for them to tread the path of armed jihaad against the enemy due to their condition of weakness. What makes this apparent is the fact that Allaah did not instruct His messenger (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) and the Companions (*radi Allaahu 'anhum*) to fight the *kuffaar* when they were in Makkah due to their weakness in number and in readiness in relation to their enemies. Ibn Taymiyyah said:

وكان مأموراً بالكف عن قتالهم لعجزه وعجز المسلمين عن ذلك، ثم لما هاجر إلى المدينة وصار له بها أعوان أذن له في الجهاد، ثم لما قوا كتب عليهم القتال ولم يكتب عليهم قتال من سالمهم؛ لأنهم لم يكونوا يطبقون قتال جميع الكفار . فلما فتح الله مكة وانقطع قتال قريش وملوك العرب، ووفدت إليه وفود العرب بالإسلام أمره الله – تعالى – بقتال الكفار كلهم إلا من كان له عهد مؤقت، وأمره بنبذ العهود المطلقة، فكان الذي رفعه ونسخه ترك القتال ا.هـ

²⁷ Just as Faysal has stated!

²⁸ See http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf

It was instructed to abstain from fighting them due to his inability and the inability of the Muslims, then when they migrated to Madeenah and gained assistance, Allaah permitted him to make armed jihaad and then when they grew in strength Allaah prescribed for them fighting and did not prescribe fighting for them for their own safety as they were not able to fight all of the kuffaar. But when Allaah opened up Makkah for them and halted fighting against the Quraysh and the kings of the Arabs and a delegation of Arabs came into Islaam, Allaah instructed the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) fighting all of the kuffaar except those who had a temporal bond of agreement and Allaah instructed him to annul those absolute agreements and that which annulled it was leaving fighting.²⁹

Ibn Taymiyyah also said:

وسبب ذلك أن المخالفة لهم لا تكون إلا مع ظهور الدين وعلوه كالجهاد، وإلزامهم بالجزية والصغار، فلما كان المسلمون في أول الأمر ضعفاء لم تشرع المخالفة لهم، فلما كمل الدين وظهر وعلا، شرع ذلك اهـ

The reason for that tax upon them is only when the deen is manifest and raised such as jihaad and their adherence to paying the jizya and subjugation. So when the Muslims were in a state of weakness in the beginning the duty (which the non-Muslims pay to the Muslim state) was not Divinely Legislated, only after the deen had been completed and manifest was that Divinely Legislated.³⁰

Then Ibn Taymiyyah said:

فكان ذلك عاقبة الصبر والتقوى اللذين أمر الله بهما في أول الأمر، وكان إذ ذاك لا يؤخذ من أحد من اليهود الذين بالمدينة ولا غيرهم جزية، وصارت تلك الآيات في حق كل مؤمن مستضعف لا يمكنه نصر الله ورسوله بيده ولا بلسانه، فينتصر بما يقدر عليه من القلب ونحوه، وصارت آية الصغار على المعاهدين في حق كل مؤمن قوي يقدر على نصر الله ورسوله بيده أو لسانه، وبهذه الآية ونحوها كان وعلى عهد خلفائه الراشدين، وكذلك هو إلى قيام الساعة، لا المسلمون يعملون آخر عُمر رسول الله تزال طائفة من هذه الأمة قائمين على الحق ينصرون الله ورسوله النصر التام، فمن كان من المؤمنين بأرض هو فيها مستضعف أو في وقت هو فيه مستضعف فليعمل بآية الصبر والصفح عن يؤذي الله

²⁹ *Al-Jawaab as-Saheeh*, vol.1, p.237

³⁰ *Iqtidaa' as-Siraat ul-Mustaqeem*, vol.1, p.420

ورسوله من الذين أوتوا الكتاب والمشركين، وأما أهل القوة فإنما يعملون بأية قتال أئمة الكفر الذين يطعنون في الدين، وبأية قتال الذين أوتوا الكتاب حتى يعطوا الجزية عن يد وهم صاغرون اهـ.

This was the result of patience and consciousness of Allaah which Allaah instructed (the Muslims to have) at the very beginning of Islaam and during that time the jizya was not taken from any of the Jewish community, or other non-Muslim communities, who were living in Madeenah. Those verses applicable to every Muslim in a state of weakness who is not able to aid Allaah and His messenger with his hand or via his tongue (i.e. by speaking), but could help by using what he was able to by his heart and the likes. The verses about subduing those non-Muslims who have contracts with Muslims are applicable to every strong believer who is able to help the deen of Allaah and His Messenger with his hand and tongue (i.e. via speaking). It is with these verses that the Muslims were applying during the last epoch of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallahu alayhi wassallam) and during the epoch of his rightly guided caliphs. And thus it will be until the Day of Judgement as there will never cease to be a group from this ummah who are well established on the truth who help Allaah and His Messenger with complete help. So whoever from the believers is weak in the earth or is weak in the time in which he is living in, must apply those verses of the Qur'aan which mention patience and forgiveness against those who are seeking to harm Allaah and His Messenger from those who were given the scriptures prior and also from the polytheists. As for those people who are in a state of strength then they are to apply the verses regarding fighting the leaders of kufr who slander the deen. They are also to apply the Qur'anic verses regarding fighting those who were given the scriptures prior until they pay the jizya and are subjugated.³¹

Imaam 'AbdurRahmaan as-Sa'dee (*rabeemabullaah*) said:

هذه الآيات تتضمن الأمر بالقتال في سبيل الله، وهذا كان بعد الهجرة إلى المدينة، لما قوي المسلمون للقتال أمرهم الله به، بعدما كانوا مأمورين بكف أيديهم اهـ.

These verses include the order to fight in the way of Allaah and this was after the hijra to Madeenah. So when the Muslims became strong Allaah instructed them to fight, after they were instructed to abstain from it.³²

Imaam as-Sa'dee then said:

³¹ *As-Saarim al-Maslool*, vol.2, p.413

³² *Tafseer*, p.89

-: ومنها: أنه لو فرض عليهم القتال – مع قلة عددهم وعددهم، وكثرة أعدائهم- لأدى ذلك إلى اضمحلال الإسلام، فروعياً جانب المصلحة العظمى على ما دونها، ولغير ذلك من الحكم. وكان بعض المؤمنين يودون أن لو فرض عليهم القتال في تلك الحال غير اللائق فيها ذلك، وإنما اللائق فيها القيام بما أمروا به في ذلك الوقت من التوحيد والصلاة والزكاة ونحو ذلك، كما قال تعالى

And from it: is that if fighting was obligated upon them, with their small numbers and many enemies, that would have led to Islaam disappearing. Some of the believers held that fighting during that condition was improper. What is actually suitable in such a period of weakness is to establish what Allaah has instructed from *tawheed*, prayer, giving charity (*zakah*) etc. As Allaah said,

وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ فَعَلُوا مَا يُوعَظُونَ بِهِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ وَأَشَدَّ تَثْبِيثًا

“But if they done what they had been instructed to do it would have been better for them and would have strengthened (their faith).”

{an-Nisaa (4): 66}

فلما هاجروا إلى المدينة ، وقوي الإسلام ، كتب عليهم القتال في وقته المناسب لذلك .هـ

So when they migrated to Madeenah and Islaam became powerful, Allaah prescribed fighting for them at the suitable time.³³

Imaam Muhammad bin Saalih al-'Uthaymeen (*raheemahullaah*) said:

لا بد فيه من شرط وهو أن يكون عند المسلمين قدرة وقوة يستطيعون بها القتال، فإن لم يكن لديهم قدرة فإن إقدام أنفسهم في القتال إلقاء بأنفسهم إلى التهلكة ، ولهذا لم يوجب الله سبحانه وتعالى على المسلمين القتال وهم في مكة ، لأنهم عاجزون ضعفاء فلما هاجروا إلى المدينة وكونوا الدولة الإسلامية وصار لهم شوكة أمروا بالقتال، وعلى هذا فلا بد من هذا الشرط ، وإلا سقط عنهم كسائر الواجبات لأن جميع الواجبات يشترط فيها القدرة لقوله تعالى

There is a necessary condition within this which is that: the Muslims have ability and power that enables them to fight. If they do not possess the power yet put themselves forward to fight, they

³³ Tafseer, p.188

will be destroyed.³⁴ For this reason, Allaah did not obligate the Muslims to fight whilst they were in Makkah as they were unable due to their condition of weakness. But when they migrated to

³⁴ This is what has taken place in the West, with London being an excellent example of where the efforts of the so-called 'leaders of *jihad*' have not materialized whatsoever and their calls have been totally quashed, squashed, crushed, quelled and destroyed and their ideologues have been thrown in prisons of the *kuffaar*, with no positive effects of their *da'wah* for the Muslims or societies whatsoever. Indeed, some of them have even freed themselves from suicide bombings due to them realizing the negative effects, as happened last year with Aboo Baseer 'AbdulMun'im ibn Mustaphaa Haleemah at-Tartoosee (based in Lewisham, south-east London) who refuted those who resort to suicide bombing in London and 'Ammaan. Some argue that this was done as Aboo Baseer wanted to free himself from such terrorist actions and due to his fear of being implicated with such actions. In any case, he remains one of the main *takfeeree* theoreticians. So even though he openly now rejects suicide bombings in the UK he calls for revolt and 'taking out' those "who get in the way" within Muslim countries!? See his so-called '*fatwa*' on Saudi Arabia. Other examples of this are with Ali al-Khudayr and Naasir al-'Umar.

Another example of this is with Aboo Zubayr Saleem "al-Azzaamee" who used to disseminate the *fataawaa* of the likes of Hamood bin 'Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee (regarding the permissibility of suicide bomb attacks) but then after the events of 7/7 decided that it was time to condemn them!? In an article written by Aboo Zubayr entitled '*Some Thoughts on the London Attacks*' (dated 9 July 2005 CE on the '*Islamic Awakening*' website) he frees himself from the evil of those attacks, praising "**the zeal of the ordinary British population**" along with other traits of the *kuffaar* which he all-of-a-sudden now considers "praiseworthy." As a result, he praises the *kuffaar* and condemns the Muslims for not going on innovated demonstrations, protests and rallies by saying "**The British public have commendably far surpassed, in their efforts for the control order detainees, the British Muslims who have succumbed to fear from day one.**" As if prancing around on a foolish demonstration (which is based on the ideas of those who one claims to hate so much!) in some cases for known *takfeerees* and *khawaarij*, is the bench-mark to assess one's *eemaan* in Allaah and the Messenger (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)!?!?

Within the article he also suddenly calls on Muslims in the UK to be "**law-abiding citizens**" yet he did not seem to adhere to this for the Muslims in Saudi when he was peddling around the views of the likes of Safar, Salmaan and Aa'id when they were imprisoned in Saudi!? Aboo Zubayr also says: "**This is where the Muslim community must play its role in tackling those who are bent on destroying what we have been building for decades.**" (!!!) Then he says "**...that if it really was in their interests to prevent such attacks from occurring in Britain, they would have tried their best in reaching out to the vulnerable young people who may fall victims to wrong ideas.**" This is from one who in the late 1990s used to call the youth at *al-Muntada al-Islaamee* to the *kufur* of the Muslim rulers and accuse the major scholars of being *Murji'ah* and not knowing "**the reality of eemaan**"!! Yet in his article Aboo Zubayr had the audacity to say: "**We should also be aware of falling into extremism or negligence, for often at times of crisis we notice the phenomena of Muslims going from one extreme to the other. Islam is a balanced religion, between extremism and negligence.**" Mashaa'Allaah, So Aboo Zubayr has finally realized that it's time to warn against and refute extremism and the avenues to it?! About

Madeenah and established the Islamic state they assumed power and were instructed to fight. Based upon this there is no escape from this condition and if not the remaining obligations would be redundant as all of the obligations have the condition of ability based on Allaah's saying,

﴿فَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ مَا اسْتَطَعْتُمْ﴾

“Fear Allaah as much as you can...”

{*Taghaabun* (64): 16}

وقوله

And Allaah's saying,

﴿لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا﴾

“Allaah does not burden a soul more than it can bear...”

{*Baqarah* (2): 286}.³⁵

Then Imaam al-'Uthaymeen (*raheemabullaah*) said in response to a question related to the Islamic society's need for *jibaad* in the path of Allaah which asked:

فضل الجهاد ومنزلته العظيمة في الشرع الإسلامي ليكون الدين كله لله، وأضاف هل يجب القتال أو يجوز مع عدم الاستعداد له؟

The virtue of jihaad and its lofty status in the Divine Legislation of Islaam is in order for the deen to be entirely for Allaah. In addition to this I ask is fighting obligated or permissible without being prepared for it?

The answer from Imaam al-'Uthaymeen (*raheemabullaah*):

لا يجب ولا يجوز ونحن غير مستعدين له، والله لم يفرض على نبيه وهو في مكة أن يقاتل المشركين ، وأن الله أذن لنبيه في صلح الحديبية أن يعاهد المشركين ذلك العهد الذي إذا تلاه الإنسان ظن أن فيه خذلاناً للمسلمين . كثير منكم يعرف كيف كان صلح الحديبية حتى قال عمر بن الخطاب: يا رسول الله ألسنا على الحق وعدونا على الباطل

time too! It's a shame that Aboo Zubayr and Aboo Baseer could not extend their new-found respect for the *kuffaar* to Muslim countries and leaders! [TN]

³⁵ *Sharh ul-Mumti'*, vol.8, p.9

؟ قال: بلى. قال: فلم نعطي الدنيا في ديننا؟، فظن أن هذا خذلان، ولكن الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم ما في شك أنه أفقه من عمر، وأن الله تعالى أذن له في ذلك وقال: إني رسول الله ولست عاصيه وهو ناصرني... وإن كان ظاهر الصلح خذلاناً للمسلمين، وهذا يدلنا يا إخواني على مسألة مهمة وهو قوة ثقة المؤمن بربه.. المهم أنه يجب على المسلمين الجهاد حتى تكون كلمة الله هي العليا ويكون الدين كله لله، لكن الآن ليس بأيدي المسلمين ما يستطيعون به جهاد الكفار حتى ولو جهاد مدافعة وجهاد المهاجمة ما في شك الآن غير ممكن حتى يأتي الله بأمة واعية تستعد إيمانياً ونفسياً، ثم عسكرياً، أما نحن على هذا الوضع فلا يمكن أن نجاهد. اهـ

It is not obligated and it is not permissible without being prepared for it. Allaah did not obligate on His Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) whilst he was in Makkah to fight the Mushrikeen and permitted His Prophet in the Treaty of Hdaybiyah to make an agreement with the Mushrikeen.³⁶ This was an agreement which if a person read

³⁶ The *Hdaybiyah Treaty* was made between the Muslims and the polytheists of Quraysh. When the *mushrikeen* of Quraysh witnessed the determination of the Muslims to risk their lives, properties, wealth and families for their faith in order to spread it peacefully, they realised that the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) and his followers (*radi Allaahu 'anhum*) could not be bullied or frightened by mere scare tactics. Therefore, a treaty of reconciliation and peace was made between the Quraysh and the Muslims. The clauses of the treaty were:

- The Muslims would return and come back in the following year (7 AH) but they would not stay in Makkah for more than three days and without arms except those concealed.
- War activities were to be suspended for ten years, during which both sides will live in security with neither side waging war against the other.
- Whoever wishes to join Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) was free to do so and likewise whoever wished to join the *mushrikeen* of the Quraysh was also free to do so.
- If anyone from the Quraysh joins Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) without his parent's or guardian's permission, he should be sent back to the Quraysh, but should any of Muhammad's followers return to the Quraysh, he was not to be sent back. (Safiur-Rahman al-Mubarakpuri, *The Sealed Nectar (ar-Raheequl-Makhtum)* Darusalam, 2002, p.403)

The treaty was significant in that the Quraysh began to recognise the Muslims legitimate existence and began to deal with them on equal terms. Safiur-Rahman al-Mubarakpuri notes in his biography of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) pp.407-408: "The Muslims did not have in mind to seize people's property or kill them through bloody wars, nor did they ever think of using any compulsive approaches in their efforts to propagate Islam, on the contrary their sole target was to provide an atmosphere of freedom in

would think that within it was a setback for the Muslims. Many of you know how the Treaty of Hudaibiyah was to the extent that 'Umar ibn al-Khattaab (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) said "O Messenger of Allaah! Are we not upon the truth and our enemies upon baatil?" The Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said "Yes." 'Umar said "Then why should we accept such difficult terms in the affairs of our deen?" 'Umar thought that there was a setback for the Muslims within the treaty. However, there is no doubt that the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) has more understanding than 'Umar and Allaah permitted the Messenger to do that. The Messenger of Allaah said "Indeed, I am the Messenger of Allaah and I would not disobey him and He will help me" so if it was clear that the treaty was a setback for the Muslims then this indicates to us brothers an important issue which is the strength of a believer's trust in his Lord. So what is important is that it is obligatory upon Muslims to wage jihaad in order to make the word of Allaah the most high and so that the deen will be entirely for Allaah. However, currently we do not possess as Muslims that which can enable us to wage *jihaad* against the *kuffaar*, even if is defensive. As for offensive jihaad then there is no doubt that this is not possible right now until Allaah brings consciousness to the *ummah* which prepare the ummah in terms of *eemaan*, personally and militarily. As for us today in this regard we are not able to wage *jihaad*.³⁷

Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan ibn 'Abdullaah (*hafidhabullaah*) was asked:

There are those who see that the hadeeth of the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam): "Jihaad is continuous until the Last Hour is established"³⁸ and then say "why do the

ideology or religion, **"Then whosoever wills, let him believe, and whosoever wills, let him disbelieve."** {*al-Kahf* (18): 29}" The Muslims on the other hand had the opportunity to spread Islaam over areas not then explored. When there was the peace agreement, war was abolished, and men met and consulted each other, none talked about Islaam intelligently without entering it; within two years following the conclusion of the treaty, twice as many people entered Islaam than ever before. This is supported by the fact that the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) went out to al-Hudaibiyah with only 1400 men, but when he set out to liberate Makkah, two years later, he had 10,000 men with him. [TN]

³⁷ *Liqaa'* (open session) 33, Thursday 1 Safar 1414 AH/July 20 1993 CE

³⁸ Shaykh Muhammad ibn Fahd al-Husayn says in his commentary and editing of Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan's treatise on *jihaad*, with regards to this *hadeeth*: I did not find this *hadeeth* with this wording and what Aboo Daawood transmitted with the wording "*Jihaad is continuous form the time Allaah sent me until the last part of this ummah fight the Dajjal*" has within the chain of transmission Yazeed ibn Abee Tushbah about whom Ibn Hajar said in *at-Taqreeb* "*majhool*." For this reason, he stated in *Fath al-Baaree* (vol.6, p.67) that in its

scholars say that the ummah is not able to make offensive jihaad during our present era and that this time resembles the first Makkan period? And the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) said that “Jihaad is continuous until the Last Hour is established.”?

Answer from Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan:

Yes, *jihaad* is continuous if the conditions and basics have been fulfilled then it is continuous. As for when the conditions and basics have not been fulfilled then it is to be awaited for until power, capability and readiness returns to the Muslims, so then they can fight their enemies. So for example, if you have a sword or a gun, can you face airplanes, bombs and rockets?? No, because this ace what they have prepared then will lead to severe harm, if you have that which is ready to face what they have prepared, or the likes of it, then face them. As for you not having anything to face them, then Allaah says,

﴿وَلَا تُلْقُوا بِأَيْدِيكُمْ إِلَى التَّهْلُكَةِ﴾

“...and do not throw (yourselves) with your own hands into destruction.”

{*Baqarah (2): 195*}

And this will harm the Muslims more than benefiting them, if indeed there is any benefit in it at all.

So look at the huge gaping difference between the scholars and Faysal and those like him, such as Anwar al-Awlaki!³⁹

chain of transmission is weakness. The wording that the scholars mention in the books of creed is as what at-Tahaawee (*raheemahullaah*) said “*Hajj and jihaad are both continuous with the leader of the Muslims, good or evil, until the Hour is established. They are not annulled at all or diminished.*” *Sharh 'Aqeedah Tahawiyyah*, 387. See: Muhammad bin Fahd al-Husayn (ed.), Shaykh, Dr. Saalih bin Fawzaan al-Fawzaan, *al-Jihaad wa Dawaabithuhu ash-Shar'iyyah* (Riyadh: Maktabah ar-Rushd, 1424 AH/ 2003 CE), p.48.

³⁹ 'Imaam 'Anwar al-Awlaki stated on one of his lectures wherein he 'explains' a book by a Saudi *jihaadee*, Yusuf al-'Uyayree, who according to his biographer 'Eesaa bin Sa'd al-Awshaan and translated by “al-Barbaree” and “edited by Aboo Irsaad” did not even study in at school!!? See the first page of the biography written by one of his followers, 'Eesaa bin Sa'd al-'Awshaan available for download here: <http://www.sendspace.com/file/95anlb> and also here: <http://www.sendspace.com/file/emqvjl>

Awlaki explained 'Uyayree's book entitled “*Thawaabit 'ala Darb il-Jihad'* [Constants on the Path of Jihad], transcribed and edited by “Mujadihd fe Sabeelillah” and is Online to be downloaded here: <http://mujahida3001.wordpress.com/ilm/> on page 46:

“These people can come in the form of Shuyookh and they will tell you that it is not the time for Jihad fe Sabeelillah, and because they are scholars you would listen to them.

Allah says, “And there would have been some among you who would have listened to them.” Why would they listen to these people? Because of the status they have. They are leaders in their community and even scholars. They discourage a Muslim from doing Jihad fe Sabeelillah; whoever discourages a Muslim from doing Jihad fe Sabeelillah is a Minafiq since this ayah is referring to the Munafiqoon. A Muslim who has become a Mujahid since this ayah is these people; he doesn't care about their status, their excellent style of speech, or their ruling. A Mujahid will do what Allah commands him to do. This is one of the most serious fitnas today and that we see, especially for the young brothers. Instead of their scholars encouraging them to do Jihad fe Sabeelillah, they are holding them back.” !!

Awlaki continues on the same page:

“A great majority of our youth want to please Allah the proper way, but because of these Shuyookh and Muslim celebrities, they are holding back these youth from doing Jihad fe Sabeelillah. Look at how much sin that these people of status are accumulating! What they are doing falls under the service of the kuffaar; their da'wah is in service of the kuffaar. Whether they are paid for it or not, whether they meet with Intelligence Agencies or not, it doesn't make a difference. If what you are doing is serving the kuffaar, then you have become one of them.” !!!

The lecture can also be heard and downloaded here:

http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=308&Itemid=181

There are a number of points to append to these words from al-Awlaki:

1. With regards to “meeting with Intelligence Agencies” then the ones who fall into this the most are the likes of the so-called “jihaadees”! The likes of Bakri, Aboo Qataadah al-Filisteene, Aboo Hamza and a while host of other *takfeerees* are well-known for their meetings with not even the police, but with Intelligence Services! Some of them have even been protected and sheltered by them! As in the case of Aboo Qataadah al-Filisteene after 9/11.
2. Awlaki seems to forget about the well known Islamic principle that has been mentioned by scholars such as Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim about abstaining from fighting during periods of weakness and inability, it is rather odd that Awlaki conveniently neglects all of this. See pp.37-64 of http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf
3. Awlaki says all of this as if he is somehow qualified! His Islamic study is negligible, yet he does have a B.S. in Civil Engineering from *Colorado State University*; an M.A. in Education Leadership from *San Deigo State University* and was working on a Doctorate in Human Resource Development at *George Washington University*!! So all of his education has not even been on anything to do with Islaam! Indeed, he has mainly studied within the US, hardly a huge endorsement of his Islamic educational background and study for him to be promoted to the level of a 'Shaykh' and 'Imaam'?!
4. Awlaki seemed to have made himself into a hero and gain credibility after the likes of Faysal actually condemned him for spreading “CIA Islam” see Faysal's lecture here wherein he quotes from a *Jumu'ah Khutbah* of Awlaki and condemns Awlaki for being an agent:

Then Faysal says:

“The ‘Mur’jif is the person who spreads negativity in the ranks of the believers for them to give up the jihaad. So if you are going on the battlefield, you’re marching forward with your Kalashnikov on your shoulder to fight listen to the hypocrite in your rank “O the sun is too hot, my shoes is⁴⁰ squeezing me, the journey is too far we’re gonna faint and die before we reach there” and then another person will say “Yeah it’s true, I think its true you know”.”

This statement is the archetypal trait of the *Khawaarij Qa'diyyah*, where has Faysal himself fought and on which battlefield has he ever been on? He mentions all of this as if he has some kind of experience, when the reality is he himself has never been on any kind of 'military expedition' for him to have knowledge of this whatsoever! He's merely trying to encourage the youth to something based on ignorance. Then Faysal says,

“Who told you that jihaad is a simple thing? There's difficulty in jihaad, so if you're marching forward and you're tired and weary but that doesn't give you the right to spread negativity in the ranks of the believers (and say) “O the journey's too far” or “O I'm hungry where's the food?”.”

<http://www.archive.org/details/faisal1> As a result of this Awlaki then had to promote a radical image and this led Awlaki himself to go more extreme in order to bolster his credibility.

In another lecture entitled '*Allaah is Preparing us for Victory*' which has been transcribed Online by "Amatullah" and edited by "Mujahid fe Sabeelillah" here: http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=602&Itemid=171 and here: <http://www.salaatime.com/downloads/anwar/Lectures/Allah%20is%20preparing%20us%20for%20victory.pdf> on page 18:

“There will always be in this *Ummah* an *at-Taa'ifah*, but what is happening is that people will try to find a way out of responsibility and they will hang it on the '*Ulema* saying, 'This '*Alim* did not give this *fatwa*', 'This '*Alim* did not tell us to fight *Jihad fe Sabeelillah*'. So they would blame it on the '*Ulema* when there are '*Ulema* who are telling you otherwise; they are telling you to do the right thing and there are '*Ulema* carrying the right *Manhaj*. They might be in jail, they might be killed, they might be underground or they might not be famous because no television station will broadcast their *Khutbah* but they are '*Ulema*. Another issue is that we are living in an interesting time were the '*Ilm* of a person is in accordance to how famous he is and that is not a right standard for '*Ilm*.”

This lecture can be heard here: http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=124&Itemid=181

⁴⁰ This is not a typo error! We have reproduced the words of Faysal here word for word. So he says “is” here when it should be “are” as the following word is plural.

As if being hungry and thirsty is not allowed when one is partaking in armed *jihad*? Then he says, in a statement which applies more to Faysal than anyone else, thus demonstrating his contradictions:

“Another sign of the hypocrite is that he likes to slander pious Muslims. In this country today (i.e. UK) don't think that, those who are working for Islaam, that the kaafirs are their greatest enemies, the hypocrites are their greatest enemies! People who are giving da'wah to the correct fikra,⁴¹ their greatest enemies are not the kaafirs, they not being slandered by kaafirs, the deviant groups, are our greatest enemies. So Ahmad Ibn Hanbal was called a khawaarij in his time, Ibn Taymiyyah was called a khawaarij in his time, Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab was called a khawaarij in his time and today we, the members of ahl us-sunnah wa'l-jamaa'ah, are called khawaarij in our time by the hypocrites of our time!”

Indeed, it was Faysal himself who called the *Salafees* **“the real khawaarij of the era”**!! What about calling other Muslims **“Jews of the ummah”**, **“the worst Salafees”**, **“major hypocrites”** and **“akin to the followers of Musaylimah al-Kadhab”**? All of which Faysal said about the *Salafees* at *Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah (Brixton Mosque)* in his lecture *The Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafis*, if slander is one of the signs of the hypocrites as Faysal said, then what about all of the slander he made in that particular lecture?! Then Faysal says in praise of Aa'id al-Qarnee:

“Aa'id al-Qarnee himself was viciously slandered and the policy of the Saudi government is that whenever there is a scholar who is famous they kill his character or throw him in prison...”

Is it indeed? So what about 'Aa'id al-Qarnee now who appears on Saudi TV on the podiums with the rulers and they praise him openly? Is this also their policy according to Faysal? If it is their policy, al-Qarnee does not seem to be currently suffering at all and on the contrary, he is on more Arabic TV channels than the actual senior scholars! So Aa'id is currently being promoted by Saudi, so much for the policy being to throw them in prison! Faysal then says:

“Evey kaafir is a hypocrite and every hypocrite is a kaafir!”

⁴¹ For Faysal the only people who are “giving da'wah to the correct fikra” as he calls it, all have to be imprisoned or on the run!

This is what he says with his own words, so when he thus described the *Salafees* in the lecture 'Saudi Salafis' as being "major hypocrites" it is clear then that within Faysal's corrupted extremist *khaarijee* mentality, he considered the *Salafees* to be *kuffaar*! Indeed, one of the signs from al-Qarnee's book which Faysal did not elaborate upon at all was that "the hypocrite has no knowledge of the *deen* of Islaam" yet Faysal conveniently and quickly skipped over this and did not explain it at all! Regarding *jibaad*, Faysal says that the *Salafees* (who he describes as being 'Madkhalees' and 'Jaamees' of *Brixton Mosque*) hate *jibaad*? He then says that they say **"there is no jibaad unless there is a caliph."**

This is false, and it is interesting that Faysal within all of this does not refer at all to what the scholars have stated regarding *jibaad*. Furthermore, the *Salafees* do not say that there has to be a Caliph but there does have to be an '*ameer*'. The Caliph is for *jibaad at-Talab* as for *jibaad ad-Daf'a* then that has to have an '*ameer*', but Faysal in his over-simplification of the issue leaves all of these conditions.

Then Faysal says in the 'question and answer' session that he was involved in a debate with some members of HT and that this debate was recorded but **"not released because we are not of those who blackmail people"** yet Faysal in the lecture entitled '21st Century House Niggas' secretly recorded a foolish discussion that he had with Idrees Palmer and produced this in the lecture for all to listen to! So what kind of contradiction is this! Also within the session he states that the *Salafees* **"reject the Islamic state which the Taalibaan established"** and this again is false and either a blatant lie or Faysal is pure ignorant. As the *Salafees* accept *any ruler* who comes about and acquires power and control via any means, as long as the affair is in his control, this is not as the *haakim al-mutaghallib*, the ruler who seized control even though the means may have not been entirely in line with the *sunnaah*. Al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalaanee transmitted this in his book *Fath al-Baaree* from Imaam Ibn Battaal, who has an explanation of *Sabeeh Bukhaaree* which has been published:

The fuquhaa (Islamic jurists) have reached consensus that obedience must be made to the leader who becomes dominant (mutaghallib)⁴² and making jibaad with him and that

⁴² Shaykh 'Alee Hasan al-Halabee (*hafidhahullaah*) stated in a lesson at the *Imaam Albaanee Centre* (Ammaan, Jordan) in March 2006 CE:

"Here we must stop at this word **"mutaghallib (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

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.⁴³

But at the same time this does not mean that the *Islamic beliefs* of the Taalibaan cannot be questioned⁴⁴, especially in the case of those who claim to be doing things in line with Islaam.

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.3

'CHALLENGES FACING THE YOUTH'

<http://www.thepathtoparadise.com/pages/Left%20Menu%20Pages/Abdullah%20Faisal.html>

Faysal's states the lecture:

"If he is a supporter of kufr, a Saudi Salafee, you have to kill him and chop of his head..."!!

This is within Faysal's model of an 'Islamic state'!! Then Faysal states during the so-called 'question and answer session', in another definitive sign of his corrupted methodology states:

acquiring power are numerous and from the paths are in the case of a ruler who becomes dominant and overpowers others (*al-Mutaghallib*). 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."

⁴³ As now the leader would have been expelled from the condition of being a Muslim due to falling into clear *kufr*. For this reason, the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said: "Until you see clear (*buwaahan*) *kufr*, for which you have with you evidence from Allaah." Pay attention here: "you have with you (*indakum*)" meaning that this evidence is firmly settled in you hearts and is clear in front of your eyes, not any type of *kufr* rather it must be clear, explicit and apparent!

⁴⁴ See the distinction here 'their Islamic beliefs' not their sins, as if there are beliefs of *shirk* that are being taught and encouraged then these have to be condemned more so than a person's own personal sins that they may fall into.

“You’re allowed to take all these benefits that these kaafirs offer you, because everything that the kaafir owns is yours. Every single thing that the kaafir owns is yours so you’re allowed to take all the benefits that they offer you and you’re even allowed to have four wives and put them on benefit, so hope that they give you a mansion in Hampstead Heath!”

With all of his foolish audience of blind followers finding this funny!? Is this the *jibaad* that Faysal is waging? Then Faysal tries to say that it is permissible to sell alcohol to disbelievers as we are not in an Islamic state!? Again, where is the evidence for this? He tries to bring an obscure statement attributed to Imaam Aboo Haneefah (*rabeemahullah*) supposedly in *al-Mugni* of Ibn Qudaamah al-Maqdisee yet does not mention the source and blindly accepts this knowing that the listeners will utilise it as a proof even though it may be a weak and rejected view, if indeed it even is a view of Imaam Aboo Haneefah! Faysal also states:

“Shaykh Bin Baaz died and did not take back his fatwa, so his entry into Paradise is in grave jeopardy.”

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.4

‘ENJOINING THE GOOD AND FORBIDDING THE EVIL’

Within this lecture, Faysal states:

“Now I am saying that the ‘aqeedah that says that to enjoin the right and forbid the wrong is “the job of scholars, maulanas, muftis and shaykhs and not for us” is a dodgy ‘aqeedah, a false ‘aqeedah and it was Shaytaan who handed them this ‘aqeedah on a silver platter...”

Hereby trying to encourage scorn, mockery and disregard of the scholars from the common masses of Muslims, which is salient feature of Faysal’s lectures so beware! It is a common and regular pattern for Faysal to do this. Let’s see what the qualified senior Islamic scholars say on this matter, not the likes of Faysal. *Al-'Allaamah*, Shaykh, Dr Saalih al-Fawzaan stated:

It is obligatory for the jaahil (ignoramus) to not speak and to keep quiet and fear Allaah, The Exalted and Majestic, and to not speak without knowledge, Allaah says,

﴿قُلْ إِنَّمَا حَرَّمَ رَبِّيَ الْفَوَاحِشَ مَا ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا وَمَا بَطَّنَ وَالْإِثْمَ وَالْبَغْيَ بِغَيْرِ الْحَقِّ وَأَنْ تُشْرِكُوا بِاللَّهِ مَا لَمْ

يُنزِلْ بِهِ سُلْطَانًا وَأَنْ تَقُولُوا عَلَى اللَّهِ مَا لَا تَعْلَمُونَ﴾

“Say, My Lord has only forbidden immoralities – what is apparent of them and what is concealed – and sin,⁴⁵ and oppression without right, and that you associate with Allaah that for which He has not sent down authority, and that you say about Allaah that which you do not know.”

{*al'A'raaf* (7): 33}

So it is not permissible for the jaahil to speak in issues of knowledge especially in regards to major issues such as takfeer, jihaad and al-walaa wa'l-baraa'. As for slander and backbiting in regards to the honour of the people in authority and the honour of the scholars, then this is the most severe type of backbiting and as a result is not permissible. As for current events which have passed or are taking place then these are affairs for the people in authority to research and seek counsel over and it is for the scholars to explain its Divinely Legislated ruling. As for the general and common people and beginning students it is not their issue. Allaah says,

﴿وَإِذَا جَاءَهُمْ أَمْرٌ مِّنَ الْأَمْنِ أَوْ الْخَوْفِ أَدَّعَوْا بِهِ وَلَوْ رَدُّوهُ إِلَى الرَّسُولِ وَإِلَى أُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْهُمْ﴾

﴿لَعَلِمَهُ الَّذِينَ يَسْتَنْبِطُونَهُ مِنْهُمْ وَلَوْلَا فَضْلُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ وَرَحْمَتُهُ لَاتَّبَعْتُمُ الشَّيْطَانَ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا﴾

“And when there comes to them something (I.e. information) about (public) security or fear, they spread it around. But if they had only referred it back to the Messenger or to those in authority among them, then the ones who can draw correct conclusions from it would have known about it. And if not for the favour of Allaah upon you and His mercy, you would have followed Satan, except for a few.”

{*an-Nisaa* (4): 83}

So it is incumbent to refrain the tongue in speaking about the likes of such issues, especially takfeer, allegiance and disavowal. And humans are mostly ignorant of its application and can apply it incorrectly and thus judge a person with misguidance and kufr, and the ruling could thus return upon the claimant. So if a person says to his brother “O kaafir, O faasiq” and the man is not like that (i.e. neither a kaafir nor a faasiq) the ruling can return upon the one who said it, and Allaah's refuge is sought. This is a very dangerous issue, so it is upon the one who fears Allaah to refrain his tongue except

⁴⁵ Any unlawful action

● أن يكون مستأمنًا.

● أن يكون حربياً.

و النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أمر بأداء الحقوق لهؤلاء؛ بل أمر الله جل وعلا بأداء الحقوق

لغير المسلمين في كتابه إذا لم يكونوا حربيين إذا لم يكونوا مظهرين العداوة، فقال جل وعلا

The non-Muslims of the earth can be divided into four categories, they can either be a dhimmi; a mu'aahid; a musta'min or a harbee. And the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) instructed given each one their due rights. Rather, Allaah instructed given non-Muslims rights in His Book, if they are not at war (with Muslims) and do not manifest enmity (against the Muslims). Allaah says,

﴿لَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يُخْرِجُوكُمْ مِّن دِيَارِكُمْ أَن تَبَرُّوهُمْ وَتُقْسِطُوا إِلَيْهِمْ

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ

إِنَّمَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ قَاتَلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَأَخْرَجُوكُم مِّن دِيَارِكُمْ وَظَاهَرُوا عَلَىٰ إِخْرَاجِكُمْ أَن

تَوَلَّوهُمْ وَمَن يَتَوَلَّهُمْ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ ﴿

“Allaah does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes – from being righteous toward them⁴⁸ and acting justly toward them.⁴⁹ Indeed, Allaah loves those who act justly.⁵⁰ Allaah only forbids

⁴⁸ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) says about this: to be gentle with them.

⁴⁹ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) says about this: to be fair with them.

⁵⁰ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) transmits in regards to this in the ayah: Imaam Ahmad recorded that Asmaa' bint Abu Bakr said, “My mother, who was an idolatress at the time, came to me during the Treaty of Peace, the Prophet conducted with the Quraysh. I came to the Prophet and said, “O Allaah's Messenger! My mother came visiting, desiring something from me, should I treat her with good relations” The Prophet said,

you from those who fight you because of religion and expel you from your homes and aid in your expulsion – (forbids) that you make allies of them.⁵¹ And whoever makes allies of them, then it is those who are the wrongdoers.”

{*al-Mumtabinah (60): 8-9*}

فإذن الحق الذي للذمي ثابت في الشريعة، فلا يعني كونه كافراً أن نهضمه حق الإنسانية، هو حق جعله الله جل وعلا له، قال عليه الصلاة والسلام: «من آذى ذمياً فقد آذاني» أو كما جاء في الحديث، وصحَّ عنه عليه الصلاة والسلام أنه قال: من قتل معاهداً لم يرح رائحة الجنة، لماذا؟ لأن المسلمين يسعى بذمتهم أدناهم، هذا قد جاء بعهد، وجاء بأمان،

«نَعَمْ صِلِي أُمَّكَ»

“Yes. Keep good relation with your mother.” The Two Saheehs recorded this hadeeth. Imaam Ahmad recorded that `Abdullah bin Zubayr said, "Qutaylah came visiting her daughter, Asmaa' bint Abee Bakr, with some gifts, such as Dibab, cheese and clarified (cooking) butter, and she was an idolatress at that time. Asmaa' refused to accept her mother's gifts and did not let her enter her house. 'Aa'ishah asked the Prophet about his verdict and Allaah sent down the ayah,

﴿لَا يَنْهَكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ﴾

“Allaah does not forbid you with those who fought not against you on account of religion”

until the end of the ayah. Allaah's Messenger ordered Asmaa' to accept her mother's gifts and to let her enter her house.” Allaah's statement,

﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ﴾

“Indeed Allaah loves those who act justly.”

And we can clearly see the contrary of this being applied from those who abandon their non-Muslims parents for fifteen years!

⁵¹ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) states about this part of the verse:

“Allah forbids you from being kind and befriending with the disbelievers who are openly hostile to you, those who fought against you, expelled you and helped to expel you. Allah the Exalted forbids you from being their friends and orders you to be their enemy.”

وكان في بلاد الإسلام بأمان وعهد، فالواجب ألا يُعتدى عليه في نفسه، وألا يعتدى عليه في دمه، وألا يعتدى عليه في عرضه، وألا يعتدى عليه في ماله، فالحقوق واجبة له شرعاً. والنصوص في أداء حق أهل الذمة وحق المعاهدين وحق المستأمنين متعددة، وكلام العلماء في ذلك كثير.

أما الحريون فهم الذين بيننا وبينهم حرب، فهؤلاء بيننا وبينهم حرب، فيه أحكام كثيرة تتعلق بهم، وحتى لو تمكنا منهم، فإنهم إذا كانوا أسارى فإنهم يكرمون، وإذا تُمكن منهم فإنه لا يقتل الوليد، ولا يقتل الطفل، ولا تقتل المرأة، ولا يتقل منهم الشيخ العجوز ونحو ذلك من الأمثلة.

مع أن في شرائع أخرى يقتل الجميع كما ذكر أن في شريعة موسى عليه الصلاة والسلام أن الجميع يقتلون في حال الحرب.

أما شريعة الإسلام فالله جل وعلا حباها لما في ذلك من المصلحة لامتداد الشريعة إلى قيام الساعة بألا يقتل من المحاربين إلا المقاتلة فقط، وإذا أسر فإن للأسرى أحكاماً كثيرة. الذمي في دار الإسلام له حقوق، إذا كان في بيته فإنه يمارس ما شاء، لكن ليس له أن يُعلن في شارع المسلمين أو أن يظهر شيئاً من المحرمات، إما أن يظهر دينه ليس له ذلك يعني في..... هذا في المعاهد والمستأمن.

أما الذمي ففيه تفصيل الكلام، كما إذا كان في أرض قد فتحت، وفيها الكنائس والبيع

كما في بلاد الشام وفي مصر والعراق ونحو ذلك

Therefore, the right of the dhimmi is well-established in the Divine Legislation. Not rights from people, but rights that Allaah has set for the dhimmi. The Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) stated "Whoever harms a dhimmi has harmed me"⁵² or as is stated in the hadeeth. It is also authenticated from him (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) that he said "Whoever kills a mu'aahad will not smell the fragrance of

⁵² Saheeh Muslim

Paradise, the smell of which can be smelt for the distance of forty years.”⁵³ Why? Because the Muslims honour their lives as they came with an agreement, they came with a trust and is not to be transgressed against with regards to his life, blood, honour, money, rights are obligatory to them in the Divine Legislation. The texts regarding the rights of the enemies, the rights of the people of dhimma, the rights of the people of agreement (mu'aahadeen), the rights of the people with whom there is a trust, are various and the statements of the people of knowledge regarding the field is abundant. As for the harbee'oon, they are the ones whom between us and them is war and there are many regulations in regards to them and if we gain empowerment over them, they are respected if they are Christians and none of their children, women or elderly are killed. Whereas within other legislations everyone is to be killed! As is mentioned that within the Divine Legislation of Moosaa (alayhi salaam) that all are to be killed during war. As for the Divine Legislation of Islaam, Allaah allowed for only the fighter to be killed during battle, due to the benefits in the Divine Legislation for this. The dhimmi in an bode of Islaam has rights and within his home can do as he wills yet is not allowed to advertise what he does or anything from the prohibited actions. He can also not manifest his deen, this is for the mu'aahad and for the musta'min, as for the dhimmi there is some explanation required for this speech in relation to those countries which were conquered yet there were already churches there like in Shaam, Egypt, 'Iraaq and the likes of these countries.

Faysal continues:

“There are many kaafirs who realise Islaam is the truth but why they don't shahaadah? Because they don't see no showkah, no power. But if you should have a strong army with planes and tanks, and can you imagine that you have an army with five million men? And your taking over countries after countries, you capture Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Afghaanistaan, 'Iraaq and you have all the oil wealth in your hands can you imagine how many kaafirs would rush into Islaam? Because they see showkah! But if they don't see no showkah, no power, they will say “you're all talk, where's your Islamic state?””⁵⁴

⁵³ Saheeh Bukhaaree in *Kitaab ul-Jizyah* under the chapter ‘*The sin of the one who kills a mu'aahad who has not committed any crime.*’

⁵⁴ So Faysal thinks that *kuffaar* are only interested in “**where's your Islamic state**”!? Nothing about *tawheed*, *adab*, *akhlaaq* and *deen*, only a political view!

Subhaan'Allaah! A very impressive figure of Faysal's imagination! Firstly is Faysal serious? Do you notice that all of the countries that he mentions here are all Muslims countries which Faysal envisages to be conquered and waged war against?! So beware! In any case how on earth can the Muslims gather all of these when the majority of the Muslims do not even know how to pray?! Then Faysal says, in utter ignorance of actual events and the situation:

“Everything which I was teaching you here is on the cassette (of Shaykh ‘Ali al-Hudhayfee) in a nutshell, everything which I was saying here Shaykh Hudhayfee in Madeenah says on the cassette. So this is why they lock him up and throw away the key...”

This is false as Imaam al-Hudhayfee was not locked up at all, let alone the key being thrown away, as he is still currently leading the prayer in *Masjid un-Nabawee* in Madeenah to this day while the likes of Faysal actually have been imprisoned due to foolish statements! In this lecture he again reiterates that it is okay to sell alcohol to non-Muslims! With regards to the evils of alcohol that is within some Muslim countries and warning against it, he says that such warning against alcohol is “lop-sided” as it diagnoses the problem yet provides no cure. The cure according to Faysal: to overthrow the leaders who ‘allow’ alcohol into their countries?!

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.5

‘FIQH UL-WAAQI (1)’

http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=499&Itemid=181

This is one of the lectures in which Faysal's hatred of the scholars is again demonstrated. In this topic Faysal himself shows that he has no idea whatsoever of the *fiqh* of current affairs himself and thus concocts his usual poison against the *Salafee* scholars in particular. This is a common trait of Faysal, we will see that in most, if not all, of his lectures the *Salafee* scholars are the ones who bear the brunt of criticisms and this is a despicable aim. He states:

“Brothers and sisters our situation is very pathetic and it is because our scholars are jaahil. It's a very bold statement and the reason is that...they are not aware of the surroundings.”

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.6

'FIQH UL-WAAQI (2)'

He says

“Because many of the scholars are jaahil and do not know the fiqh ul-waaqi’ they pass ridiculous fatwas.”

Indeed, this more applies to Faysal himself in any case who says horrific and outrageous things under the pretext of him being a ‘Shaykh’ which he called himself!! He continues:

“For example, there are scholars and there is a scholar who says that we should leave occupied Palestine and give it to the Jews. Who passed that fatwa? Albaanee! The ijmaa of the ummah says if the kaafirs are approaching the Muslim country to take it...jihad becomes fard al-‘ayn on all the Muslims to fight and repel the kaafirs. From the ijmaa’...So the Jews are now occupying Palestine and there you have Albaanee going against the ijmaa of the ummah telling the Muslims in Palestine to leave the land in Palestine to the Jews.⁵⁵ Salaauddeen al-Ayyoobee who did he fight against? The crusaders, Richard the Lion-heart where did he come from? England, and why was he called ‘the lion-heart’ because he killed Muslims. So England and Italy and Germany all these people are Christian crusaders. Now what would you think about a person if a Jew, a Rabbi passed a fatwa allowing the Muslims to come and take Israel, to have a military base inside of Israel and that military base should be used to kill Jews? Would a Rabbi do that? No Rabbi would do that!⁵⁶ So if a Jewish Rabbi would never pass a fatwa to

⁵⁵ Here, Faysal cleverly neglects to mention, either purposefully or out of ignorance, but knowing Faysal’s methods it was no doubt purposefully, that Imaam al-Albaanee rejected *jihad* as being *fard al-‘ayn* completely. The reality of the matter is that during the Afghaan *jihad* for example, Imaam Albaanee said that it was *fard al-‘ayn* as is well known, so where is the justice of the likes of Faysal??! Here again is another one of Faysal’s tricks to throw doubt, scorn, suspicion and distrust of the scholars of the *sunnah* of this era.

⁵⁶ Hereby seeking to compare the Muslims to *kuffaar*, *again*, rather Allaah says,

﴿أَفَمَنْ كَانَ مُؤْمِنًا كَمَنْ كَانَ فَاسِقًا لَا يَسْتَوُونَ﴾

“Then is one who was a believer like one who was defiantly disobedient? They are not equal.”

{*as-Sajdah (32): 18*}

Allaah also says,

﴿أَفَنَجْعَلُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ كَالْمُجْرِمِينَ﴾

“Then will We treat the Muslims like the criminals?”

{*al-Qalam (68): 35*}

allow Muslims to come inside of Israel and set up a military base to be used to kill Jews how then can Shaykh Bin Baaz pass a fatwa to let the Dajjaal, the army of the Dajjaal, America, England and the rest of the world to set up a military base inside the holy land? And that military base is used as an operation centre to kill Muslims! This is the ultimate treachery! So the holy land has been colonised by kaafirs, the scum of the earth and it was a Shaykh, a so-called Shaykh who gave legitimacy, who made it halaal for them to come into the holy land and set up a military base and operation centre to massacre the believers.⁵⁷ From that military base 200,000 Iraaqees were slaughtered, from that military base! A scholar passed a fatwa to day that peace with the Jews is halaal, not Albaanee, but Bin Baaz.”

So here again Faysal unleashes most of tongue against the people of knowledge and his speech revolves around political discussion with no reference whatsoever to what Allaah or His Messenger (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said, so beware! Not only does he greatly simplify the words of Imaam Albaanee (*rabeemabullaah*) but he also twists it to make it look as if the scholars sanctioned the killing of Muslims directly and this is false. As for Faysal claiming that 200,000 Iraaqees were killed from a base that was in Saudi then which base? He gives no details of this and merely expects the listeners to blindly follow him. He furnishes this serious claim with absolutely no proof whatsoever and so this is rejected. It actually indicates that Faysal himself has no understanding of *fiqh ul-waaqi'* as he does not give any details about this whatsoever. As for him naming the *kuffaar* armies as being “the armies of the Dajjaal” then this is also false as the Dajjaal is not here yet!? So how can Faysal assign to the Dajjaal an army as the Dajjaal is not even present yet!

Faysal also has an issue with his definition of ‘the holy land’ and here he is merely blindly following the likes of Salmaan and Safar in their opinions of this is in the past. It is important then for us to assess the definition of the ‘Arabian peninsula’ as some scholars define as being the *Jazeeraat ul-'Arab* (Arabian Peninsula) just Makkah and Madeenah; while some scholars

⁵⁷ There were not allowed into Makkah and Madeenah, which some scholars define as being the *Jazeeraat ul-'Arab* (Arabian Peninsula); while some scholars define the Arabian Peninsula to be Makkah, Madeenah and al-Yamaamah; some scholars define the Arabian Peninsula as being Makkah, Madeenah, al-Yamaamah and Yemen. See Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Ra'ees, *al-Burhaan al-Muneer* [The Clear Proofs for Refuting the Doubts of the People of Takfeer and Bombing!], pp.79-89: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf

define the Arabian Peninsula to be Makkah, Madeenah and al-Yamaamah; some scholars define the Arabian Peninsula as being Makkah, Madeenah, al-Yamaamah and Yemen. See Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Ra'ees, *al-Burbaan al-Muneer* [The Clear Proofs for Refuting the Doubts of the People of Takfeer and Bombing!], pp.79-89: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf

Yet Faysal, as occurs after an hour into the lecture of the *Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafis* says that the Arabian Peninsula is:

“Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Oman, Bahrayn and Yemen, all these are the Arabian Peninsula.”

From Faysal's other errors are his saying;

“A peace treaty can only be for a year, two years or three years if you make it forever you abrogate jihaad and if you abrogate jihaad you have done kufr!”

This is foolish and within all of this Faysal not at all referred to the *Treaty of Hdaybiyah* and left off explaining to his band of blind-followers. Then Faysal says in total contradiction of what he said on a previous lecture which we have quoted that:

“The kaafirs use DSS⁵⁸ to buy you out, poverty leads to kufr.”

Yet it was Faysal himself who told his blind followers (in the lecture *Challenges Facing the Youth*) to take welfare state benefits and Faysal even told his listeners to take all benefits and money from *kuuffaar*! So beware of this man's gross contradictions and distortions.

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.7

'IDEOLOGICAL WARFARE (1)'

<http://www.thepathtoparadise.com/pages/Left%20Menu%20Pages/Abdullah%20Faisal.html>

This lecture I think was conducted in New York and Imaam Sirraaj Wahhaaj was also present at this *khawaarij* lecture! Herein Faysal states:

“Another strategy of the colonial powers is to control the Muslim governments, then they control the scholars. First of all they big up a scholar, highlight him, elevate him,

⁵⁸ This refers to the British welfare state benefits department which gives people state hand-outs depending on the employment, disability or age status of an individual.

praise him “this is the muftee of this country anything you want to learn about Islaam go to him”⁵⁹ they big up the scholar, they elevate him. Secondly, they put him on their pay-roll⁶⁰ and control him, then they use this scholar to control the Muslims. So when they asked “who is it will enable us to get into the gulf and kill ten thousand...” O I'm sorry “...100,000 Iraquee Muslims, men, women and children?”⁶¹ What was their answer? Does anybody know what their answer was? Their answer was “We control the Muslims by controlling their scholars.” When you are on the pay-roll of a kaafir government, a corrupted government you have absolutely no use to Muslims⁶²...So think about these people who have ten years of Islamic studies, twenty years of Islamic studies and they see the most shameful deeds taking place underneath their nose and they didn't speak out against it...So for you to see an evil act and you didn't stop it nor condemn it with your tongue not hate it in your heart you are in the category of these Jews who were turned into apes!”

Again another example of Faysal spending most of his time undermining the scholars and trying to defame, slander and attack them, indeed Faysal again tries to compare the scholars to Jews. Then he says:

“The only reason that they have these scholars in prison (Safar, Salmaan etc) is because they said “we want the sharee'ah” so whenever a scholar doesn't tow the line they make his life hell.”

So what about now, considering Safar, Salmaan and 'Aa'id have all been released and they all openly praise the Saudi government now! Do they no longer “want the sharee'ah”?? Furthermore, the likes of Safar, Salmaan and Aa'id are currently work hand-in-hand with the Saudi government, Salmaan and Aa'id in particular. In fact, in November 2003 CE Aa'id al-

⁵⁹ Here Faysal intends Saudi Arabia and thus attempts to inculcate into his blind followers disrespect for Imaam Bin Baaz and the other senior scholars of Saudi.

⁶⁰ When Faysal studied at *Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University* in Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia, the students also receive a stipend and other financial benefits when studying there, as is well-known. It is interesting that Faysal never at all admits, acknowledges or refers to this within his tirade against the *Salafee* scholars of Saudi!

⁶¹ Here indicates that Faysal himself is not even sure of the figures that he is throwing about!

⁶² Does Faysal include his own self within this simplistic rubric, considering the fact that he also received finances, stipends and support from Saudi during his studies at *Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University*??

Qarnee interviewed Ali al-Khudayr and al-Khudayr also freed himself from many of his past erroneous views and rulings!⁶³

So if Faysal so passionately loves these individuals Faysal and his blind followers would follow their example and not agitate against the Saudi government! The whole fiasco shows the foolish insight of Faysal, he so passionately supported and praised Safar, Salmaan and Aa'id for their imprisonment and yet now all three have retracted from the mistakes that the likes of Faysal followed them in!⁶⁴ So does Faysal still look up to them or do his own vain desires take over? Indeed, in this lecture Faysal described them as being **“the most prominent scholars in Saudi Arabia”** in actually fact Faysal describes them as being the **“Ibn Taymiyyah of the era”** so does Faysal now accept that they have retracted from much of their *khurooj*, *khaarijyyah*, *ghuloo* and *tatarruf*? In the foolish lecture Faysal also says that such 'scholars' have to be **“liberated, as they are on death row”**!! Well, they all look perfectly well to the masses of people on now see Salmaan and Aa'id on more Arabic satellite channels than any other scholars! Indeed, take a look at this picture of Salmaan in December 2004 CE: http://www.rainmedia.net/images/photo_isoaq_3.jpg

looking very relaxed talking and sipping tea with a *kuffaar* journalist, this is the so-called oppressed Shaykh of 'Abdullaah Faysal. Then he says, in his pure *khaarijee manhaj*:

“So we have to liberate the scholars, liberate Makkah, liberate Madeenah, liberate Masjid al-Aqsa and we say to hell with the Saudi government because you can't kill the scholars of Islaam! You may kill the scholars but you may not kill Islaam!”

To which the audience of *jumaybeel* scream “Allaahu Akbar!” in totally opposition to the *sunnah*. So what has Faysal contributed to liberating? He has not liberate nothing! Merely a mouthpiece of action yet has done absolutely nothing except flap his lips and loll out his tongue like a dog! So after this 'impressive' (not) statement Faysal has landed his own self into jail and has not brought about or witnessed any of this nonsense that he and his *khavaarij* followers screamed for.

⁶³ http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/3280715.stm

<http://www.ain-al-yaqeen.com/issues/20031226/feat8en.htm>

<http://www.arabnews.com/?page=1§ion=0&article=35266&d=18&m=11&y=2003>

⁶⁴ Even though Salmaan, Safar and Aa'id now have other errors!

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.8

'JEWISH TRAITS IN THE UMMAH'

<http://www.thepathtoparadise.com/pages/Left%20Menu%20Pages/Abdullah%20Faisal.html>

The very title of this lecture shows Faysal's horrific ideas, as there has not been one single Muslim scholar who authored a book with this title who has preceded Faysal! He goes to show Faysal's *khawaarij* methods of making *takefeer* of other Muslims and branding them as being *kuffaar*. He says at the beginning of the lecture:

“The reasons why have not been able to defeat them is because we are equal to the Jews in sins...so I'm here today to prove to you that we are similar to the Jews in behaviour, we are equal to them in sins like a carbon copy.”

Hereby seeking to compare the Muslims to *kuffaar*, rather Allaah says,

﴿أَفَمَنْ كَانَ مُؤْمِنًا كَمَنْ كَانَ فَاسِقًا لَا يَسْتَوُونَ﴾

“Then is one who was a believer like one who was defiantly disobedient? They are not equal.”

{*as-Sajdah* (32): 18}

Allaah also says,

﴿أَفَنَجْعَلُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ كَالْمُجْرِمِينَ﴾

“Then will We treat the Muslims like the criminals?”

{*al-Qalam* (68): 35}

See the difference between the words of Allaah and the words of Faysal! Then Faysal states:

“I have in front of me approximately 50 Jewish traits and how they have found their way into the ranks of the believers.” (!)

But here he immediately contradicts himself, as he mentions a 'trait' which Faysal himself has and does! He says:

“Today, unfortunately, there are many Muslims who create fitna amongst the ranks of the believers. If they know that 'Abdullaah doesn't like Zayd or Khadeejah doesn't like 'Aa'ishah they spread news backward and forward...So the same way that the Jews

create fitna and they love people to be at each others throats they are many Muslims today who spread news backward and forward for Muslims to fight and kill each other...”

O really? So then according to Faysal's own definition he himself is the first to have this 'Jewish trait' after his labelling the people of *sunna* as being **“Jews of the ummah”, “the same as the followers of Musaylimah”, “house-niggas”, “kuffaar”** and more!!! There has not been anyone who has unleashed their vile tongue against the Muslims moreso than Faysal, the only other contenders being other varieties of extremists that are found who attack others in the name of Islaam and the *sunna*. Faysal also in the lecture *The Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafees* makes mention that:

“When I was in Riyadh the only people that were punished were Pakistanis.”

Trying to make out that there is some sort of discrimination against Pakistani Muslims and thus tries to create enmity against Saudi from the Pakistani-derived Muslim community in the UK. The reality is that there are probably more non-Muslim Filipino gangsters that are executed for crimes as opposed to Pakistani Muslims. Then he states:

“There are many Muslims who hearts are hard like the Jews, take for instance those Muslims who do not believe in tawheed al-haakimiyyah.⁶⁵ That Allaah is the only law-giver, if you open the Qur'aan and show him the verse in soorah eighteen where Allaah says “I do not allow anyone to share with Me in My Legislation” do you think he will believe in tawheed al-haakimiyyah? I debated with many Salafees and showed them in black and white in the Qur'aan soorah eighteen verse twenty six where Allaah says that He doesn't allow anyone to share with Him in his legislation and still they say “tawheed haakimiyyah is bida” How many types of tawheed are there? Four! Allaah is the only creator, Allaah alone deserves to be worshipped, Allaah has ninety-nine Names and Attributes and Allaah is the only Law-Giver. Tawheed ur-Ruboobiyyah, 'Uloohiyyah, Asmaa' wa's-Sifaat and al-Haakimiyyah. If I, Faysal, look at you and say “come to my house I will challenge you to a debate in regards to tawheed ar-Ruboobiyyah” I become

⁶⁵ Another one of Faysal's emotional ploys to garner support from the audience, thus by saying this Faysal hopes to instill into the audience that whoever rejects the innovated concept of '*tawheed haakimiyyah*' is 'hard-hearted' when the reality is that '*tawheed haakimiyyah*' is a modern concept which has its roots in the works of the journalist Sayyid Qutb (*raheemahullaah*) than from the works of Islamic scholars, let alone the *Salafus-Saalih*!

a kaafir. True or false? Do you understand the question? I am denying tawheed ar-Ruboobiyyah that Allaah is the only creator and I says⁶⁶ to you “I am gonna check out my books and you come with your books and we’ll have a debate with regards to tawheed ar-Ruboobiyyah” if I challenge you to a debate I become a kaafir. Likewise, if I challenge you, and the Salafees we have given them this challenge then they runaway and hide.⁶⁷ If a Salafee should open his mouth and challenge saying “I’m going to have a debate, a public debate, in regards to tawheed al-haakimiyah” if he (i.e. the Salafee) throws that challenge out to you that person becomes a kaafir! Are you convinced or you’re not convinced? This is known of Islaam by necessity that Allaah is the only Law-Giver...so why do the people reject it? Because their hearts are hard just like the Jews!”

Then Faysal says:

“The reason why they say “kufr doona kufr” because they want to protect their kaafir paymasters.” (!!)

This is one of Faysal’s major attempts to hoodwink the people and hide what Muslim scholars have actually said on the narration of **“kufr less than kufr.”** Here is a clear example of Faysal’s deception and pouring scorn onto the Muslim scholars of the *sunnah* aswell.

Many scholars refer to the narration of **“kufr less than kufr”** and utilise it as a narration which is verified and authenticated, such as with Imaam Abee ‘Ubayd al-Qaasim ibn as-Sallaam⁶⁸, al-Marwazee in *Ta’dbeem Qadr us-Salaah*⁶⁹ and Abee Madhfar as-Sama’anee when he stated:

Ibn ‘Abbaas said “The verse is about the Muslims and intends kufr less than kufr and I know that the Khawaarij make deductions from these verses and say that: “whoever does not rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever” but the people of sunnah say: “he is not to be considered a disbeliever due to leaving off judgement.”⁷⁰

⁶⁶ This is not a typo error, Faysal does actually state “I says...”!!

⁶⁷ Indeed, if they do “runaway and hide” it is to be safe from Faysal’s *khawaarij manhaj* and beliefs of innovation! However, in many cases it was Faysal who “ran away to hide”!!

⁶⁸ *Kitaab ul-Eemaan*, p.45

⁶⁹ Vol.2, p.250

⁷⁰ *Tafseer ul-Qur’aan*, vol.2, p.42

Other scholars who also verify **“kufr less than kufr”** are: Al-Baghawee in his *tafseer*⁷¹, Ibn 'Arabee al-Maalikee⁷², Imaam Ibn Taymiyyah⁷³, Ibn Qayyim⁷⁴, Shaykh al-'Allaamah Muhammad Naasirrudeen al-Albaanee⁷⁵, Shaykh *al-'Allaamah* 'Abdul'Azeez bin 'Abdullaah bin Baaz⁷⁶ and finally Shaykh *al-'Allaamah* Muhammad bin Saalih al-'Uthaymeen wherein he said:

However, due to this narration those who have been tested with takfeer have not been pleased and begin to say “this narration is unacceptable! It is not authentically relayed from Ibn 'Abbaas!” so it can be said to them: “How can it not be authentic when those who are more virtuous and greater in knowledge than you in hadeeth have accepted the narration?! In relation to the narration of Ibn 'Abbaas, then it is sufficient for us that the noteworthy scholars such as Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qayyim and others have all received the narration with acceptance and relay it as being an authentic narration.⁷⁷

So did all of these scholars mention the narration of “kufr doona kufr” because **“they wanted to protect their kaafir paymasters”**???. So beware of the rantings of the *Rumaybidab!* Faysal continues:

“Do you know that it is impossible to find a Salafee book on the market, a book on tawheed and they mention tawheed al-haakimiyyah? Have you seen such a book? And if you can find it bring it to the halaqah...so tawheed al-haakimiyyah that whenever the leader dismantle the Sharee'ah you should fight him because the Prophet said when you see clear kufr you should fight him, you will never find when they write their books...but they will never mention tawheed al-Haakimiyyah because they do not want to offend their kaafir paymasters. So they love money more than Allaah, they love their salary more than Allaah.⁷⁸ They prefer to offend Allaah than to offend their kaafir paymasters who they sign off and on with.”

⁷¹ Vol.3, p.61

⁷² *Ahkaam ul-Qur'aan*, vol.2, pp.624-625

⁷³ *Majmoo' al-Fataawaa*, vol.7, pp.315 and 522.

⁷⁴ *Madaarij us-Saalikeen*, vol.1, p.335

⁷⁵ *Silsilat as-Saheehah*, vol.6, pp.109-116

⁷⁶ *Majmoo' Fataawaa wa Maqaalaat*, vol.2, pp.326-330

⁷⁷ From his notes to the book *Tahdheer min Fitnat it-Takfeer*, pp.68-69, also see for additional info, *Qurrat ul-Uyoon fee Tasheeh Tafseer 'Abdullaah Ibn 'Abbaas 'alaa Qawlihi Ta'ala* “*Wa man lam yahkum bi ma Anzala Allaah fa Oolayika hum ul-Kaafiroon*”pp.87-94 by Shaykh Saleem al-Hilaalee.

⁷⁸ Hereby Faysal insinuates that he can look into their hearts by stating these slanderous claims.

The simple reason for Faysal not being able to find any book which speaks of *'tanbeed baakimiyyah'* is due to the fact that it is an innovated category that has been developed currently by the readers of the works of the journalist Sayyid Qutb (*raheemahullaab*)!!! Then Faysal says yet again:

“Another Jewish trait is that they kick people out...the Jews took sides with other people to kill their Jewish brothers and drove them out of their homes. Now how are we the Muslims similar to this? When Saddaam Husayn misbehaved⁷⁹ what did the Saudis do? They brought America in who are the greatest enemies of Islaam and took sides with America⁸⁰ to kill the Iraaqees. So the same way how the Jews in Baqarah 84-85 took sides with the kuffaar and drove their own people out of their homeland it is the same thing that happened in the gulf war when they brought the crusaders in. Those same crusaders the Saudis brought them in to occupy the holy land and kill the Muslims of 'Iraaq. And they bombed 'Iraaq at night, and they did not exactly see who they were bombing and they killed men, women and children and even animals without discretion, so they took sides with the crusaders in massacring the Muslims and they killed 300,000 thousand civilians, innocent civilians in 'Iraaq...”⁸¹

First of all we can see that Faysal has mentioned yet another figure of the amount killed in 'Iraaq?! He stated 200,000 in one talk we have mentioned, 10,000 in another talk only to correct himself and say “100,000” and within this cassette he states “300,000”!! So how many is it and where is Faysal getting his stats from? He has mentioned four different numbers and he has not verified them whatsoever yet mentions them just to incite and hype-up his ignorant followers. So beware of such absence of verification, then Faysal wants to make out that the *Salafee* scholars have no idea of the **“fiqh of current affairs”!**

⁷⁹ This is an understatement to say the least! Saddam Husayn and his army of Ba'ath is noticeable underplayed within most of Faysal's vitriol and this is not adequate. Saddam entered al-Khafjee which was Saudi territory, after he had invaded Kuwait.

⁸⁰ To say “they took sides” is simplistic, Saudi had their own interests of protecting their borders and others had their interests, but it wa

⁸¹ Faysal also claims that Yemenis that were resident in Saudi were expelled due to 'Ali 'Abdullah Saalih agreeing with Saddam when he invaded Kuwait. Faysal says that the Yemenis were “made homeless by the Saudis” and this again is utter falsehood that Faysal states as there was no mass expulsion whatsoever of the Yemenis from Saudi. Faysal also claims that Saudis took all money and wealth from them when the Yemenis returned to Yemen!?

He continues unleashing his dirty tongue against the *Salafees*:

“The Jews said “we are the people of paradise, we are God’s chosen people, paradise is exclusive to us, everybody is going to the Hell Fire” there is a group in this country who is well known to everyone who claim that “we are the saved sect and every other Muslim group is going to the Hell Fire.” Who is that group? And if I was to put that in an exam question no one would get it wrong...And we say to the Salafee if you claim that you are God’s chosen people why don’t you wish for death,⁸² they will never wish for death they love life so much they say that there’s no jihaad anywhere in the world...and you have to be firmly grounded in knowledge before you can make jihaad. The Jews used to seek knowledge to show off...there was a man who the Salafees used to big-up “he’s our Shaykh” and when he came from America and told them about tawheed al-Haakimiyyah they classify him as a deviant (and say) “he’s not our Shaykh anymore he’s now become a deviant” so they change their tune to suit them⁸³ and this is a sign of the hypocrites.”

Faysal is insinuating 'Ali Tamimi, who none of the *Salafees*, from what we know, never ever exclaimed that he was a Shaykh to refer back to!?

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.9

'LET THE SCHOLARS BEWARE'

http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=490&Itemid=181

He states:

“Any time takfeer is made on a man and his wife still stays with him and co-habits with him that woman is committing zina anytime takfeer is made on a person and this takfeer is made by a scholar of ahl us-sunnah wa'l-jamaa'ah and the woman was told to make bara'ah from her husband because he has now become a kaafir if the woman stay with him we judge you as a kaafir aswell so what we do is wage jihaad against you, we kill your husband and take you as a right-hand possess. This is the Islamic verdict and when you have right-hand possess you don't have to marry them...”

⁸² Where do *Salafees* say that they “are God’s chosen people”??

⁸³ This isn't “changing the tune” it is rather rejecting what is in contradiction to the Qur'aan, Sunnah and *manhaj* of the *Salaf*, whoever that may be!

Hereby giving a *fatwa*!! Then he says:

“The second evil scholar is a Murji’ee, a murji’ is a person who refuse to pronounce a kaafir a kaafir, even after the evidence are made clear...the favourite hadeeth of the murji’ is the hadeeth in which the Rasool (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) said “Anyone of you who says to his Muslim brother “O kaafir” one of you become a kaafir”...”

So Faysal defines the *Murji’ab* as merely **“a person who refuses to pronounce a kaafir a kaafir”** so he mentions nothing about the *Murji’ab* with regards to *eemaan*, as their main issue is with regards to *eemaan*, so Faysal doesn’t even define the *Murji’ab* correctly! He then states:

“Now I am here giving you a bayaan freely and there are many people who’d like to silence me Faysal, they’d like to see my life go out but they have failed miserably to silence me and every time I challenge them to a debate they refuse, they only speak behind my back like nine-year old girls.”

Faysal then says:

“Now if a person says the Qur’aan is created is he a Muslim or a kaafir? I can’t hear you! A kaafir! Ma’moon believed the Qur’aan was created, so if Ma’moon believed the Qur’aan was created why Ahmad ibn Hanbal did not make takfeer on him? The answer to that: because he (i.e. Ma’moon) implement⁸⁴ the Sharee’ah to the letter, this is why Ahmad ibn Hanbal didn’t make takfeer on him.”

Where’s the proof for this? Faysal says this and provides no evidence whatsoever of whom from the people of knowledge stated this.⁸⁵ There is no mention of **“implementation of the Sharee’ah”** in *Usool us-Sunnab*⁸⁶ of Imaam Ahmad, nor in *Tabaqaat ul-Hanaabilah*⁸⁷ of Qaadee Muhammad ibn Abee Ya’la⁸⁸ nor in *Sharh Usool I’tiqaad Ahlis-Sunnab* of Imaam al-Laalikaa’ee.

⁸⁴ Again, this is direct from Faysal’s own words, he did not used the past tense ‘implemented’ he rather said ‘he implement’ even though he is talking about something in the past.

⁸⁵ Faysal also repeats this issue of the **“implementation of Sharee’ah”** in the lecture *The Devil’s Deception of the Saudi Salafees’* with regards to Hajjaaj ibn Yoosuf, about an hour and twenty minutes into the lecture.

⁸⁶ Edited by Fawwaaz Ahmad Zumarlee in 1411 AH

⁸⁷ Abdurrahmaan al-Uthaymeen (ed.), Riyadh: Maktabah al-Ubaykaan, 2005 CE; also Muhammad Haamid al-Faqeehee (ed.), Cairo: 1952 CE; Beirut: Daar ul-Ma’rifah

⁸⁸ He is al-Qaadee Aboo Ya’la Muhammad bin Husayn bin Muhammad bin Khalaf bin Ahmad al-Baghdaadee and he authored some of the major classifications of the *Hanbalee madhab*. He was born in 380 AH/ CE and studied under many scholars including ‘Eesaa Ibn Wazeer. He excelled in *fiqh*, *tafseer*, *usool* and was the Imaam of ‘Iraq during his time, he died in 458 AH/ CE. He authored *Ahkaam ul-Qur’aan*, *Masaa’il-Eemaan*, *al-Mu’tamid fee Usool id-Deen* (edited by W.Z. Haddaad, Beirut, 1974 CE), *Uyoon ul-Masaa’il*, *Rad ‘alaa*

There is nothing about **“Ahmad not making takfeer due to the implementation of the Sharee’ah”** and in any case believing that the Qur’aan is created is not **“implementing the Sharee’ah”**! This is one of the common doubts of the people of *takfeer*, they apply this new modern interpretation about **“takfeer not being made due to the implementation of the Sharee’ah”** but the reality is that Imaam Ahmad mentions in his *Usool us-Sunnah* that revolt against a Muslim leader is not to be made. He states under point 53:

And whoever revolts against a leader from among the leaders of the Muslims, after the people had agreed upon him and united themselves behind him, after they had affirmed the khilaafah for him, in whatever way this khilaafah may have been, by their pleasure and acceptance or by (his) force and domination (over them), then this revolter has disobeyed the Muslims, and has contradicted the narrations of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam). And if the one who revolted against the ruler died he would have died the death of ignorance.

Then point 54:

And the killing of the one in power is not lawful, and nor is it permissible for anyone amongst the people to revolt against him. Whoever does that is an innovator, (and is) upon other than the Sunnah and the (correct) path.⁸⁹

So Imaam Ahmad (*raheemahullaah*) did not mention anything whatsoever about the **“implementation of the Sharee’ah”** he states that *any* Muslim ruler that assumes power is to be obeyed and revolt against him is not permissible. Imaam Aboo Ja’far at-Tahaawee, author of *Aqeedah Tabaaniyyah*, which was explained by Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafee, states:

We do not view (that it is permissible to) revolt against our leaders or those who are responsible for our affairs and even if they transgress we do not make du’aa against them⁹⁰ and we do not take back the covenant of obedience from them⁹¹ and we view that

Karaamiyyah, Rad ‘alaa Saalimiyyah wa’l-Mujassimah, Rad ‘alaa Jahmiyyah, al-Kalaam fi’l-Istiwaah, Fadaa’ilu Ahmad, at-Tib, Tareekh ul-Islam and other works.

⁸⁹ For both Arabic and English texts see *Foundations of the Sunnah by Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal* (Birmingham: Salafi Publications, 1417 AH/1997 CE), pp.37-38

⁹⁰ Shaykh ‘Ali Hasan al-Halabee stated in his lessons at the *Imaam Albaanee Centre* (in ‘Ammaan, Jordan) in March 2006 CE: “Some people make du’aa against the Muslim leaders or curse and slander them and this is not from the characteristics of the people of truth.”

⁹¹ Shaykh ‘Ali said: “This obviously means by extension removing themselves from the obedience of Allaah as the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said *“There is no obedience to the creation in disobedience to the*

obedience to them is from obedience to Allaah and obligatory⁹² as long as they do not command to disobedience and we make du'aa to Allaah for them to have correctness and good health.⁹³

As for the consensus which indicates this clearly is that which was stated by Imaam an-Nawawee (*raheemahullaah*) in his explanation of *Saheeh Muslim* wherein he stated:

وأما الخروج عليهم، وقتالهم، فحرام بإجماع المسلمين، وإن كانوا فسقة ظالمين

As for revolting against the rulers and leaders and fighting against them then it is haraam (impermissible) according to the consensus of the Muslims, even if they are sinful transgressors.⁹⁴

This contemporary argument about “takfeer not being made due to the implementation of the Sharee’ah” is also feebly used by the *takfeerees* to rebut the following *hadeeth*:

أخرج مسلم في ((صحيحه)) عن حذيفة بن اليمان – رضي الله عنهما – قال

قلت : يا رسول الله ! إنا كنا بشر فجاء الله بخير فنحن فيه فهل من وراء هذا الخير شر ؟ قال ((نعم))، قلت : هل وراء ذلك الشر خير ؟ قال ((نعم)) قلت فهل وراء الخير شر ؟ قال : ((نعم)) قلت : كيف ؟ قال ((يكون بعدي أئمة لا يهتدون بهدائي، ولا يستنون بسنتي، وسيقوم فيهم رجال قلوبهم قلوب الشياطين في جثمان إنس))

قال : قلت : كيف أصنع يا رسول الله – أن أدركت ذلك ؟

Creator” and he (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) also said “Obedience is only in that which is good.” If the issue is in regards to that which opposes the Divine Legislation and the affair of the Allaah and His Messenger, then obedience in this regard is not permissible.”

⁹² Meaning: responding in obedience to the leader is as if you have responded in obedience to Allaah, it is obligatory. (Shaykh Ali Hasan)

⁹³ Shaykh ‘Ali stated: “Instead of making *du’aa* against them we make *du’aa* for them as Imaam Ahmad (*raheemahullaah*) mentioned.”

⁹⁴ Meaning: even if those Muslim rulers are sinners and transgressors. This is found in vol.12, p.229 of Imaam an-Nawawee’s *Sharh* of Saheeh Muslim.

قال : ((تسمع وتطيع للأمر وإن ضرب ظهرك وأخذ مالك فاسمع وأطع)) .

Reported in *Sabeeh Muslim*⁹⁵ from Hudhayfah ibn al-Yamaan (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) wherein he asked the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) if there was any evil after this good and the Prophet responded saying “Yes.” Hudhayfah asked “how can this be?” The Prophet said “*There will be after me leaders who will neither be guided by my guidance nor follow my sunnah and men will emerge from them who will have the hearts of devils in the bodies of men.*” Hudhayfah asked “What should be done if that happens?” The Prophet said “*Listen and obey the leader, even if he beats your back and takes your money, listen and obey!*”

So if a leader “does not follow the guidance of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)” is this **“implementing the Sharee’ah”**? If the leader “will not follow the *sunnah* of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)” is this **“implementing the Sharee’ah”**? If the leader “beats your back” (unjustly) is this **“implementing the Sharee’ah”**? If the leader “takes your money” after doing this beating, is this **“implementing the Sharee’ah”**? If a leader has a heart of a devil in human form is this “implementing the Sharee’ah”? Yet the *takefeeres* conjure up, with no precedence from any scholar from the *Salaf*, that this *hadeeth* is only applied to **“those Muslim leaders who are implementing the Sharee’ah”**!!!! So they seek to append to the words of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)!

Faysal continues by making *takefeer* due to Muslim countries being part of the UN and this is again false. Faysal states:

“Even if they implemented the Sharee’ah still they’d be kaafirs because they give their allegiance, their bay’ah, their oath of allegiance, to the UN...”

Shaykh ’Abdul’Azeez bin Ra’ees ar-Ra’ees (*hafidhabullaah*) has dealt with this in *al-Burhan al-Muneer fee Dhad Shubuhaat Abl it-Takfeer wa’t-Tafjeer* in a chapter dealing with the issue of *takefeer* due to being in the UN. Shaykh ’Abdul’Azeez ar-Ra’ees notes that:

فهي هيئة ذات أنظمة وقرارات وعهود ومواثيق انضمت إليها أكثر دول العالم، ومنها الدولة السعودية – حرسها الله ورعاها -، وقد نشأت إبان الحرب العالمية الثانية، والهدف الرئيس من إنشائها تقريب وجهات النظر بين الأمم، وتضييق الثغرات التي قد تنشأ بين الدول، والتي من

⁹⁵ Vol.3, p.1476

شأنها إن استمرت أن تشكل خطراً على السلم والأمن الدوليين إلى جانب تحقيق السلام، ومنع اللجوء إلى استخدام القوة كحل للمشكلات العالمية.

(The UN) is an organisational system of resolutions, agreements and covenants which most of the world's states are affiliated to, including the state of Saudi, may Allaah protect it. it (i.e. the UN) developed....the second world war and the main aim of its development was to bring together nations and views and to narrow the variances which can emerge between nation-states which if left to continue would lead to dangerous consequences for peace and security between two states alongside achieving peace. It also was also set-up to prevent the use of power as a solution to global problems.

Then Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez (*bafidhabullaah*) mentioned King Faysal (*rabeemabullaah*) highlighting this about the UN and then the Shaykh stated:

وبما أن الغلبة في هذه الهيئة للكفار فإن بها أنظمة لا توافق الشرع ؛ فلذا عارضت السعودية بعض الأنظمة، ولم توافق على كل ما فيها.

وإليك جملة من العهود والمواثيق التي لم تقبلها الدولة السعودية – حرسها الله – :

- 1- لم توافق المملكة العربية السعودية على الاتفاقية التي تنص على القضاء على جميع أشكال التمييز ضد المرأة. قال طلال محمد نور عطا: تحفظت المملكة العربية السعودية على هذه الاتفاقية، ولا تلزم نفسها بما يتعارض مع أحكام الشريعة الإسلامية اهـ⁹⁶
- 2- لم توافق المملكة العربية السعودية على المادة السادسة عشرة في حقوق الإنسان القائلة " للرجل والمرأة متى بلغا سن الزواج الحق بالتزوج بدون قيد بسبب الدين " فقالت دولة التوحيد في مذكرة أرسلتها إلى الأمم المتحدة : إن زواج المسلم من امرأة وثنية وغير مؤمنة بوجود الله أمر حرمه الإسلام، وأيضاً زواج المسلم من كتابية يهودية أم مسيحية أباحه الإسلام، أما زواج غير المسلم بمسلمة فغير مباح.⁹⁷

حاشية كتابه المملكة العربية السعودية والمنظمات الدولية ص181. 96

مذكرة الحكومة السعودية إلى منظمة الأمم المتحدة حول تطبيق حقوق الإنسان في المملكة عملاً بالشريعة الإسلامية. نشر في العدد الأول من المجلة العربية ص182، وانظر كتاب موقف المملكة العربية السعودية من القضايا العالمية في هيئة الأمم المتحدة ص98. 97

3- لم توافق دولة التوحيد على المادة العاشرة من الإعلان العالمي لحقوق الإنسان التي أعطت كل شخص حرية تغيير دينه.⁹⁸

4- أن المملكة العربية السعودية لم تنظم إلى المعاهدتين الدوليتين: الأولى الخاصة بالحقوق الاقتصادية والاجتماعية والثقافية. والثانية المتعلقة بالحقوق السياسية والمدنية، بسبب احتواء كل من هاتين المعاهدتين على مواد لا تساير تعاليم الشريعة الإسلامية السمحة.⁹⁹ فإذا كانت هذه حال الدولة السعودية مع هيئة الأمم المتحدة، من أنها لا تقبل الأنظمة التي تخالف الشريعة الإسلامية باعتراف قادات هذه الدولة - وفقهم الله لما فيه هداه -، وبتطبيقهم لها عملياً، وذلك بأن يتحفظوا على الأنظمة والقرارات المخالفة للشريعة الإسلامية، إذا كان هكذا حال الدولة مع هيئة الأمم المتحدة فلماذا - يا منصفون - يُشنع عليها وتُكفر؟! أليس من حقها أن تشكر بدل أن تكفر، من أجل امتناعها عن القرارات المخالفة للشريعة؟ أليس من حقها أن تؤازر وتساند على اعتزازها وحدها من بين جميع الدول الإسلامية بشريعة الإسلام وتحفظها على كل ما يخالفه؟

ب/ أن المصلحة تقتضي انضمام الدولة السعودية لهذه الهيئة حماية لنفسها من أعدائها الكفار،

بل وبعض الدول الإسلامية المخالفة للمعتقد السلفي، فإنهم يتربصون بدولة التوحيد الدوائر لدوافع متعددة معلومة، ومن أوضح البراهين حرب الخليج الأولى، فدولة تهجم وأخرى عن أنيابها تكشر .

ومن المتقرر شرعاً أن للضعف أحكاماً مغايرة لحالة القوة، وبنود صلح الحديبية خير شاهد ودليل على هذا.

وقد ذكر الشيخ المؤرخ إبراهيم بن عبيد آل عبدالمحسن في كتابه التاريخي " تذكرة أولي النهى والعرفان بأيام الله الواحد الديان " كتب معاهدات مع بريطانيا ظاهرها الرضا بالضميم فقال: سادساً: يتعهد ابن سعود كما تعهد أبأوه من قبل أن يتحاشى الاعتداء على أقطار الكويت

المرجع السابق. 98

موقف المملكة العربية السعودية من القضايا العالمية في هيئة الأمم المتحدة ص98. 99

والبحرين ومشائخ قطر وسواحل عمان التي هي تحت حماية الحكومة البريطانية، ولها صلات عهدية مع الحكومة المذكورة، وأن لا يتدخل في شؤونها وتخوم الأقطار الخاصة بهؤلاء ستعين فيما بعد. وجرى توقيعها في 18 صفر من هذه السنة الموافق 26 ديسمبر 1915، ولا ريب أن هذه الاتفاقية جائزة... وقد انتقدها الكتاب فقال عنها الضليع فؤاد حمزة لما أشرف عليها إنَّها معاهدة جائزة. وقال عنها الماهر الذكي حافظ وهبة المشهور بحرية الفكر ورجاحة العقل واستقلال الرأي ما نصه: تجلى قصر نظر مستشاري ابن سعود بما يجري في العالم والاستفادة من الفرص ولكن يقال عنها إنَّ الظروف والأحوال ذلك الوقت دعت إلى توقيعها. ولما خلى ابن سعود وصحبه الذين فيهم الشرف والدين والقوة غير أنهم لا يعرفون لغة السياسة وأساليب الاستعمار ولا يصدقون بالظفر لغير الصارم البتار واستشارهم كعادته أجاوبه بأننا في حال ضعف وخصمنا قوي جبار، فراها تنفعنا بإذن الله في الحال ولا تضرنا إذا كنا في حالة منعة وقوة، ويمكن تعديلها فيما بعد، فالعبرة بالقوة في كل وقت وحال، فقم وتوكل على الله ووقعها، كما أنه أدرك بأنه لا يبيع ولا يتخلى ولا يرهن من نيته حسن الجوار، وتسهيل طرق الحجاج. فما أحسن نتائج هذه الآراء والأفكار، ولنا أسوة في صلح الحديبية، أضف إلى ذلك أنها ألغيت بعد سبع سنوات وعدلت فيما بعد ذلك لما فتح الله له الحجاز واعترفت له بريطانيا بالاستقلال التام يفعل ما يشاء ويحكم ما يريد. اهـ¹⁰⁰

ج/ أنه لو قدر جدلاً أن الانضمام إلى هيئة الأمم المتحدة من الحكم بغير ما أنزل الله لما كفرت الدولة السعودية بفعالها؛ لأنه تقدم بيان أن الحكم بغير ما أنزل الله على شناعته وكونه سبباً للضعف وتسلط الأعداء، إلا أنه لا يخرج من الملة، وبهذا كان يفتي شيخنا عبدالعزيز بن باز والشيخ الألباني - رحمهما الله - كما تقدم.

تنبيه/ لو كان الانضمام إلى هيئة الأمم المتحدة من الحكم بغير ما أنزل الله لرأيت علماءنا كالشيخ محمد بن إبراهيم والشيخ سعد ابن عتيق والشيخ عبدالعزيز ابن باز والشيخ محمد العثيمين - رحمهم الله - أنكروه وبينوا حرمة، بل نص على جوازه بعضهم فقد سئل الشيخ

¹⁰⁰. (198/2).

محمد بن صالح بن عثيمين: بعض الناس يقول إن الانضمام إلى الأمم المتحدة تحاكم أيضاً إلى غير الله سبحانه وتعالى، فهل هذا صحيح؟

فأجاب: هذا ليس بصحيح، فكل يحكم في بلده بما يقتضيه النظام عنده، فأهل الإسلام يحتكمون إلى الكتاب والسنة، وغيرهم إلى قوانينهم، ولا تجبر الأمم المتحدة أحداً أن يحكم بغير ما يحكم به في بلاده، وليس الانضمام إليها إلا من باب المعاهدات التي تقع بين المسلمين والكفار. اهـ¹⁰¹، بل واستمر هؤلاء العلماء الأجلاء يرددون أن الدولة السعودية – حرسها الله – تحكم بما أنزل الله، وزكوها بهذا .

And as the majority of the member states are kuffaar there are aspects which do not agree with the Divine Legislation and for that reason Saudi rejected some of the system and did not agree with all that is in it. Here unto you are some of the agreements and treatises that the Saudi state, may Allaah protect it, did not accept:

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not agree with the agreement judging all forms of discrimination against women. Talaal Muhammad Nooh 'Ataa stated: "The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia preserved this agreement put did not adhere itself to what opposed the Divine Legislation of Islaam.
2. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not agree with article 16 which says that a man and a woman, when they reach the age of marriage, they have the right to marry without any religious conditions. Saudi Arabia stated in a memo sent to the United Nations "The marriage of a Muslim male to a polytheist woman or to a woman who does not believe in the existence of Allaah is a matter that Islaam has prohibited. Also, the marriage of a Muslim male to a woman of the book, being a Christian woman or a Jewish woman is a matter that Islaam has allowed. As for the marriage of a non-Muslim male to a Muslim female then this is impermissible.¹⁰²

مجلة الدعوة - العدد 1608 - 10 جمادى الأولى 1418هـ - 11 سبتمبر 1997م. ¹⁰¹

¹⁰² *Mudhakirat ul-Hukoomah Saudiyyah ilaa Munnadhmat il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah Hawla Tatbeeq Huqooq ul-Insaan fi'l-Mamlakah 'Amalan bi'sh-Sharee'ah Islaamiyyah* [Memo of the Saudi Government to the United Nations Organisation About the Application of Human Rights in the Kingdom According to the Divine Legislation of Islaam], *Majallah 'Arabiyyah*, no.1, p.182. Also see *Kitaab Mawqif Mamlakat il-'Arabiyyat is-Saudiyyah min al-Qadaayah al-'Aalamiyyah fee Hay'at il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah* [The Position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in Regards to World Affairs in the United Nations Organisation], p.98

3. The state of tawheed did not agree with article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which gives anyone the right to change their religion. ¹⁰³
4. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not implement two state covenants, the first being particular to economic, social and cultural rights and the second being related to political and civic rights due to what is within these covenants of contents which do not conform with the Divine Legislation of Islaam.¹⁰⁴

So if this was the situation of the Saudi state with the UN, in that it does not accept those aspects of the system which contradict the Divine Legislation of Islaam, by the admission of the leaders of this state (i.e. Saudi), may Allaah grant them success with His guidance of what is in it, and their application of the Divine Legislation practically and preserving the Divine Legislation in face of the system and contradictory resolutions. So if this is the condition of the Saudi state in its dealings with the UN, why then, O people of justice, is it abused and made takfeer of? Is it not from its right that it is thanked rather than made takfeer of due to its avoidance of resolutions which oppose the Divine Legislation of Islaam? Is it not from its right that it is supported and trusted due to its unique pride, amongst all of the Islamic countries, in the Divine Legislation of Islaam and preserving it against whatever contradicts it.

B. THE BENEFIT DEPENDS ON THE ENTRY OF THE SAUDI STATE TO THIS ORGANISATION

To protect itself from its kuffaar enemies, or even rather, some Islamic countries which oppose the creed of the Salaf lay in wait for the state of tawheed to meet with disaster for many well known reasons. From the clearest proofs of this is the first Gulf war wherein one state attacked another. What is repeated in the Divine Legislation is circumstances of weakness are different from a state of strength. The treaty of Hdaybiyah is the best witness and proof for this. The historian, Shaykh Ibraaheem Bin 'Ubayd Aal 'AbdulMuhsin in his historical book *Tadhkiratu Awlee wa'n-Nahy wa'l-'Irfaan bi-Ayaam Allaah al-Waahid ad-Dayaan:*

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ *Kitaab Mawqif Mamlakat il-'Arabiyyat is-Saudiyyah min al-Qadaayah al-'Aalamiyyah fee Hay'at il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah* [The Position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in Regards to World Affairs in the United Nations Organisation], p.98

“Sixthly: Ibn Saud made agreements just as his fathers did in order to keep away the enemies from the regions of Kuwait, Bahrayn, the Shaykhs of Qatar,¹⁰⁵ the coastal areas of 'Uman (Oman) which were under the rule of the British and had treaty relations with the aforementioned government. Also, the agreements were to neither interfere in the affairs of these countries nor to settle in those areas, the treaty was signed on (circa) 18 Safar 1334 AH corresponding to 16 December 1915 CE. There is no doubt that this type of agreement is allowed...and the well-versed historian Fu'ad Hamza¹⁰⁶ stated about it that the treaty was permitted. The adept intelligent memoriser who was gifted with fame for free thinking, composure of intellect and independent opinion stated: “The short-sightedness of the advisor of Ibn Sa'ud of what was taking place in the world was clear and was merely taking advantage of the opportunities. However, it was said about the opportunity that the circumstances of the time necessitated a treaty to be signed...”¹⁰⁷

C. TO ASSUME, FOR ARGUMENT'S SAKE, THAT JOINING THE UN WAS RULING BY OTHER THAN WHAT ALLAAH HAS REVEALED

The Saudi state still would not be made takfeer of by being in it, because, as has been explained, ruling by what Allaah has revealed is due to weakness and the reign of the enemy, so it does not expel from the religion, this is what our Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Bin Baaz and Shaykh al-Albaanee (raheemahumallaah) judged as has preceded.

ATTENTION: If joining the UN was ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed you would have seen our scholars such as Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibraaheem, Shaykh Sa'd bin 'Ateeq, Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Baaz and Shaykh Muhammad ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen (raheemahumullaah) reject it and clarify its prohibition. Rather, it is transmitted from some of them its permissibility (being part of the UN), Shaykh 'Uthaymeen was asked:

“Some people say that joining the UN is rule by other than Allaah, is this correct?”

He answered:

“This is not correct, as each one in his country rules by what is required of him. So the people of Islaam rule by the Book (Qur'aan) and Sunnah and others rule by their laws. The UN does not force anyone to rule by other than what they rule by within their

¹⁰⁵ The Ottoman Turks were driven out of these three regions in 1913 CE after Ibn Sa'ud finally defeated them at al-Ahsa. [TN]

¹⁰⁶ He is the author of *Qalb Jazeerat ul-'Arab* (Riyadh: Maktabat an-Nasr al-Hadeethah, 1968 CE). [TN]

¹⁰⁷ Vol.2, p.198

countries. Being in the UN is nothing other than from the aspect of treaties which take place between the Muslims and the kuffaar.”¹⁰⁸

So rather, such scholars (which have just been mentioned above) constantly repeat that the Saudi state rules by what Allaah has revealed.”

Faysal states;

“These scholars who have given their allegiance to the leaders it is haraam for you to respect these scholars...”

Even though the scholars from the *Salaf* have all agreed upon obedience to the Muslim rulers! We will deal more with this in the last chapter. Faysal states, in his pure ignorance and hatred of the people of *sunnah*, after an hour into the lecture:

“I suggest you don't embarrass yourself and promote the 'aqedah of kufr doona kufr...because when you promote this dodgy 'aqedah and this is the 'aqedah of the Salafees, may the curse of Allaah be upon them in this life and the hereafter, and anyone who promote the 'aqedah of kufr doona kufr this person is an enemy of Allaah, His Rasool and al-Islam.”

Again we observe here that Faysal saves his most harsh criticisms for the *Salafees* yet again saying “may the curse of Allaah be upon them in this life and the hereafter” yet the people of *sunnah* are not harmed by those who oppose them and thus his oppression will not yield any results, inshaa'Allaah! He continues:

“The Jews love Judaism more than the Muslims love al-Islam, this is why they have a Jewish state and we don't have an Islamic state. The Jewish Rabbis are more sincere to their false religion more than our Islamic scholars who are not sincere to our religion...Islam is a religion without scholars...”

What more is there than this to indicate Faysal's *Khaarijyyah*?! He praises the Jews and Christians for having scholars and then attacks the Muslims by claiming that the Muslims have no scholars whatsoever on the face of the earth! Twenty minutes before the end of the lecture Faysal says:

“The fitna of our time is the Sharee'ah there is no Sharee'ah anyway and only the Taalibaan is trying...”¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁸ *Majallat ud-Da'wah*, no.1608, dated: 10 Jumadaa al-Ulaa 1418 AH/September 11 1997 CE

¹⁰⁹ Over 56 minutes into another lecture entitled '*Islam Under Siege*' Faysal again praises the Taalibaan as having “**implemented Sharee'ah**” and being a “**Sharee'ah state.**”

This is where we find one of Faysal's huge blunders, he said earlier:

“Even if they implemented the Sharee’ah still they’d be kaafirs because they give their allegiance, their bay’ah, their oath of allegiance, to the UN...”

Yet even the Taalibaan sent its envoy to the USA in December 1997 CE to meet *UNOCAL* there to discuss the proposed gas pipeline from Turkmenistan and Khazakhstan via Afghanistan! The Taalibaan delegation included *Acting Minister for Mines and Industry* Ahmed Jan, *Acting Minister for Culture and Information* Amir Muttaqi, *Acting Minister for Planning* Din Muhammad, and appointed **‘Taliban Permanent Delegate on the United Nations’,** Mujahid! <http://www.gasandoil.com/goc/news/ntn80956.htm> The article states:

Dec. 15, 1997 A Taliban delegation has visited Washington and was received by some State Department officials. The Talib delegation’s meeting with U.S. Undersecretary of State for South Asia Karl Inderforth was arranged by the Unocal, which is eager to build a pipeline to pump gas from Turkmenistan to Pakistan via Afghan territory. “We made our position clear, namely that the pipeline could be useful for Afghanistan’s rehabilitation, but only if the situation was settled there by political means”, a State Department official said on condition of anonymity. He stated that the Taliban representatives were told that they should form “a broadly-based government together with their rivals before the ambitious project to build an oil and gas pipeline is launched”. According to Taliban assessments, only one pipeline could yield almost \$300 mm for rehabilitating the war-ravaged Afghanistan.**The Taliban delegation included Acting Minister for Mines and Industry Ahmed Jan, Acting Minister for Culture and Information Amir Muttaqi, Acting Minister for Planning Din Muhammad, and recently appointed Taliban Permanent Delegate on the United Nations Mujahid.** A State Department official described the talks as “open and useful”. He said that they also touched on the production of opium and open poppy on the Taliban-controlled territory, human rights, treatment of women, and on America's attitude to the projected pipeline. Asked whether there could be problems for the U.S. government if it backed the commercial investments into a country, which is ruled by Islamic fundamentalists, who, according to western standards, are oppressing women, the State Department official said that any real “political settlement” would resolve this problem. In the meantime, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright described the Talib government only a month ago as something quite disgusting due to its policy of oppressing women.

So did the Taaliban have allegiance to the UN which thus makes them *kuuffaar* too, according to Faysal? Indeed, this extremism and simplistic reasoning did even lead to some of the *khawaarij* of the era making *takfeer* of the Taalibaan and viewing their country as being 'Daar ul-Kufr' this is stated by the *mudallis* Omar Bakri Muhammad al-Mudallis as-Sooree al-Lubnaanee!!!¹¹⁰ This is in fact the logical deduction of the ideas and thinking of the likes of Faysal.

In March 2000 CE the Taalibaan sent its roving representative (Syed Rahmatullah Hashemi) to meet with US officials to discuss issues related to oil and gas. Not to mention what has been stated regarding their taking training, weapons and other munitions from the CIA! But the *Salafees* do not take not make *takfeer* of the Taalibaan, and Faysal didn't due to his contradictory stances, but actually in keeping with his *khawaarij manhaj* he should have also made *takfeer* of Afghaanistaan and the Taalibaan as Omar Bakri Muhammad al-Fustuq al-Lubnaanee al-Mudallis did.

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.10

'REJECTING THE TAGHOOT'

<http://www.thepathtoparadise.com/pages/Left%20Menu%20Pages/Abdullah%20Faisal.html>

With this lecture Faysal attributes *kufr* even to his own audience (!), after 30 minutes into the lecture saying:

"Many of you your Shaahadah has gone even without you realising it"!!

Continuing with his mass *takfeer* of Muslims Faysal states around forty minutes into the lecture, in yet another statement which reveals his *khariijyyah*:

"So today the Muslims are like the kaafirs of Quraysh..."

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.11

¹¹⁰ *As-Sharq al-Awsat* newspaper, no.2, August 2001 CE

'TREACHERY FROM WITHIN'

http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=498&Itemid=181

He states:

“The Saudi Salafees, they are your enemies, in fact they are your greatest enemies because they guise themselves, they hide themselves, in clothing of righteousness and piety with a beard and a white thowb, some of them speak Arabic, yet they use their knowledge of Arabic to cement the throne of the apostate leaders...these are the nine enemies who you have to fight in this world today.”

Reflect on this enmity, indeed some of the brothers of north-west London that used to be with Faysal for about three years and then left him state that he used to tell them to **“prepare themselves against the Salafees, as I have heard that they are coming”** to which the blind followers of Faysal would arm themselves with Uzis, machetes and other weapons to use against the *Salafees*! This is the so-called *jihad* of Faysal!! Towards the end of the lecture, a couple of minutes passed the hour, Faysal states:

“To say ‘the Rabbi Bin Baaz’, that’s more befitting.”!!!

Indeed, this is the real treachery from within the ranks of the Muslims, from the *khawarij*!

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.12

'40 SIGNS OF THE WICKED SCHOLAR'

This lecture is 1 hour and 35 minutes of attempting to discredit the senior scholars of the *sunnah*, Imaam Bin Baaz (*raheemabullaah*) in particular. The ruined Faysal Jamaykee states:

“Evil scholars do not take direct questions from the floor because they cannot afford to be exposed.”

Here then Faysal is again trying to hoodwink the audience against the scholars by making this foolish claim. And in any case it doesn't apply to the major scholars as they are all well-known for taking direct questions from the floor, so here is just another one of Faysal's blatant lies.

In continuing with his propaganda Faysal says:

“They even have talks, speakers and conferences and then they plant a man in the crowd to ask them questions (such as) “what do you think about so and so?” “what do you think about this Shaykh and that Shaykh?” to use that opportunity to kill the character

of that particular Shaykh, so they plant people in the crowd to ask them questions about certain personalities..."

How does Faysal know this? Where are the examples of this? So Faysal mentions this yet provides no evidence of this taking place whatsoever, its based on conjecture and evil suspicion. He continues with his nonsense after one hour and twenty minutes:

"There is absolutely no Salafee scholar who will teach you shirk al-haakimiyyah and mention shirk al-haakimiyyah, the shirk of a leader throwing the Qur'aan behind his back and govern the people with his evil and corrupted desires."

To **"govern the people with evil and corrupted desires"** does not necessitate revolting, fighting or attempting to remove a leader as the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) stated, which Faysal never quotes in any of his lectures, is in *hadeeth* in *Sabeeh Muslim*¹¹¹ from Hudhayfah ibn al-Yamaan (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) wherein he asked the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) if there was any evil after this good and the Prophet responded saying "Yes." Hudhayfah asked "how can this be?" The Prophet said "There will be after me leaders who will neither be guided by my guidance nor follow my sunnah and men will emerge from them who will have the hearts of devils in the bodies of men." Hudhayfah asked "What should be done if that happens?" The Prophet said "Listen and obey the leader, even if he beats your back and takes your money, listen and obey!" Faysal continues just before the end of the lecture by saying:

"Anyone who says that Algeria is fitna because it is Muslims killing Muslims then he is passing fatwa to suit the UN, USA, France and is in the pocket of evil and kaafir governments..."

This is the methodology of Faysal, anyone who doesn't agree with his own *khawaarij* views must therefore be in the pocket of *kuuffaar* governments and this is false.

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.13

'KNOWLEDGE'

He states after seven minutes into in this pathetic lecture:

"Your scholars have failed you miserably, they don't guide you to the straight path. Many of you did not even know that there is something called tawheed al-

¹¹¹ Vol.3, p.1476

haakimiyyah...many of you don't know that there is something called shirk al-haakimiyyah.”¹¹²

Here we see the pattern of Faysal yet again trying to discredit the scholars and claim that the scholars have failed the Muslims, in doing so Faysal hopes to place himself in their stead so that people turn to him for guidance. After 50 minutes into the lecture Faysal continues in his *takfeer* of general Muslims and claiming to know what is in the hearts by stating;

“So the Muslims in this country (i.e. the UK), the majority of them, they have no eemaan and no taqwaa, the average Muslim you meet on the street he has no eemaan and no taqwaa...”

Faysal mentions, after an hour and twelve minutes into this pathetic lecture:

“Another quality of the student of knowledge is to abstain from arguing, do not argue with anyone, al-jidaal, do not dispute or argue with anyone, do not get yourself involved in too many debates...as for inviting someone to debate with you and then you show off this is not allowed as a student of knowledge.”

Herein Faysal blatantly contradicts his own foolish self, as in the lecture *Let the Scholars Beware* he states:

“...and every time I challenge them to a debate they refuse...”

So Faysal himself is guilty of entering into **“too many debates”** based upon *baatil*, in *Jewish Traits in the Ummah* Faysal stated:

“...if I challenge you to a debate I become a kaafir. Likewise, if I challenge you, and the Salafees we have given them this challenge then they runaway and hide. If a Salafee should open his mouth and challenge saying “I’m going to have a debate, a public debate, in regards to tawheed al-haakimiyyah” if he (i.e. the Salafee) throws that challenge out to you that person becomes a kaafir! Are you convinced or you’re not convinced?”

So Faysal is the most notable for his pathetic debates, even debating with the likes of Aboo Hamza and Aboo Qataadah, with both of them even calling Faysal a *khaarij*! As took place in Aboo Hamza’s refutation of Faysal (see here: <http://downloads.islambase.co.uk/booksEN/BewareTakfir.pdf>) and with Aboo Qataadah in

¹¹² We have commented on Faysal’s infatuation with this prior

the debate *Are the Salafees Muslims?* After an hour and fifty minutes into the lecture Faysal states:

“Aboo Qataadah is your Shaykh because I get my knowledge, some of it, from Aboo Qataadah and I pass it on to you.”

Enough said! Refer to Shaykh ‘AbdulMaalik ar-Ramadaanee al-Jazaa’iree’s refutation here:

<http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhajQataadah.pdf>

Ten minutes before saying this Faysal stated:

“The reason why he (i.e. Aboo Qataadah) did not make takfeer of the salafee is because, I think, his knowledge of the salafees is not very vast because when I played the tape when the salafee said those who believe in jihaad and do jihaad are the brothers of the Shaytaan he was taken aback he didn’t know that salafees believe that those people who do jihaad are the brothers of the Shaytaan.”

Here Faysal makes another farcical allegation, the statement about those being **“brothers of the devils”** are related to those people who bomb innocent people *in the name of jihaad*, not people who wage *jihaad* (whether defensive or offensive) generally. So here Faysal tricks his audience into thinking that the *Salafees* hold the sincere and real *mujaaabideen* as being **“brothers of the Shaytaan”** and hoodwinks the audience into following this, when the reality is that the *fatwa* was regarding terrorists, unless Faysal supports the likes of the actions about which the *fatwa* was referring??

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.14

‘SACRIFICE’

He states after 25 minutes into the lecture:

“In the Muslim world today most of our scholars are not prepared to sacrifice, they are not prepared to speak the truth and this is why we are in a pathetic state...Where are the sacrifices that are being made by the scholars of Islaam? Where they are afraid of men instead of being afraid of Allaah.”

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.15

‘THE ROLE OF THE MASJID’

<http://www.thepathtoparadise.com/pages/Left%20Menu%20Pages/Abdullah%20Faisal.html>

This lecture is merely another display of false accusations against the *salafees*, he states after eighteen minutes into the lecture:

“...and today noses are being broken in the mosque, on many occasions noses were broken in Brixton Mosque if you go there and speak about King Fahd they give you a black eye.”

We will see that Faysal repeats this allegation in some later lectures in order to create propaganda against the *Salafees* of *Brixton Mosque*.¹¹³

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.16

‘WHAT’S YOUR AIM? WHAT’S YOUR OBJECTIVE?’

http://islambase.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=489&Itemid=181

In this lecture of agitation, Faysal states just two minutes before the end:

“...Today Muslims are starving and we have Muslim governments who turn a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters and send money to feed the monkeys in the London Zoo!”¹¹⁴

This is another unjust and transgressing statement, as the Saudi government for example is at the forefront of assisting needy Muslims around the world and this has to be acknowledged and admitted with no blame, shame or *kibr*.

<http://www.wfp.org/english/?ModuleID=137&Key=2249>

<http://www.wfp.org/english/?ModuleID=137&Key=2099>

<http://www.saudiaramcoworld.com/issue/198501/cake.for.the.poor.htm>

<http://www.arabnews.com/?page=1§ion=0&article=75965&d=8&m=1&y=2006>

¹¹³ Indeed, even according to the likes of Aboo Hamza al-Misree Faysal only stated this as he himself got his nose broken! Refer to Aboo Hamza's own words on page 68 here at this link: <http://downloads.islambase.co.uk/booksEN/BewareTakfir.pdf> - however this is not trustworthy but it shows that even Faysal's own takfeere thinkers question this oft-repeated allegation of Faysal.

¹¹⁴ Faysal then states in a quote which owes more to communism and socialism: **“Wealthy Muslims who Allaah has blessed and this wealth is for all, for the ummah.”**

http://www.saudigazette.com.sa/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=11490&Itemid=116

So the above are clear examples of Muslim governments contributing to end hunger, starvation and famine in Muslim countries. So the questions to Faysal and his blind followers are: When the Saudi government donated \$2.6 million to Palestinians this Ramadaan (2006 CE) is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? When the Saudi gave \$500 million to help in the situation in Lebanon this year (2006 CE), the Saudi government gave Lebanon \$1 billion and the people via a telethon donated around \$50 million to Lebanon, is all of this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? When the Saudi government gave \$10 million dollars to poor countries in the Horn of Africa and East Africa, is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? When Saudi gave \$2 million to help the poor within its own country is this **“turning a blind eye to their poor starving brothers and sisters”**?¹¹⁵ When the Saudi government donated 45

¹¹⁵ According to P.K. Abdul Ghafour reporting for the *Arab News* on Sunday 8 January 2006 CE corresponding to 9 Dhu'l-Hijjah 1426 AH:

King Donates SR2bn for Housing Poor

JEDDAH, 8 January 2006 — Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Abdullah has donated SR2 billion for housing projects to provide decent housing for the Kingdom's poor and needy. According to a report in Asharq Al-Awsat, this was the largest single donation to a charity in the Kingdom's history. Yousuf Al-Othaimeen, secretary-general of the King Abdullah Charitable Housing Foundation, said the king had given land in Madinah worth SR2 billion to the foundation. He estimated the total area of the land at five million square meters. It is located between the Prophet's Mosque and the Madinah airport. "This land will be administered as a source of income for the foundation's charitable projects," Al-Othaimeen told the Arabic daily. "Part of the land will be sold while the rest will be used for development projects," he said. Al-Othaimeen said King Abdullah earlier gave 10,000 square meters of land in Riyadh for the foundation's permanent headquarters. "King Abdullah bought the land for SR15 million specifically for that purpose," he said. The foundation, which was established three years ago, has already constructed a large number of low-cost housing projects for the poor in various parts of the country. The housing units are provided along with other facilities including health care and education. Al-Othaimeen said the foundation intended to establish 7,000 housing units in different parts of the Kingdom which would benefit some 50,000 citizens. King Abdullah ordered a national strategy to fight poverty in the country after

million Saudi Riyals¹¹⁶ to help the Muslims in Chechnya and the Qatari people gave 8 million in a telethon in 1999 CE, is all this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? When Saudi donated SR18 billion to the poor Muslims in Bosnia is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? According to the *Bosnian Muslims* themselves, and even non-Muslims, Saudi funded and financed schools, medical services, clinics, restored water supplies, financed the care of 7000 orphans, rebuilt *masaajid* and houses etc.¹¹⁷ When Pakistan was hit by the earthquake, the Saudi people through a concerted telethon donated 450 million Saudi Riyals, is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? Saudis donated 308 million Saudi Riyals to Tsunami hit areas, and in the same year they gathered 746 million Saudi Riyals for Palestinian families, is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? When the Saudi government donated \$185 million in 1984 CE to help pay the cost of transporting food, drilling wells and installing water pumps in poor countries in Africa, is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? When Saudi also put up \$30 million and \$45 million in 1985 CE for food aid in Eritrea, Chad, Sudan and Somalia is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? When Saudi donated \$135 from 1982-84 to the *International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)*, and was the second largest donor after the USA, is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”**? As a result of all of this, ‘Abdul’Azeez ar-Rukbaan, the *World Food Programme’s* special ambassador stated:

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has donated billions of dollars bilaterally or multilaterally to relief and development projects over the last thirty years and the recent donations to the WFP are examples of its ongoing commitment to help humanity.

Abdul Wahab Bashir stated, reporting for the *Arab News* (dated: Friday 12 April 2002 CE/30 Muharram 1423 AH):

Saudi telethon raises SR210 million for Palestinians

JEDDAH, 12 April — Viewers from inside Saudi Arabia and abroad strongly responded to last night’s national telethon for the Palestinian people giving millions of dollars in

visiting a Riyadh slum three years ago when he was crown prince. He set aside SR2 billion from the budget surplus for a low-cost housing scheme.

¹¹⁶ This is the equivalent to about £6 million, \$12 million and 10 million Euros.

¹¹⁷ <http://koz.vianet.ca/boshis125.htm>

donations. The donations include gold, cars and even slingshots sent by Saudi children to help their Palestinian brethren fight Israeli occupation. By the time this paper went to press, an hour before the early morning deadline for the end of the telethon, the amount had reached SR210 million (\$56 million). Throughout the telethon, the second since the start of the current Palestinian intifada 18 months ago, the Ulema on screen urged Saudis and expatriate workers to give generously to relieve the suffering of the Palestinian people. The viewers' response turned the courtyard of the television studios in Riyadh and Jeddah into a giant warehouse. Roads leading to the two TV stations were clogged with vehicles and entire families were seen heading toward the site to give their contributions. Four Indonesian Muslim maids on their way home to spend vacation with their families paid SR100 each to the authorities at King Khaled International Airport in Riyadh saying they wanted to join to the campaign to help the Palestinians. Westerners, too, joined in the campaign. A Briton from Dammam in eastern Saudi Arabia contributed cash and blamed the United States for what is happening in the occupied land and the suffering of the Palestinians. A Saudi businessman based in Jeddah said giving money is the least Saudis could do to help the Palestinian. At the television stations the yards overflowed with goods of every kind from giant tin trunks bursting with heavy gold bangles and pearl necklaces to cars including ambulances, electrical appliances and dresses. One Saudi man offered to donate one kidney and to give blood 13 times to Palestinians in need of medical treatment. Another came up with a rare copy of the Holy Qur'an, which he put for auction, and it fetched SR150 million soon after the start of the bidding. Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Fahd, who donated SR10 million, ordered the 11-hour telethon. Generous donations also came from Crown Prince Abdullah, deputy premier and commander of the National Guard, and Prince Sultan, second deputy premier and minister of defense and aviation, and other members of the royal family. A unified bank account was set for the event by the Saudi Committee for the Support of the Intifada headed by Interior Minister Prince Naif. The committee coordinates assistance to the Palestinians. The last telethon for Palestinians saw support pouring from all over the world and by the end of the day SR40 million were raised. The committee has urged Saudi citizens and expatriates to support the intifada and help provide food, medicines and clothes to the Palestinians and contribute to rebuilding homes and other infrastructure destroyed by the Israeli Army. It said it would continue to provide direct assistance to the families of Palestinian martyrs, the wounded and families suffering under the occupation. A spokesman for the committee called the

station to say the committee will start sending 100 vehicles loaded with food, medicines and other relief material in addition to ambulances to the Palestinians through Jordan. "The telethon reflects the solidarity the Saudis and expatriates in the Kingdom feel toward the Palestinian people. What is happening in Palestine stirs mixed feelings of pain and hope in Muslims. They feel pain and anger seeing the killings and destruction that the Palestinians continue to suffer and the conspiracies being directed against the Muslim identity and sanctuaries. But at the same time there is hope because this event is being launched from the land of the two holy mosques (in Makkah and Madinah) which is closely linked to the land of Al-Aqsa Mosque," said Sheikh Abdul Rahman Al-Sudais, imam of the Grand Mosque in Makkah. He was referring to the ascension of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) who was transported from the Sacred Mosque in Makkah to the Farthest (Al-Aqsa) Mosque of Jerusalem in one night and shown the Signs of God."¹¹⁸

Mashaa'Allaah! This was in 2002 CE! Is this "turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters" as Faysal claims?? What are the likes of him doing practically for the people?! We would like to know after his pompous accusations against the *Salafees* and their scholars. In 2000 CE:

The International Islamic Relief Organization has provided SR 2 million [U.S. \$ 0.5 million] as a first installment to help the Palestinian people in their present ordeal. The organization's Secretary-General Dr. Adnan bin Khalil Basha called for the provision of all possible assistance, specifically \$1,000 for the family of each martyr, \$500 for the family of each injured person, \$25,000 dollars to support each hospital in Al-Quds and the West Bank, \$35,000 for the purchase of an ambulance for the Holy Mosque in Al-Quds, \$100,000 to equip an emergency room in the mosque's clinic, and \$70,000 to establish a fire-fighting center in the mosque. For those wishing to participate in this charitable work, an account has been set up in the Alrajhi Bank.¹¹⁹

Is this "turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters" as Faysal claims??

Also during the 'Israa'eelee' bombing of Lebanon earlier this year:

LEBANON: Arab nations more generous than Western counterparts:

¹¹⁸ <http://www.arabnews.com/?page=1§ion=0&article=14239&d=12&m=4&y=2002>

¹¹⁹ <http://www.saudiembassy.net/2000News/News/ForDetail.asp?cIndex=2558>

So far Saudi Arabia is the Arab world's major donor to Lebanon. On Wednesday, Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah ordered the transfer of US \$1 billion to Lebanon's central bank, in an effort to consolidate the stability of the Lebanese pound. Although the Lebanese central bank had some US \$14 billion of foreign reserves, pressure was mounting on the pound and there was increased demand for the US dollar. According to economists, the Saudis have been supporting the Lebanese currency since 1990. Billionaire Saudi Prince Alwaleed bin Talal, whose mother is Lebanese, is also one Lebanon's major foreign investors. The country depends heavily on foreign direct investment, which amounted to about 10% of gross domestic product (gdp) in 2005, to finance a current account deficit of nearly 13% of gdp last year. An additional US \$500 million have been provided by the Saudis to Lebanon. On Wednesday, Lebanese Prime Minister Fouad Siniora described the funds as a "grant... [which would be] a nucleus for an Arab fund to reconstruct Lebanon." It is estimated that the damage caused by the current conflict to Lebanon's infrastructure is worth more than US \$2 billion. According to Siniora, the Saudis have also given Lebanon US \$50 million in emergency humanitarian aid for victims of Israeli attacks and the displaced people, estimated to number some 800,000 by the UN in Lebanon. A further donation of US \$32 million was raised through a Saudi television appeal on Thursday. A similar telethon conducted on Friday in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) raised Dh49 million (US \$13.5 million). The telethon was organised by Dubai Media Incorporated, the Sheikh Mohammed Bin Rashid Humanitarian and Charitable Foundation and the UAE Red Crescent Authority. UAE President Sheikh Khalifa bin Zayed al-Nahayan has ordered a US \$20 million donation to provide medical and other aid supplies to the Lebanese people. A similar sum – US \$20 million – has been promised by Kuwait's Emir Sheikh Sabah al Ahmed al Sabah to help secure the transportation of emergency aid to the Lebanese. Kuwait was among the first countries to help Lebanon since its current crisis with Israel started. In addition to official donations by Arab governments and NGOs, individuals throughout the Arab world have been contributing generously to assist the Lebanese people, according to local media reports. The Qatari authorities, for example, have collected about US \$ 3.9 million in donations towards that goal. Some US \$250,000 have been wired to the Lebanese Red Cross by the Kuwait Red Crescent Society from private donations, according to its head, Berjas al-Berjas. Al-Berjas said a Kuwait plane carrying tonnes of first aid medicine will arrive in Damascus on Sunday, en route to Beirut and that 290 electric power generators were sent to Lebanon from Kuwait on Wednesday.

On the same day, a Jordanian military plane arrived in Beirut carrying humanitarian relief aid supplies, including tonnes of food and medical supplies. The figure of total donations by individuals in the Arab world is higher probably than that officially released as Muslims are discouraged to publicise acts of goodwill, including charitable donations. "It is important to note that the figure that we see coming out of the Arab states may not necessarily reflect the totality of assistance since there is also a lot of discreet assistance which is provided by individuals or groups of individuals who are not concerned to have their generosity advertised as per the principle of giving in Islam," said Freijesen.¹²⁰

And according to Adel al-Malki reporting for the *Saudi Gazette* on Friday 28 July 2006 CE:

AID Lebanon Telethon Closes with SR108 Plus:

JEDDAH - Mohammed Zaal Al-Otaibi wanted to donate 100 she-camels to the people of Lebanon. Donation officials were happy with Otaibi's donation, but politely asked him to sell them off and then come back with the cash. Each she-camel can fetch anywhere from SR5,000 to SR2 million, depending on the breed of the she-camel. Likewise, some teenagers and men in their twenties went down to donation centers and handed over their car keys to donation officials, telling them they had no money, but they were sure the cars would fetch a pretty price. Officials again asked them for help and said "please sell them and come back with the money." Towards the early hours of Thursday morning, Saudi Television reported that the Kingdom had gathered more than SR108 million in donations from the public. The one day telethon to promote donations for Lebanon was kick-started by an extremely generous endowment announced by King Abdullah Bin Abdul Aziz, Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques Tuesday, where the King pledged a \$500 million grant for the reconstruction of Lebanon and \$250 million for the reconstruction of Palestine. King Abdullah further promised a deposit of \$1 billion to the Central Bank of Lebanon to aid the Arab tourism destination's ailing economy. The King, who came to Jeddah Wednesday after visiting Baha earlier this week, donated another SR10 million upon his arrival Wednesday. Crown Prince Sultan put forth another SR5 million and Minister of Interior Prince Naif Bin Abdul Aziz, chairman of the donation effort, presented another two million riyals. Other Saudi royals

¹²⁰

http://www.irinnews.org/report.asp?ReportID=54880&SelectRegion=Middle_East&SelectCountry=LEBANON

gave generously, but mostly said they preferred their names be withheld. Also on Wednesday, the King ordered the dispatch of a mobile hospital to Lebanon that will travel by road through Jordan and Syria to Lebanon. Earlier on Wednesday, a Jordanian plane equipped with a mobile hospital managed to land at Beirut International Airport, earlier in the morning after receiving clearance from the Israelis to fly in. Women thronged centers with gold and silver jewelry. Children brought their toys, with one girl breaking her piggy bank open at a donation box to pour all of her savings out. One 13-year-old sold his moped to a friend on the spot and walked into a donation center and handed over the money. The donation campaign will last for the coming 15 days, with cash donations being accepted by Ahli Bank and giveaways being processed by the Saudi Red Crescent at Jeddah Islamic Port. Giveaways are sorted by the Saudi Red Crescent at its port warehouses, with jewelry being sold in public auctions, and medical supplies and the like being packaged ready for shipping to the war-torn country. Likewise for food supplies, and clothes and toys. The telethon started Wednesday at 1 P.M. local time and ended with SR9.245 million in donations from the Saudi public and foreign residents living in the Kingdom in the first two hours. Saudi Fransi Chairman, Ibrahim Al-Touqi, gave the first donation in the amount of SR1 million. "This is the last 50 riyals in my pocket," one man, who identified himself with his initials told the television presenter, as he pledged the money for donation Wednesday. "I do not even have a car, but I do not believe that I cannot give this money to the Lebanese people," he added. Shar Al-Shihri said he had donated his IPO money instead of subscribing with it on Wednesday. "I came over to the ATM machine and saw the announcement for donations. Instead of subscribing to the King Abdullah Economic City IPO, I donated the money," Shihri told The Saudi Gazette, as he left a bank branch in Al-Nuzha district. "The pictures of all those Lebanese children say it all," he added. This is the 10th telethon to generate donations from the public for a grief stricken country. When Pakistan was hit by an earth shattering earthquake earlier this year, the public in Saudi Arabia donated over SR450 million in cash and assets. Saudis donated SR308 million to Tsunami-hit Indonesians at the end of 2004, while they gathered SR746 million in other donations for Palestinian families that same year. The Kingdom's chief Islamic cleric, Grand Mufti Sheikh Abdul Aziz Bin Abdul Rahman Aal Al-Sheikh gave a passionate plea for donations, urging the public to look deep in their hearts and give. Abdul Rauf Rajab, a spokesman for the Organization of the Islamic Conference, said the Lebanese government had given the OIC a list of items much needed by the country's war-stricken

population that mostly included medical supplies, and provisions needed to care for children. "The UN will be getting in supplies through Al-Reeda corridor," he said. The World Health Organization is asking for \$32.4 million, on behalf of the partners working on health issues like UNICEF, UNFPA and UNRWA to serve the medical needs of 800,000 people over the next three months. According to the UN this appeal is part of the total United Nations' Flash Appeal for Lebanon, which seeks a total of \$150 million. Some 1,200 people have been injured and 346 killed. Several hundred thousand Lebanese have fled their homes, some to neighboring Syria."

Is all this, "turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters" as Faysal claims??

Then let's turn to:

Saudi Arabia to finance new Palestinian homes in Hebron:

The Saudi Committee for the Relief of the Palestinian People has said it will finance the construction of 100 housing units in the West Bank city of Hebron at cost of US\$ 6.3 million. The project, to be undertaken in cooperation with UN-HABITAT, was approved on the instructions of His Majesty King Abdalla Bin Abdel Aziz Al Saud, and Prince Naif Bin Abdel Aziz Al Saud, Minister of Interior and General Supervisor of the Saudi Committee for the Relief of the Palestinian People. Officials said the new homes would be allocated to underprivileged or widowed women. The Chairman of the Saudi Committee for the Relief of the Palestinian People, Mr. Said Al Orabi Al- Harthi, who also serves as Advisor to the Minister of Interior, said the idea was to improve the living conditions of widowed women and their families. The project would be implemented, during a period of 24 months, through the Special Human Settlements Programme of UN-HABITAT and in cooperation with the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, and the Ministry of Public Works and Housing of the Palestinian National Authority and local NGOs. He cited the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's deep commitment to mitigate the suffering of the Palestinian people and help meet their essential needs. To date, he added, it had financed more than 36 relief and humanitarian programmes in the Palestinian territories in cooperation with a number of international organizations. UN-HABITAT and the Saudi Committee for the Relief of the Palestinian People will soon sign a Memorandum of Understanding to commence the implementation of the project."¹²¹

¹²¹ <http://www.unhabitat.org/content.asp?cid=3739&catid=7&typeid=6&subMenuId=0>

Is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”** as Faysal asserts? How about:

Saudi Committee for the Relief of Palestinian People donates \$3 million to Palestinian children:

JERUSALEM / RIYADH, SEPT 6, 2005 - The Saudi Committee for the Relief of Palestinian People is giving US\$3.6 million to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) towards critical projects supporting children in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT). The contribution is part of a new strategic framework with UNICEF for assistance to children in OPT. It emerged from meetings this spring between representatives from UNICEF's Gulf Area Office and OPT and senior officials from the Saudi Ministry of the Interior. The fresh funding will focus on assistance in education and health for the new generation of Palestinian adolescents. "UNICEF and the Saudi Committee for the Relief of Palestinian People come together at this critical time when assistance in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are more important than ever following disengagement," said Dan Rohrmann, the UNICEF Special Representative in OPT. "There are immense challenges but also immense opportunities in terms of improving the lives of children. It is heartening to see the Saudi Committee providing such a major boost." June Kunugi, UNICEF Representative for the Gulf countries, said: "This generous contribution is a landmark agreement and we thank the Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Abdullah bin Abdul Aziz, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and its people for partnering with UNICEF to safeguard the well-being and rights of children, in this instance in the occupied Palestinian territories." The Saudi Committee for the Relief of Palestinian People was established in 2000, and has since donated some US\$200 million to projects in OPT. The Committee has provided cash and in-kind assistance in addition to funding educational and medical activities as well as reconstruction schemes.¹²²

Is this **“turning a blind eye to their starving brothers and sisters”** as Faysal, the arm-chair activist, claims? In 1996 CE:

Saudi Arabia launches fund-raising week for Bosnia:

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia today launched a week-long fund-raising campaign to help rebuild the war-ravaged Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is the third such

¹²² <http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/HMYT-6FYL76?OpenDocument>

'Bosnia Week', and is in line with the directives of HRH Prince Salman Bin Abdul Aziz, Governor of Riyadh Province and head of the Supreme Commission for Collection of Donations for Bosnian Muslims. Two-thirds of all that is collected by the Commission is remitted directly to the Bosnian government either in a dedicated bank account, or through the Bosnian Embassy in Riyadh, or to President Izetbegovic by a delegation visiting Bosnia. One-third of the donations are used to purchase relief aid or extend monetary assistance to individuals in need, as well as to secure health care, restore gas supplies, and repatriate displaced persons. Seventeen shiploads of food, clothes, vehicles and other supplies have been sent to the Commission's office in Bosnia, which distributes aid to Muslims in Bosnian towns through eight affiliated centers. In addition, the Commission distributes religious books and organizes seminars and training courses, including Qur'an memorization. The media is asked to highlight the need in Bosnia for rebuilding mosques as well as factories and agricultural centers. In appealing to all Muslims to contribute to the fund-raising, the Commission praises the generosity of the Saudi people and of Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Fahd Bin Abdul Aziz."¹²³

Saudi even donated money (some accounts say \$250 million) to help poor and *miskeen kuffaar*, mostly African-American ones who had been left out in the cold and left to drown by their own racist government, during Hurricane Katrina! Anyone would have thought that it was a poor African country the way the people were struggling there! So what has Faysal and his blind followers given to the *ummah*, except for *fitna*, falsehood, controversy and suicide bombers who kill innocent people in the name of *jibaad*?

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.17

'THE DEVIL'S DECEPTION OF THE 21ST CENTURY HOUSE NIGGERS '

<http://inshallshaheed.wordpress.com/lectures/>

This appalling lecture establishes Faysal's wrath, enmity and kindling of tribulation amongst Muslims. After entitling this lecture with a term of expression which in no way applies to those who he aims to condemn at all! Furthermore, Faysal states that he only named this lecture as such based on what "some people told him" demonstrating that Faysal was more concerned

¹²³ <http://208.246.28.155/1996News/News/ForDetail.asp?cIndex=4213>

in following the desires of his ignorant followers and pandering to them for credibility, even if it is devoid of Islamic *adab* and *akblaag*. This lecture also shows Faysal's frustration with the *Salafee da'wah*, which as he cannot rebut with concise proofs, has to resort to a simplistic attack which is immediately noticeable when one listens.

What is immediately noticeable in this lecture is that Faysal totally copies Aboo Usaamah's format of refuting 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan! So Faysal's plays the lecture and stops it in the exact same way as Abee Usaamah does. After nine minutes into the lecture he reiterates:

“These house niggers they break noses of people in different mosques, especially in Brixton Mosque, to protect the so-called honour of King Fahd and the other apostate leaders.”

We will not assess this allegation, which he previously stated in the lecture *The Role of the Masjid*, and regurgitates it twice in this lecture, we will assess it later *inshaa'Allaah*. Just twenty minutes into the lecture Faysal states, in another clear indication of his attempting to generate the ideology of *takfeer* and revolt amongst the common Muslims that:

“When Ibn Katheer was explaining in his tafseer in Maa'idah 50, he said “it is the ijmaa' of all the Muslims” he didn't say the ijmaa' of the scholars, he said “Muslims” even the layman on the street knows that this person is a kaafir, that if you don't judge by what Allaah revealed you're a kaafir.”

Again look at the falsehood of Faysal, when the scholars mention *ijmaa'* of course they are referring to the scholars and not the lay people such as the barber, the road-sweeper, the housewife or the dress-maker!! Faysal is merely trying to make *takfeer* to be an easy matter to execute. Faysal then states:

“...he is seeking to please his kaafir paymaster...”

So the question has to be asked what about Faysal himself who in the 'question and answer session' of the lecture *Challenges Facing the Youth* stated that it is permissible to take welfare state benefits and government hand-outs! Is this not also receiving “pay from kaafir paymasters”? Indeed, it is in its most debased, dishonourable and subjugated form!

As for Faysal claiming that the refutation on 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan was to **“draw the attention of kuffaar intelligence services to him”** then this is another foolish analogy from Faysal. As just because one doesn't agree with the extremist, erroneous, incorrect, false and nonsensical beliefs of 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan and those other *takfeerees* this in no way implies

that **“this means they are working for kuffaar intelligence services”**!! This is another one of Faysal's ways of not allowing any criticism of extremists. With regards to Faysal's praise of 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan, it has to be said that Faysal has never even met 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan!! Yet refers to him as being “his Shaykh”.

Faysal states just after thirty minutes into the lecture that soldiers in the Egyptian army are *kuffaar* and says regarding what Aboo Usaamah said:

“err...what you have just heard is a statement of kufr and some of you detected it and some of you did not detect it, unfortunately...this statement is kufr and if you believe it,¹²⁴ it takes you out of the fold of al-Islam.”!!

Faysal's initial proof is that he makes a comparison with what takes place in the UK, from pledging allegiance and then tries to make an analogy between that and what takes place in a Muslim country! So Faysal compares what *kuffaar* do within their procedures to Muslims! This is the typical *khawaarij manhaj*. Then Faysal states:

“The ayah is self-explanatory you don't even need a tafseer for the ayah, but for your convenience I will elaborate...”

Observe this placing himself forward as one who is completely capable of giving *tafseer*, whereas classical *tafaaseer* don't even get a mention! Then he says:

“So these tyrannical leaders which we have in our midsts today who have given their allegiance to the UN or the USA or the UK or all the other Dajjaal forces on the face of the earth they are kaafirs and I will explain it later why they are kaafirs. So the soldiers of these leaders are also kaafirs...”

See how Faysal makes unequivocal and unrestricted *takfeer* of all of the Muslim countries, Abu'l-Hasan al-'Ash'aree mentioned in *Maqaaat al-Islamiyyeen* the view of the *Khawaarij*, from the *al-Azaariqah* and *Safariyyah*, that:

They claim the abode, the abode contrary to theirs, is an abode of tawheed except for the soldiers of the Sultan for indeed it is a state of disbelief.¹²⁵

As for his support of the Taalibaan regime, then we have discussed this earlier when assessing his lecture *'Let the Scholars Beware'* (no.9 in this treatise). Faysal then proceeded to note that

¹²⁴ i.e. that soldiers in armies of Muslims countries are merely working to feed their families and support themselves!!!

¹²⁵ *Maqâlat al-Islâmiyyîn*, p.104

Egyptians soldiers participate in crimes and transgressions, but again this does not necessitate *takefeer* of them, which Faysal insinuates. Faysal says:

“They kill the men because they are fighting for Sharee’ah, so if a soldier kill you because you’re fighting for Sharee’ah how can you pronounce him...err err...a Muslim?”

Here Faysal stutters here as if he is not sure as to what he is saying and how does Faysal know that individuals are **“fighting for the Sharee’ah”** when Faysal doesn’t even know them! Then Faysal makes a huge blunder which we observed, he says:

“Those who hate what Allaah has revealed they are kaafirs, Soorah Muhammad verse twenty-five.”

And Faysal says it quick so that the listener almost does not hear it fully. In fact it is in ayah 26 not 25!! And even then the ayah does not say “those who hate what Allaah has revealed they are kaafirs” it actually says:

﴿إِنَّ الَّذِينَ ارْتَدُّوا عَلَىٰ أَدْبَارِهِم مِّن بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُمُ الْهُدَىٰ الشَّيْطَانُ سَوَّلَ لَهُمْ وَأَمَلَىٰ لَهُمْ﴾

﴿ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ قَالُوا لِلَّذِينَ كَرِهُوا مَا نَزَّلَ اللَّهُ سَنُطِيعُكُمْ فِي بَعْضِ الْأُمْرِ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ إِسْرَارَهُمْ﴾

“Indeed, those who reverted back (to disbelief) after guidance had become clear to them – Satan enticed them and prolonged hope for them. That is because they said to those who disliked what Allaah sent down,¹²⁶ “We will obey you in part of the matter.” And Allaah knows what they conceal.”

{*Muhammad (47) 25-26*}

So observe Faysal’s trickery with the Book of Allaah and his simplistic reasoning in order to hoodwink the audience, we will see later how Faysal has problems with this verse and so Faysal should focus on memorising it properly as opposed to making *takefeer*! Indeed, in one narration

¹²⁶ i.e. the Jews of Madeenah

in 'Ali ibn Abee 'Taalib said about the *khawaarij* that “they will hold it (the recitation of the Qur'aan) for them, when it is against them.”¹²⁷ The ayah was revealed regarding the *yabood* of Madeenah and Faysal tries to apply it to the Muslims! After forty-seven minutes into the lecture Faysal says:

“And even if you live in Daar ul-Harb, UK, USA your deen is not protected every time you give shahaadah to someone ten people leave the deen...”

Hereby making out that the UK and the USA are ‘abodes of war’ yet provides no *daleel* whatsoever as to why and which scholars have declared these countries to be ‘abodes of war’! When some *takfeeres* of the UK were asked by some *Salafee* brothers in London “why do you live in the UK if you consider it Daar ul-Harb?” The response of the *takfeeree* was “That doesn’t mean that can’t live here”!! Following his own desires! As for Faysal’s attempt to **“give the Sharh of the hadeeth”** (!!!) then this is nothing but a farce! Better to stick to explanations by *hadeeth* scholars as opposed to self-made ‘Shaykhs’ like Faysal.

After an hour into the lecture Faysal al-Khaarijee makes *takfeer* on Abee Usaamah and then fourteen minutes later accuses the brother Dawood Adeeb of being a ‘house nigga’ and of making **“a statement of kufr”** just because the brother Dawood Adeeb said that a scholar can make *ijtibaad* yet err!!!?

Faysal says:

“He is telling us, Aboo U err...Dawood Adeeb, that you can’t criticise the fatwa of Bin Baaz, which is the crime of the century, to let the crusaders into the Holy Land,¹²⁸ if you are not 100% on your deen so that statement in itself is kufr.”

First of all, we again see Faysal’s utter ignorance of the reality of *shirk* that is currently rampant within the *ummah* and if this is not the real **“crime of the century”** then Faysal has no comprehension of the reality of the crime of *shirk*. There are graves, tombs, mausoleums, shrines and the like all dedicated to the worship of ‘Shaykh so and so’ or for ‘Peer Saab so and

¹²⁷ Ibn Abee 'Aasim, *as-Sunnah*, no.916

¹²⁸ There were not allowed into Makkah and Madeenah, which some scholars define as being the Jazeerat ul-'Arab (Arabian Peninsula); while some scholars define the Arabian Peninsula to be Makkah, Madeenah and al-Yamaamah; some scholars define the Arabian Peninsula as being Makkah, Madeenah, al-Yamaamah and Yemen. See Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Ra'ees, *al-Burhaan al-Muneer fee Dahd Shubuhaat Ahl it-Takfeer wa't-Tafjeer* [The Clear Proofs for Refuting the Doubts of the People of Takfeer and Bombing!], pp.79-89: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf

so' or for 'Imaam so and so', for 'Maulvi so and so' and for 'Hajji so and so'!! If *shirk* is not the greatest crime for Faysal then he seriously needs to re-sit his studies again.

Secondly here, Faysal, in his excitement and extremism, stumbles over his words and then Faysal doesn't assess *at all* Dawood Adeeab's point about what is found in the books of 'Uloom ul-Qur'aan and how many scholars have allowed *kuffaar* to assist in warfare, Faysal did not even acknowledge this at all and did not deal with this reality! So beware of Faysal's chicanery and simplistic rulings!

Scholars of the past also allowed the use of non-Muslim, *kuffaar* and *mushrik* forces to be drafted upon for Muslims, if there is a benefit in that for the Muslims. Such as:

- Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee (*rabeemabullaah*)
- Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal (*rabeemabullaah*)
- Imaam Abu'l-Qaasim al-Khirqee (*rabeemabullaah*)
- Imaam Abu'l-Hasan as-Sindee (*rabeemabullaah*)
- Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*)
- Imaam Ibn 'Uthaymeen (*rabeemabullaah*)

Therefore, this shows that the issue of drafting *kuffaar* forces is something which was said by scholars in the past and the scholars who also ruled this in the present era were thus preceded in their rulings. Ibn Qudaamah al-Maqdisee (*rabeemabullaah*) stated in *al-Mugnee* (vol.13, p.98):

Help is not to be sought from a mushrik, this is what Ibn al-Mundhir, al-Joozjaanee and a group of the people of knowledge. There is present from Ahmad what indicates the permissibility of gaining assistance from them (i.e. mushrikeen) and the statements of al-Khirqee also indicate that, if there is a need and this is the school of thought of Shaafi'ee.

Imaam an-Nawawee stated in his explanation, vol.11-12, p.403, under *hadeeth* no.4677:

His saying (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam): "Go back, for I do not seek help from a mushrik; and it is mentioned in another hadeeth that the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) sought help from Safwaan bin Umayyah before his Islaam, as a result some scholars give the first hadeeth precedence over the second one. Imaam Shaafi'ee and others said: If the disbeliever has good opinion of the Muslims and the need has come to utilize him, of not then he is disliked. So these two hadeeths are taken in light of two circumstances.

Shaykh as-Sindee stated in his explanation of the *hadeeth* "I do not gain assistance from a mushrik", from the *Sunan Ibn Maajah* (vol.3, p.376, under *hadeeth* no.2832):

It shows that gaining assistance from a mushrik is haraam without a need. But if there is a need then it can be done as an exception and this is not opposed.¹²⁹

Faysal continues with his lies to try to discredit the *Salafees*:

"This person (i.e. Abaa Usaamah), along with the rest of the Saudi Salafees, their always looking down on jihaad..."

Then Faysal proceeds with his corrupted, sick and evil *khawaarij* methodology:

"Anyone who listens to this tape, of this man and doubt that he's a kaafir you become a kaafir! If you listen to this person Aboo Usaamah trying to put Islaam down and Muslims down and jihaad down, if you have an atom's weight of doubt in your heart that he's a kaafir, you yourself become a kaafir." !!!

Here we see a prime example of Faysal's brainwashing and emotional ploys wherein he tries to terrorise the audience ideologically by forcing them to accept his view, so that the audience will be forced to make *takfeer*. Then Faysal states, in an outburst which typifies his *khhaarjyyah*:

"What do you think we should do with this person?"

Audience: Kill him!

Faysal: "I can't hear you?"

Audience: "Kill him!"

Faysal: I still can't hear you?

Audience: "Kill him!"

Faysal: OK that makes sense." (!!!)

Look at this uncouth brutality and *khhaarjyyah*, what more is there to indicate Faysal's *khawaarij* *usool* and *manhaj*? Indeed, from the characteristics of the *khawaarij* is that they kill the people of Islaam and leave the people of polytheists, in one narration it states "they will kill the people of Islaam" as occurs in the *hadeeth* of Abee Sa'eed al-Khudree (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*).¹³⁰

Now here comes another blunder which Faysal makes in the lecture and if the *Salafees* are supposed to be "jaahil in regards to 'aqeedah" as he regurgitates in this lecture, we were

¹²⁹ Bandar bin Naa'if bin Sanahaat al-'Utaybee, *Wa Jaadilhum Bilatee Hiya Ahsan, Munaaqishatun 'Ilmiyyatun Haadiyyatun li-19 Mas'alatan Muta'alaqatin bi-Hukkaam il-Muslimeen* (Riyadh: Maktabah 'AbdulMusawwir bin Muhammad bin 'Abdullaah, 1427AH/2006 CE, Fourth Edition), pp.38-42

¹³⁰ Saheeh Muslim *hadeeth* no.2451

still able to find this blunder of Faysal's! So what does that say about Faysal's own ignorance and distortions of the *deen*?! So pay attention here, Faysal states:

“Now which ayah in the Qur'aan tells you that the moment you give your bay'ah to NATO or the UN you're a kaafir? Who can tell us?”

Okay, so this is the question he asks the audience, who as usual in Faysal's lectures do not respond as most are only blind followers, and Faysal also bangs on the table in order to drive home the seriousness of the matter! So now let's look at Faysal's answer to his own question:

“Soorah Muhammad verse....te...err...(inaudible)...ty-five, Allaah says in Soorah Muhammad verse twenty five “those who have rejected faith in what Allaah has revealed...””

So Faysal again, as has been seen beforehand, stumbles over himself in his excitement and extremism. He also recites verse 25 so quickly that it is unintelligible as to what is being recited and Faysal also makes a mistake in his recitation of verse 25 and misses out a big section of it. So we will reproduce it again here fully for the benefit of the reader:

﴿إِنَّ الَّذِينَ ارْتَدُّوا عَلَىٰ أَدْبَارِهِم مِّن بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُمُ الْهُدَىٰ الشَّيْطَانُ سَوَّلَ لَهُمْ وَأَمَلَىٰ لَهُمْ﴾

﴿ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ قَالُوا لِلَّذِينَ كَرَهُوا مَا نَزَّلَ اللَّهُ سَنُطِيعُكُمْ فِي بَعْضِ الْأَمْرِ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ إِسْرَارَهُمْ﴾

“Indeed, those who reverted back (to disbelief) after guidance had become clear to them – Satan enticed them and prolonged hope for them. That is because they said to those who disliked what Allaah sent down,¹³¹ “We will obey you in part of the matter.” And Allaah knows what they conceal.”

{*Muhammad* (47) 25-26}

The clearest *daleel* of the tactics of Faysal in defending innovation and its people is evident in this lecture, as what is clear from this sick lecture, which is infected with *kharijyyah* and *takfeer*,

¹³¹ i.e. the Jews of Madeenah

is that Faysal is oddly silent over the fact that 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan praised the *Shee'ah* state of Iraan and its so-called 'revolution' headed by al-Khomaynee!! So Faysal purposely left this out when he played the lecture of Aboo Usaamah, trying to hoodwink his audience of blind followers. Faysal thus played only about twenty minutes of Aboo Usaamah's lecture yet left out the remaining hour or so!!!¹³²

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.18

'CANCERS IN THE BODY OF THE UMMAH (1)'

<http://www.archive.org/details/faisal1>

Faysal states at the beginning of this lecture in a statement which seems to be more for name and fame and is totally irrelevant in what is supposed to be the context of a lesson teaching Muslims about their *deen*:

"Today's topic is very provocative and I have many enemies but I will gain even more enemies because I will be calling the criminals by their name."

Faysal states after an hour and fifteen minutes:

"So the Jews they immediately changed their tune, so the Salafees because they are the yahood of the ummah, they have all the qualities that the Jews have." !!!

This *takfeer* is the real cancer of the *ummah*! Yet Faysal is unable to diagnose this acute cancer within the body of the *ummah*!

Faysal again tries to show that Imaam Bin Baaz's statement about the *jamaat ul-jihaad* and them being the "brothers of the devils" applies to the *mujaahideen* completely and refers to anyone who even believes in *jihaad*!! Then Faysal says, in total contradiction to all what we have seen about Faysal, that it is the *Salafees* who **"have absolutely no respect for scholars"!!!!!!** It is rather odd for Faysal of all people to have the audacity to state this when on most of his tapes he accuses, abuses, slanders, discredits and pours scorn on the scholars and that's when he doesn't make *takfeer* of them. Faysal then says

"The statement of kufr doona kufr where did it come from? Qurtubi says it come from Taawoos! A man who did not even meet the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam), a

¹³² Aboo Usaamah's refutation of 'Umar 'AbdurRahmaan was on two tapes.

man by the name of Taawoos came up with this statement kufr doona kufr. So as for the statement kufr doona kufr Ibn 'Abbaas did not make this statement!"

We have refuted this prior in regards to Faysal's lecture *Jewish Traits in the Ummah*. But there is more to add here as Faysal has said something which even none of his *takfeeree* Shaykhs say!! Even some of the main *takfeeree* theoreticians do not say that Taawoos invented the statement of *kufr* less than *kufr*!! Faysal also leaves off explaining who Taawoos is, so after discrediting Taawoos as being "a man who did not even meet the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)" he conveniently neglects to say that Taawoos was one of the main students of Ibn 'Abbaas (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*). Furthermore, Imaam Ahmad verified¹³³ as did at-Tabaree¹³⁴ and Ibn Nasr¹³⁵, with an authentic chain of transmission from 'Ataa bin Abee Rabaah that he said **"Kufr less than kufr, dhulm less than dhulm and fisq less than fisq."** Imaam Ahmad¹³⁶, at-Tabaree and Ibn Nasr¹³⁷ reported with an authentic chain of transmission via Taawoos that he said **"kufr which does not expel one from the religion."** The students of Ibn 'Abbaas viewed that the "disbelievers" mentioned in the verses is regarding minor *kufr* and the speech of the scholar is understood from the statements of his students who are more aware of what is narrated from their Shaykh¹³⁸ and Imaam. Faysal says shortly after this that:

"Even the layman walking on the street who didn't go to an Islamic university if you ask him "what about a man who dismantles the sharee'ah?" the layman will say "he's a kaafir!""

We have refuted this simplistic and erroneous insinuation of Faysal prior.

¹³³ *Masaa'il Abee Daawood*, p.209

¹³⁴ *Tafseer*, vol.6, p.116

¹³⁵ *Ta'dheem Qadr us-Salah*, vol.2, pp.522, 575

¹³⁶ *Masaa'il Abee Daawood*, p.209

¹³⁷ *Ta'dheem Qadr us-Salah*, vol.2, pp.522, 574

¹³⁸ For that reason you'll see that the Imaams of *hadeeth* raise narrations from a Shaykh due to him opposing what his students are upon, as is done with Imaam Yahyaa ibn Sa'eed who weakened a statement narrated from Ibn Mas'ood as his followers opposed this. Aboo 'Ubayd al-Qaasim bin Sallaam said "I saw Yahyaa ibn Sa'eed deny and criticise the chain of transmission because the companions of Abdullaah opposed it." (*Kitaab ul-Eemaan*, p.22) see the likes of this from Imaam Ahmad in *as-Sunnah* of Khallaal (vol.3, p.559), so if they raised the narration of a scholar out of him opposing what his students were upon in their understanding, how then can the scholar be understood on the basis of the views of his students.

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.19

'ISLAM UNDER SIEGE'

<http://inshallahshaheed.wordpress.com/lectures/>

After eight minutes into the lecture he mentions a fabricated story about the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) being offered the sun in one hand and the moon in the other. This story, which is found in some books of the seerah, is fabricated. Twenty minutes into the lecture Faysal states, in utter foolishness:

“So as a Muslim it is not for you to fear a coalition, it is not for you to despair. Many of you, when you see the B52 bombers, the Tomahawk cruise missiles, the F16 planes you despair! What about your tawwaqqul, your trust in Allaah ta’ala?”

Then Faysal makes an open error after fifty minutes into the lecture and tries to brush over it!! He gets corrected by one of his blind followers about whether the verse he quoted is in Maa'idah 51 or 56 and then says **“Never mind you can correct your own Shaykh”** (!) and then states:

“I stand corrected whenever I’m wrong and I tell my enemies for the past eight years, if you listen to my tapes and you find one mistake in regards to fiqh or ‘aqeedah, I will take it back publicly! For eight years I’m repeating myself, if you listen to any of my tapes and you find one mistake in regards to fiqh or ‘aqeedah, whether it is al-walaa wa’l-baraa, tawheed haakimiyyah, fiqh ul-waaqi, any, seven conditions of shahaadah just one mistake in regards to ‘aqeedah I will take it back publicly! For eight years I’ve been saying that and my enemies haven’t been able to find any mistake they only slander me behind my back like nine year old girls...they slander me behind my back like menstruating women. Not like Bin Baaz who they claimed he took back his mistake a minute before he died on his bed secretly, the tawbah of the Shaykh is not like the layman, did you understand that? Do you understand that? When you pass a dodgy fatwa you misguide thousands and millions, is that clear? So you have to take back your fatwa publicly, but if you are a layman and you make a mistake you can make your tawbah secretly behind closed doors. If you’re a Shaykh and you pass a dodgy fatwa you need to take it back publicly because you misguide tens, hundreds, thousands and millions of people.”

So here Faysal has not only elevated himself to the level of a scholar, by saying that he is prepared to take back any mistakes because this is only for scholars to do this publicly, but he has also raised himself to the level of Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*)!! Faysal stated that public *tawbah* is only for the scholars, so when Faysal stated that he is prepared to take back any statements openly and publicly, then he is insinuating that he also is a scholar as according to him only the scholars make public and open *tawbah*!! Then Faysal says:

“It’s all because of Shaykh Bin Baaz we have this disaster in the ummah today.”

La hawla wa la quwatta ila billaah! So is it due to Shaykh Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) that *shirk* is widespread in the *ummah*? Is it because of Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) that some of the Muslim youth are ignorant and only know about killing, murder and injustice? Is it because of Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) that people who study and graduate after a few years suddenly pose themselves as Shaykhs? Is it because of Imaam Bin Baaz that people blindly follow self-styled ‘Shaykhs’ and do anything that they tell them? Is it because of Imaam Bin Baaz (*rabeemabullaah*) that the likes of Faysal are locked up behind bars? Or is it due to Faysal al-Khaarijee’s own irresponsible, ignorant, hateful, ‘dodgy’ and extremist statements? Imaam Muhammad bin Saalih al-’Uthaymeen (*rabeemabullaah*) stated, in words which are appropriate for Faysal:

I ask Allaah to support the scholars against what is leveled against them from the tongues of the foolish minded ones, as there are many things which the scholars face.

FIRST: We hear things that are ascribed to the people of knowledge, who are trusted, yet when we check we find out that it is not at all like how it has been said.¹³⁹ Much of what is said “So and so is like this...” when we actually check we find out that the situation is not like that at all. This is a great crime and especially if the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) said “Indeed, lying upon me is not like lying on someone else”¹⁴⁰ or words to that effect.

¹³⁹ Indeed, so we are not going to blindly follow the writings of the self-styled ‘independent Islamic thinkers’ and petty columnists who slander the Salafee scholars and actually aim to achieve fame from such despicable actions.

¹⁴⁰ Part of a *hadeeth* reported by al-Bukhaaree, *hadeeth* no.1291 in *Kitaab ul-Janaa’iz (Funerals)* and Muslim also in *Kitaab ul-Janaa’iz, hadeeth* nos. 2154, 2155 and 2156; from al-Mugheerah bin Shu’bah (*radi Allaahu ‘anhu*). The rest of the *hadeeth* is famous: “...whoever lies about me intentionally then let him prepare to take his seat in the Hell Fire.”

So lying about the scholars is connected to the Divine Legislation of Allaah and is not like lying on other people because it includes a Divinely Legislated ruling that is related to a trusted scholar. For this reason whenever the people trust a scholar more, the lies about him will increase and become more dangerous. Because when you say to any common person "So and so said..." they will not respond to you, but if you say "So and so from those who are trusted said..." they will listen to you. So you will find some people who have an opinion or an idea which they think is the truth and they thus try to establish people upon it, yet the only way they can find to achieve this is to lie about one of the trusted scholars and say "this is what so and so said, this is a very dangerous matter, it is not attacking the scholar personally, but it is related to the regulations of Allaah."

SECONDLY: Blowing up errors out of proportion, as I have just said, is also dangerous and vile, as a scholar is a human who makes mistakes at times and is correct at other times. However, if a scholar makes a mistake it is incumbent on us to contact him and we can ask him: "did you really say this?" and if he says "Yes" yet we see that it was a mistake we can say to him: "Do you have any evidence for this?" so if we get into a discourse the truth will become clear. Every (true) scholar is just and fears Allaah, the Exalted and Majestic, and must return to the truth and must make known his retraction also. As for inflating mistakes and then mentioning worse things about the scholar's situation then there is no doubt that this is showing enmity against your brother Muslim, and is also showing enmity against the Divine Legislation, if I am able to say this. Because if the people trust a person and then his trustworthiness is doubted, where will the people turn to? The people will be left wavering without a leader to guide them with the Divine legislation of Allaah. Or are the people supposed to turn to an ignoramus who misguides the people from the path of Allaah unintentionally? Or are the people supposed to turn to an evil scholar who blocks them from the path of Allaah intentionally?¹⁴¹

Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan also stated in regards to mockery of the scholars and accusing them of compromising and being 'in the pocket' that:

It is incumbent to respect the scholars of the Muslims as they are the inheritors of the Prophets and making a mockery of them is considered to be making a mockery of their

¹⁴¹ Imaam Muhammad bin Saalih al-'Uthaymeen, 'Ali bin Hasan Aboo Lowz (ed.), *as-Sahwa al-Islaamiyyah – Dawaabit wa Tawjeehaat, Vol.1* (Riyadh: Daar ul-Qaasim, 1417 AH/19 CE, Fourth Edition), pp.230-231

position and inheritance from the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam), and mockery of the knowledge which they carry. So whoever mocks the scholars, also mocks the Muslims firstly, as the scholars must be respected for their knowledge and position in the ummah. If the scholars are not to be trusted then who should be trusted? And if trust of the scholars is lost to whom shall the Muslims resort to help them solve their problems and explain the regulations of the Divine Legislation? At such a point the ummah will lose out and corruption will spread. So if the scholar works hard is correct then he gains one reward, yet if he strives hard and errs he gains one reward, and his (Islamic scholarly based on the Qur'aan and sunnah) error is forgiven. What is there for the one who mocks the scholars expect punishment? History is the best witness of this, past and present and especially if the scholars (that are being mocked) are those who referred to regarding issues affecting the Muslims, such as the Council of Senior Scholars (in Saudi Arabia).¹⁴²

Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan was also asked:

“Due to events in the past, some of the Muslims ally themselves to the kuffaar due to a fatwa heard by some students of Islamic knowledge. What is the ruling on that?”

Shaykh Saalih responded:

I do not think that there is a Muslim who allies to the kuffaar however you explain allegiance with a misunderstanding, as the one who allies to them can be ignorant, a non-Muslim or from the hypocrites. As for the Muslim then he does not have allegiance to the kuffaar yet there are some actions which you consider to be allegiance when in reality is not allegiance. These are things like buying from and selling to the kuffaar, giving and receiving presents from the kuffaar and the like are all permissible and not allegiance to the kuffaar. Rather, these things are from worldly interaction and beneficial exchanges, such as also hiring a disbeliever for work. These are like the beneficial exchanges of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) when he hired 'Abdullaah bin Urayqit al-Laythee to guide him on the way to hijra, while 'Abdullaah was a disbeliever, in order to help due to his experience on the tracks, so that is permissible. It is also permissible for a Muslim to hire out his services for kuffaar to use if necessary as this is from the door of beneficial exchanges and not from the door of love. To the extent that a disbelieving father must be righteous to him and this is not from the door of love. Allaah says,

¹⁴² Shaykh, Dr Saalih bin Fawzaan al-Fawzaan, *op.cit.* pp.37-38

﴿لَا تَجِدُ قَوْمًا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ يُوَادُّونَ مَنْ حَادَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَلَوْ كَانُوا آبَاءَهُمْ
أَوْ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ أَوْ إِخْوَانَهُمْ أَوْ عَشِيرَتَهُمْ أُولَئِكَ كَتَبَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمُ الْإِيمَانَ وَأَيَّدَهُم بِرُوحٍ مِّنْهُ
وَيُدْخِلُهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ
أُولَئِكَ حِزْبُ اللَّهِ أَلَا إِنَّ حِزْبَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ﴾

“You will not find a people who believe in Allaah and the Last Day, having affection for those who oppose Allaah and His Messenger, even though they were their fathers or their sons or their brothers or their kindred. For such He has written eemaan in their hearts, and strengthened them with spirit¹⁴³ from Him. And He will admit them to Gardens under which rivers flow to dwell therein forever. Allaah is pleased with them, and they with Him. They are the Party of Allaah, indeed, it is the Party of Allaah that will be successful.”

{*al-Mujaadilah* (58): 22}

However, he (who has a disbelieving father) has to be righteous and good to him, this is from worldly goodness. There are aspects of interaction with the kuffaar such as peace treaties, covenants and trusts with the kuffaar which are all allowed and is not ‘allegiance’ (to the kuffaar). There are some things which some ignoramuses think are allegiance when in reality, are not allegiance. There are situations when the Muslims are in danger and the kuffaar avert such a danger from the Muslims, then this is not *mudaahanah* (compromising) this is *mudaarah* (being amicable and harmonious).¹⁴⁴ So

¹⁴³ i.e. “that which gives life”, explained as the guidance of the Qur’aan or victory over their opponents.

¹⁴⁴ *Mudaarah* literally means to be amicable, affable and harmonious and in the context of the *Sharee’ah* the scholars have noted that it is given away some of your *dunya* for the preservation of the *deen*. As Shaykh Saalih is emphasizing here it is known by the scholars that *mudaarah* is different from *mudaahanah* (to compromise). Imaams Bukhaaree and Muslim (*raheemahumullaah*) in their *saheehs* within their sections on manners then include chapters on *mudaarah*. Al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar stated: “..the intent of it is to ward off via kindness.” In *al-Qaamoos al-Muheet* it is stated about the definition of *daraa’*: “To make something a deterrent, and to deter is to rebut, i.e. they rebutted each other in the argument.” Examples of *mudaarah* in the Qur’aan are in Soorah al-’An’aam (6: 108) and in al-Qasas (28: 54).

there is a difference between being amicable and harmonious (*mudaarah*) and compromising (*mudaahanah*), as compromising is not permissible however *mudaarah* is. So when the Muslims are in danger they obtain *mudaarah* (harmony) of the *kuffaar*

Evidences from the *sunnah* for this are the *hadeeth* from Abi'l-Dardaa' that "We smile in the faces of people yet our hearts are cursing them." (*Fath al-Baaree*, vol.10, p.527, *Kitaab al-Adab, Baab al-Mudaarah ma'a'n-Naas*). Also when 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr reported that 'Aa'ishah told him: "A man sought permission to enter upon the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*), and he said, "Let him in, what a bad son of his tribe (or bad brother of his tribe) he is!" When the man came in, the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) spoke to him kindly and gently. I said: "O Messenger of Allaah, you said what you said, then you spoke to him kindly." He said, "O 'Aa'ishah, the worst of the people in the sight of Allaah is the one who is shunned by others or whom people treat nicely because they fear his sharp tongue." (*Fath al-Baaree*, vol.10, p.528, *Kitaab al-Adab, Baab al-Mudaarah ma'a'n-Naas*). Ibn Hajar said about these two *hadeeth*:

"Ibn Battaal said: Mudaarah is from the good character of the believers, to be responsive to people, even with a word, without being coarse with them in speech, this is one of the strongest causes of harmony. Some people think that mudaarah is mudaahanah and this is an error, as mudaarah is regrettable and mudaahanah is prohibited. The difference is: mudaahanah is taken from the word ad-Dahhaan (the painter) who glosses over something and covers what is actually there. The scholars have explained it as lying with a sinner and openly displaying happiness with what he is doing without forbidding him at all. Mudaarah is being kind with the ignorant in order to teach him, being kind with the sinner in order to forbid him from what he is doing, without being harsh with him so that he does not expose what he does, and forbidding him with gentle speech and action, especially if his comradeship is needed and the likes of that." (*Fath ul-Baaree* (Daar ur-Rayyaan), vol.10, p.545)

Imaam al-Qurtubee stated:

"The difference between mudaarah and mudaahanah is that mudaarah is to surrender the dunya for the benefit of the deen and it is permissible and even recommended. Mudaahanah is leaving the deen for the dunya." (*Fath ul-Baaree* (Daar ur-Rayyaan), vol.10, p.469)

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah (*raheemahullaah*):

"Thus mudaarah is praiseworthy and mudaahanah is censured , so there is a difference between the two. The one who is mudaaree uses kindness with a person in order for the truth to manifest from the person or make him retract from falsehood. The mudaahin (compromiser) uses kindness in order for the person to remain established upon falsehood and leaves him upon his desires. Mudaarah is for the people of eemaan while mudaahanah is for the hypocrites.
" (*ar-Rooh*, p.231)

in order to avert such danger and this is not allegiance. The matters need to be understood and understood yet as for explaining every act of interaction with the kuffaar to be allegiance to them then this is ignorance and error, or deceiving the people. So such a person should not enter into such issues except the fuquraa and the people of knowledge. It is neither for the students nor for the school teachers to enter into such issues and analyse, prohibit and criticize the people saying “this is allegiance to the kuffaar and they (scholars) do not know the Divinely Legislated rulings” this is dangerous on the one who says such things as he is speaking about Allaah without knowledge.”¹⁴⁵

Faysal continues in his rant of hatred, extremism and excessiveness:

“You have twenty years of Islamic knowledge, or thirty years, you even memorise the Qur’aan and 100,000 hadeeth and your Islamic knowledge didn’t cause you to fear Allaah for you to tell the Muslims the truth, for you to wake up the ummah of Muhammad, you are not a scholar! You are a Shaytaan!”

Faysal says again, praising himself:

“You have seen the result of having wicked scholars and apostate leaders ruling over you. Even if you never believed me in the past that they were kaafirs now that they have given their bay’ah to the crusaders to fight against Islaam this should have convinced you...”

Indeed, Faysal himself demonstrates here that he is trying to “convince” his audience into *kburooj* and *takfeer*, an archetype of the contemporary *Khawaarij Qa’diyyah* if there ever was one. Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah had mentioned that:

They made the abode of the Muslims an abode of disbelief and war and they entitled their abode which they migrate to as ‘an abode of eemaan’ and they considered the countries of Islaam as being violable much more than their considering violable the countries of the disbelievers.¹⁴⁶

Ash-Sharbeenee¹⁴⁷ mentioned in *Mughni al-Mubtaaj*:

¹⁴⁵ Shaykh, Dr Saalih bin Fawzaan al-Fawzaan, *op.cit.* pp.54-56

¹⁴⁶ See *Majmû’ al-Fatawaa Ibn Taymiyyah*, compiled and arranged by ‘Abdur-Rahmaan bin Qaasim al-’Aasimee an-Najdee and his son Muhammad, (ar-Ra’aasah al-’Aamah li-Shu’oon al-Haramayn ash-Shareefayn, n.d.), vol.3, p.28

¹⁴⁷ Muhammad ash-Sharbeenee al-Khateeb, he was an Egyptian scholar born in the city of Shirbeen <http://www.tageo.com/index-e-eg-v-01-d-m471240.htm>

The belief, of the Khawaarij, that whoever performs a major sin has disbelieved, his actions have been nullified and he will reside in the fire forever and that the abode of the Imaam becomes with the manifestations of the major sins in it an abode of disbelief and legalisation [of spilling of blood]. For this reason they slandered the leading scholars, did not pray behind them and avoided the Jumu'ah and congregation.¹⁴⁸

Indeed, Islaam was under siege within this lecture and it was Faysal who was holding Islaam and its scholars under siege!

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.20

'THE DEVIL'S DECEPTION OF THE SAUDI SALAFIS'

<http://www.archive.org/details/faisal1>

This is probably the most horrific of all of 'Abdullaah Faysal's lectures of hate. Just after the first minute into the lecture Faysal states:

"The topic we are covering, we are about to cover, is very sensitive...and I have delayed it for three years because I don't want to cover the topic for the sake of nafs..."

Faysal also states:

"Now the reason why we say Saudi Salafees, as the term 'Salafee' is used to describe a person who practices Islaam the way it was practiced by the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) and his companions, the Sahabahs aswell as the other two generations that come after. There are two types of Salafees, the 'classical Salafee'¹⁴⁹ and the fake Salafee which we classify, which we call the 'Saudi Salafees.' The Muslims this like,¹⁵⁰ the classical Salafees are like Salmaan al-Awdah and Safar Hawaalee who are sincerely

He was a scholar of Shaafi'ee *fiqh* and also a *mufassir*, he died in 977 AH/1569CE

¹⁴⁸ Muhammad ash-Sharbeene al-Khateeb, *Mughni al-Muhtaj ilaa Ma'rifat Ma'aani Alfaadh il-Manhaj*, (Beirut: Daar Ihya al-Turaath al-'Arabee, n.d.), vol.4, p.124; also available online: <http://www.ahlalhdeth.com/vb/showthread.php?t=31646>

A more recent print was done in 2000 CE and 1994 CE by Daar Kutub 'Ilmiyyah (Beirut) edited and verified by Aadil 'Abdul-Mawjood and 'Ali Muhammad Muwwidh. There was also an edition printed by Daar ud-Dhakhair in 1377 AH/1985 CE; also Beirut: Daar al-Ma'rifah, 1419 AH/1997 CE and Daar ul-Fikr, n.d.

¹⁴⁹ Where on earth did Faysal get this division from? Which scholar has preceded Faysal with this division of 'a classical Salafee' and a 'fake Salafee' and then from this only including the likes of Safar and Salmaan within that classification?!

¹⁵⁰ This is actually what Faysal states, this is not a typo error on our behalf!

practicing Islaam the way it was practiced by the Sahabahs and the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam),¹⁵¹ these are the classical Salafees.¹⁵² So if you say that the topic is the 'Devil's Deception of the Salafees' you have misled the people....So we have gathered here today to expose one of the greatest fitna to ever emerge in the Ummah of Prophet Muhammad (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam).”

Faysal then proceeds to use as a basis for this lecture

“...a book in Arabic which was written by a classical scholar of today!¹⁵³ I don't want when I deliver the topic the people to say that “Faysal said it.”¹⁵⁴ Now I have in front of me the book of 'AbdurRazzaq ibn Khaleefah ash-Shayjee, he is from Kuwait and he has his Ph.D in Islamic Studies.”

As for his use of the works of the *majhool* (the unknown) ash-Shayjee, then this is enough to indicate the weak basis of this lecture! Ash-Shayjee has been refuted by Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan. Indeed, ash-Shayjee has stated that entering into democratic and parliamentary elections are permissible! Yet Faysal did not mention this at all and rather refers to ash-Shayjee as being “a classical scholar of today!”!! Does “a classical scholar of today” call for joining political parties that enter into democratic elections?? Does “a classical scholar of today” get himself refuted by the actual classical scholars of the era?? Does “a classical scholar of today” include the people of innovation among Ahl us-Sunnah?? The best online refutations of ash-Shayjee have been compiled by Aboo Iyyaad as-Salafee at: <http://www.spubs.com/sps/sp.cfm?secID=NDV&subsecID=NDV10&loadpage=displayubsection.cfm>

Then Faysal states after an hour and three minutes into the lecture:

¹⁵¹ As for Salmaan al-Awdah he praises extremist *soofees* like Ali Jifri and also Amr Khaalid!

¹⁵² Notice how Faysal only includes these two as being those “who are sincerely practicing” as Faysal knows what is in the hearts! Faysal only mentioned these two due to the fact that they were in prison at the time. So out of all of the scholars in the world, only these two are the “sincere ones”!!? It is interesting if Faysal still considers

¹⁵³ Are there any contemporary Muslim scholars who have testified that ash-Shayjee is ‘a classical scholar of today’? It is only Abdullaah Faysal al-Khaarjee al-Jamaykee who has stated this! Furthermore, what does Faysal mean by alleging ash-Shayjee to be ‘a classical scholar’? It is as if Faysal is just merely trying to insinuate that ash-Shayjee is a scholar who uses the Qur’aan and *sunnah* as his basis, yet ash-Shayjee is not known to the people of knowledge.

¹⁵⁴ This again demonstrates his deception, as most of the calamities and *khaarjiyyah* within the lecture emanate from Faysal’s own mouth and not even from the erroneous views of ash-Shayjee!!

“The British were the greatest enemies of Islaam and the Muslims and they are the ones who set-up Saudi Arabia, they are the ones who formulating the government of Saudi Arabia, they are behind the kingship of Saudi Arabia, Saudi Arabia is a puppet government governed by the British.”

Here then, Faysal agrees and shares the exact same *manhaj* of the *Brailwees*, *Soofees* and *Tabreerees* in regurgitating the nonsense that the British supported Saudi Arabia, when the reality is that in the early stages of the state and of the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad Ibn 'AbdulWahhaab (*rabeemabullaah*), the British were against it with a passion!

What indicates that the British were opposed to the “Wahhabi movement” is the fact that they sent Captain George Foster Sadlier¹⁵⁵ to **“congratulate Ibrahim Pasha on his success against the Wahhabis”** – during the war of Ibrahim Pasha in Dir'iyyah – and also to find out to what extent he was prepared to cooperate with the British authorities to reduce what they called “Wahhabi piracy in the Arabian Gulf.” Indeed, this clearly expressed a desire to establish an agreement between the British government and Ibrahim Pasha with the aim of destroying the “Wahhabis” completely. Sadlier made an arduous journey from India to Riyadh to see the ruins in Dir'iyyah, which was razed to the ground by Ibraheem Pasha.¹⁵⁶

Furthermore, one should not forget that Faysal says all of this yet he himself studied in *Imaam Muhammad bin Saud University* in Riyadh!! So according to his own extremist reasoning and arguments, his own Islamic education from whence he began to utilize in order to promote himself as a ‘shaykh’, is in question! As Faysal studied in Saudi Arabia and used that as his main proof to call himself a ‘Shaykh’!!! After an hour and four minutes, the howling Faysal then claims that he can look into the hearts: **“They (Salafees) are not sincere to their shahaadah.”** Approximately one hour, nine minutes and 50 seconds into the lecture Faysal states:

¹⁵⁵ An officer of the 47th Regiment in the India British army at a time when securing sea routes to India was Britain's main interest. The British were concerned about the rise of the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab and branded any opposer to British colonial rule in India as being a “Wahhabi”, this thus contributed to the scaremongering against the *da'wah* of Imaam Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhaab (*raheemahullaah*).

¹⁵⁶ Jalal AbualRub, Alaa Mencke (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab* (Orlando, Florida: Madinah Publishers, 1424 AH/2003 CE), pp.224-231.

“Now the worse Salafees in this country my brothers, sorry to be specific, but I have to be specific, the worse Salafees in this country are those in south London, more specifically those in Brixton Mosque because they are coming from very poor backgrounds and they are hungry, so they will kill for Fahd, they break noses in Brixton Mosque on three occasions for the love of Fahd,¹⁵⁷ one of them was even crying on the minbaar! He was giving a khutbah on a Friday and he was crying tears his shirt was soaked with tears (saying) “why do you speak bad about Fahd? If you were rich like him you would do the same thing, keep quiet about him”¹⁵⁸ so he loves him so much that on the minbaar he cried hoping that the news will reach in their report, they write reports to Saudi on the da’wah they do every month,¹⁵⁹ so in his report he can write “I cried for you so increase my salary.”¹⁶⁰ He want his report to look fancy! Why is it that the African-Caribbean community of Brixton Mosque they are the most vehement in their love of Fahd?¹⁶¹ The answer is clear, Umar said that poverty leads to what? To kufr! Poverty leads to kufr. That’s why you only find the very rich Arabs in this movement, you don’t find Moroccans, Algerians in this movement! Am I lying? Am I lying? I’m talking in this country do you find Moroccans and Algerians in the Salafee movement? If I’m lying tell me. I want to be corrected. There’s a few in this country, but the vast majority are they in this movement? Just one and two. The people who are in this movement are the rich Arabs in the Gulf who have something to lose!”

In all the years there has never been a report that has left *Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah (Brixton Mosque)*, apart from to the charity commission! As for the “**money from Saudi**” then the brothers are still waiting for the alleged sum of money that *Masjid Ibn Taymeeyah (Brixton Mosque)* has

¹⁵⁷ Here again Faysal reiterates the thing about “noses being broken”, yet as even the likes of Aboo Hamza al-Misree have stated he only states this as it was Faysal himself who had his nose broken!!

¹⁵⁸ The individual who Faysal is accusing here is not clear as Faysal does not mention the name of the accused so it is very difficult to affirm this claim of Faysal, due to Faysal’s fear of mentioning the name. However, it has been suggested that it refers to an individual who himself was later banned from the office of *Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah (Brixton Mosque)* for his exaggerations!

¹⁵⁹ Do they?

¹⁶⁰ At this, the ignorant audience of blind followers burst into laughter as if they are being entertained by a comedian at a comedy club!

¹⁶¹ Observe Faysal’s propaganda here and use of simplistic reasoning in order to incite the audience to agree with him. *Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah (Brixton Mosque)* is independent and receives absolutely no financial support from Saudi Arabia and never has done, yet due to Faysal’s propaganda this has become disseminated around the UK.

received!!! This uncorroborated claim is exactly like a similar claim about Brixton Mosque (*Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah*) that has been circulated on a number of *takfeeree* websites and authored by a writer who called himself 'KM', and his real name that he tried to hide is Muhammad al-Keenee, as he was originally from Kenya and also known as 'Kenyan Muhammad', but he did not have the gall to put his real name to his article of *baatil*. In 'KM's account of his experience he states:

Alhamdulillah, during the process of the hearing, it was established that the Home Secretary had received the letter on the 22nd June 2002 from officials of *Brixton Mosque*, stating that I was a supposed threat to national security, and he was acting on that information, and that's why I was arrested in Belmarsh.¹⁶²

So where is this letter from 'officials of *Brixton Mosque*?? Why cannot anyone seem to find such a letter? So Muhammad al-Keenee conducted his interview with the '*Cage Prisoners*' website, who blindly support anyone based on the premise that they have been imprisoned on terrorism charges, yet the interviewer did not bother to even confirm this or even ask *Brixton Mosque* if this was the case.

Secondly, there is somewhat of a clear contradiction here, as Faysal impugns the African and Caribbean communities of being *Salafee* due to perceived poverty, yet then states that the majority of *Salafees* are rich Gulf Arabs!!! Since when have *all* the Gulf countries admitted that they are *Salafee*? With the exception of Saudi Arabia, most, if not all, of the Islamic ministries of these Gulf countries are not *Salafee* at all!

Thirdly, Faysal again demonstrates his deception and aims to hoodwink his audience who even here did not fall for his lies, when he claimed that there are no Moroccan and Algerian salafees in the UK!! It is well-known that there are many Moroccan and Algerian *Salafees* within the UK and within the countries there are thousands upon thousands of *Salafees* in Morocco and Algeria! Faysal even states that there are only **"just one or two"** (!!) Moroccan and Algerian *Salafees* within the UK!! Yet Faysal tries to feebly assert that only rich Gulf Arabs are *Salafees* and this is absolutely bizarre! Indeed, the *Salafee da'wah* is well established within Yemen, Indonesia, Jordan, Nigeria and Ghana, not to mention Algeria and Morocco so the statements of Faysal here are utterly foolish.

¹⁶² The full article can be read here: <http://www.cageprisoners.com/articles.php?id=4449>

Fourthly, one of the brothers who used to listen to Faysal during his early university years in the late nineties has noted to the salafimanhaj.com team that when he first went to *Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah (Brixton Mosque)* he found that Faysal's claims were totally unfounded and found loads of Algerians and Moroccans attending the mosque with even the Imaam at that stage being Moroccan! As a result, the brother realized the exaggerations and dangers of 'Abdullaah Faysal al-Jamaykee al-Khaarijee.

Fifthly, Faysal picks out and highlights the African and Carribbean community in particular due to Faysal's own failure to generally penetrate the Muslim community of this particular ethnic background with his *da'wab*. The reality is that due to the *Salafee da'wab* being accepted and received from reverts and Muslims from Muslim backgrounds of African origin London, the *da'wab* of Faysal was going extreme and was based on personal failures and frustrations. Faysal's failure in the Brixton area, which is an area which many so-called 'revolutionaries' have tried to gain a foothold for their own desires and designs, led him to oppose the *salafees* of Brixton the most and accuse them of *kufr*. Due to this some have even questioned the mental state of Faysal, yet as his mental state is not something which can be corroborated by us, we are sticking with his statements as they stand without the necessity of a psychiatric or psycho-analytical assessment, or the likes.

Sixthly, Faysal applies a racial stereotype which has its origins with the *kuuffaar* and Faysal has merely accepted it, which is that the *Salafees*, and those from African and Carribbean origins **“are coming from very poor backgrounds and are hungry”** SubhaanAllaah! Not only is this utterly incorrect but it is also an ethnic and racial stereotype that Faysal is regurgitating. From those who attend *Masjid Ibn Taymiyyah (Brixton Mosque)* are doctors, consultants, self-employed businesswomen and men, civil servants, teachers, youth workers, college and university students, IT experts, university graduates and more! Therefore, we totally reject the racist and stereotypical slanderous descriptions of the *salafees* of Brixton as being **“poor and hungry”** and **“unemployed”** which constantly dribbles off the dirty tongues of Faysal and those like him from the *takfeerees*. After one hour and fourteen minutes he says:

“I wouldn't be surprised if this is the biggest movement in this country because most of the Muslims are hypocrites.”

Hereby, again making *takfeer* of the Muslims of the UK! Then Faysal states, in his utter ignorance and in his accusations of the Muslim women:

“Women love to marry those who say that there is no jihaad anywhere in the world. So you'll find people, hypocrites, they have two wives and three wives and their women are also evil, because a woman is supposed to help her husband go to Paradise, so if I have a wife and I am a hypocrite...”

Allaahu Musta'an! Faysal tries to show that having two or three wives is a characteristic of hypocrisy even though Allaah has Legislated it in His Book:

﴿فَانكِحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مَثْنَى وَثُلَاثَ وَرُبَاعَ﴾

“...then marry those that please you of (other) women, two, three or four...”

{an-Nisaa (4): 3}

Here Faysal accuses the *Salafee* sisters of being evil, he reiterates this after one hour, 16 minutes and 30 seconds into the lecture by stating:

“...But these Salafees their wives don't help them so their wives are also evil. And the reason why they keep quiet is because they are also in it for the money, they are also in it for the money so that they can be able to dress in fancy dresses and so on and so forth. They are dunyafied.”

Faysal states after 1 hour and 19 minutes:

“The claim that the leaders are still Muslims because they see them praying on CNN and so on and so forth...so a person praying is no evidence that the person is a believer, firm in al-Islam, firm with eemaan.”

This is very dangerous, as it inculcates into the minds of the youth that even though they see a Muslim praying, “it doesn't mean anything because he is a kaafir anyway”!! This is the logical result from the beliefs of Faysal. Then Faysal states one hour and twenty-two minutes into the lecture:

“They have a lot of Jewish traits, I will mention about thirteen Jewish traits they have, so they are the yahhod of the ummah, the Saudi Salafees there are the yahood of the ummah.”

Allaah says,

﴿أَمْ نَجْعَلُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ كَالْمُفْسِدِينَ فِي الْأَرْضِ أَمْ نَجْعَلُ الْمُتَّقِينَ كَالْفُجَّارِ﴾

“Or should We treat those who believe and do righteous deeds like corrupters in the land? Or should We treat those who fear Allaah like the wicked?”

{*Saad (38): 28*}

Allaah also says,

﴿أَفَنَجْعَلُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ كَالْمُجْرِمِينَ﴾

“Then will We treat the Muslims like the criminals?”

{*al-Qalam (68): 35*}

He continues spouting venom:

“Salafees oppress their wives and stop them from education...Salafees force women to wear niqaab and stop them from driving cars, all these are examples of how they oppress women. Any hadeeth to give women freedom, liberation and prestige they say the hadeeth is weak.”

Contemplate! Blatant lies from Faysal al-Khaarijee one after the other! And it is also noticeable how he says all of this but on his lectures entitled *Let the Scholars Beware* and the lecture *Islam Under Siege* he praises the Taalibaan regime who closed down women's Islamic schools and actually did force women! After an hour and twenty-seven minutes into the lecture:

“The verdict on the Salafees, I've given you their descriptions, I've given you their 'aqeedah, I will now give you the verdict...”

Before we proceed, here Faysal is giving a *fatwa* now, an Islamic ruling, even though he is not qualified to give this at all, so beware! He continues:

“...Salafees are major hypocrites, there's no difference between a Salafee and a disciple of Musaymlimah, Musaymlimah exchanged the Sharee'ah and he had people who helped him, supported him, aided him and fought for him. Salafees will fight and kill for King Fahd who has dismantled the Sharee'ah...therefore you're not allowed to pray behind a salafee, your salah behind them is baatil because they're major hypocrites, they're mega hypocrites. Now you know why I delayed the speech for four years because I make sure you can handle the verdict before I deliver the verdict on you!”

Faysal delivers another incredulous and vile 'verdict':

“Any woman that is married to a Salafee, she has to disassociate herself from him and make baraa' from him! How can she co-habit with a man who betray Allaah Ta'ala, His Messenger and the Muslims. She should abhor such a man just to look into his face should make her feel upset and sick. So how can she co-habit with a man, marry man, that a man¹⁶³ and cohabit with him?”

La Hawla wa la Quwwata ila billaahi!

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.21

'RULES OF JIHAD'

<http://inshallahshaheed.wordpress.com/lectures/>

Twenty minutes into the lecture Faysal states:

“What's our relationship with kaafirs? Peaceful co-existence or all-out war? The opinion of Imaam Shaafi'ee is that it is all-out war”!!

So he states this without even bringing any *daleel* from where Imaam Shaafi'ee (*raheemahullaah*) said this! Which book did Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee state this in? Who transmitted it? No evidence is mentioned whatsoever. Let's see what the Muslim scholars actually say on this issue, Shaykh Saalih Aal ush-Shaykh (*bafidhabullaah*) noted in his lecture on the subject of *Rights in the Sharee'ah* (*Human Rights*) that:

أقسام غير المسلمين في الأرض هذه الأربعة أقسام:

- أن يكون ذمياً.
- أن يكون معاهداً.
- أن يكون مستأمناً.
- أن يكون حربياً.

و النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أمر بأداء الحقوق لهؤلاء؛ بل أمر الله جل وعلا بأداء الحقوق

لغير المسلمين في كتابه إذا لم يكونوا حربيين إذا لم يكونوا مظهرين العدواة، فقال جل وعلا

¹⁶³ This sentence is not a typo error? He does actually say this in this way!

The non-Muslims of the earth can be divided into four categories, they can either be a dhimmi; a mu'aahid; a musta'min or a harbee. And the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) instructed given each one their due rights. Rather, Allaah instructed given non-Muslims rights in His Book, if they are not at war (with Muslims) and do not manifest enmity (against the Muslims). Allaah says,

﴿لَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يُخْرِجُوكُمْ مِّن دِيَارِكُمْ أَن تَبَرُّوهُمْ وَتُقْسِطُوا إِلَيْهِمْ

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ

إِنَّمَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ قَاتَلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَأَخْرَجُوكُم مِّن دِيَارِكُمْ وَظَاهَرُوا عَلَىٰ إِخْرَاجِكُمْ أَن

تَوَلَّوهُمْ وَمَن يَتَوَلَّهُمْ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ ﴿

“Allaah does not forbid you from those who do not fight you because of religion and do not expel you from your homes – from being righteous toward them¹⁶⁴ and acting justly toward them.¹⁶⁵ Indeed, Allaah loves those who act justly.¹⁶⁶ Allaah only forbids

¹⁶⁴ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) says about this: to be gentle with them.

¹⁶⁵ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) says about this: to be fair with them.

¹⁶⁶ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) transmits in regards to this in the ayah: Imaam Ahmad recorded that Asmaa' bint Abu Bakr said, “My mother, who was an idolatress at the time, came to me during the Treaty of Peace, the Prophet conducted with the Quraysh. I came to the Prophet and said, “O Allaah's Messenger! My mother came visiting, desiring something from me, should I treat her with good relations” The Prophet said,

«نَعَمْ صِلِي أُمَّكَ»

“Yes. Keep good relation with your mother.” The Two Saheehs recorded this hadeeth. Imaam Ahmad recorded that `Abdullah bin Zubayr said, "Qutaylah came visiting her daughter, Asmaa' bint Abee Bakr, with some gifts, such as Dibab, cheese and clarified (cooking) butter, and she was an idolatress at that time. Asmaa' refused to accept her mother's gifts and did not let her enter her house. 'Aa'ishah asked the Prophet about his verdict and Allaah sent down the ayah,

you from those who fight you because of religion and expel you from your homes and aid in your expulsion – (forbids) that you make allies of them.¹⁶⁷ And whoever makes allies of them, then it is those who are the wrongdoers.”

{*al-Mumtabinah* (60): 8-9}

فإذن الحق الذي للذمي ثابت في الشريعة، فلا يعني كونه كافراً أن نهضمه حق الإنسانية، هو حق جعله الله جل وعلا له، قال عليه الصلاة والسلام: «من آذى ذمياً فقد آذاني» أو كما جاء في الحديث، وصحَّ عنه عليه الصلاة والسلام أنه قال: من قتل معاهداً لم يرح رائحة الجنة، لماذا؟ لأن المسلمين يسعى بذمتهم أدناهم، هذا قد جاء بعهد، وجاء بأمان، وكان في بلاد الإسلام بأمان وعهد، فالواجب ألا يُعتدى عليه في نفسه، وألا يعتدى عليه في دمه، وألا يعتدى عليه في عرضه، وألا يعتدى عليه في ماله، فالحقوق واجبة له شرعاً. والنصوص في أداء حق أهل الذمة وحق المعاهدين وحق المستأمنين متعددة، وكلام العلماء في ذلك كثير.

﴿لَا يَنْهَكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ﴾

“Allaah does not forbid you with those who fought not against you on account of religion”

until the end of the ayah. Allaah’s Messenger ordered Asmaa’ to accept her mother’s gifts and to let her enter her house.” Allaah’s statement,

﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ﴾

“Indeed Allaah loves those who act justly.”

And we can clearly see the contrary of this being applied from those who abandon their non-Muslims parents for fifteen years!

¹⁶⁷ Ibn Katheer (*raheemahullaah*) states about this part of the verse:

“Allah forbids you from being kind and befriending with the disbelievers who are openly hostile to you, those who fought against you, expelled you and helped to expel you. Allah the Exalted forbids you from being their friends and orders you to be their enemy.”

أما الحريون فهم الذين بيننا وبينهم حرب، فهؤلاء بيننا وبينهم حرب، فيه أحكام كثيرة تتعلق بهم، وحتى لو تمكنا منهم، فإنهم إذا كانوا أسارى فإنهم يكرمون، وإذا تُمكن منهم فإنه لا يقتل الوليد، ولا يقتل الطفل، ولا تقتل المرأة، ولا يتقل منهم الشيخ العجوز ونحو ذلك من الأمثلة.

مع أن في شرائع أخرى يقتل الجميع كما ذكر أن في شريعة موسى عليه الصلاة والسلام أن الجميع يقتلون في حال الحرب.

أما شريعة الإسلام فالله جل وعلا حباها لما في ذلك من المصلحة لامتداد الشريعة إلى قيام الساعة بالألا يقتل من المحاربين إلا المقاتلة فقط، وإذا أسر فإن للأسرى أحكاما كثيرة. الذمي في دار الإسلام له حقوق، إذا كان في بيته فانه يمارس ما شاء، لكن ليس له أن يُعلن في شارع المسلمين أو أن يظهر شيئاً من المحرمات، إما أن يظهر دينه ليس له ذلك يعني في..... هذا في المعاهد والمستأمن.

أما الذمي ففيه تفصيل الكلام، كما إذا كان في أرض قد فتحت، وفيها الكنائس والبيع

كما في بلاد الشام وفي مصر والعراق ونحو ذلك

Therefore, the right of the dhimmi is well-established in the Divine Legislation. Not rights from people, but rights that Allaah has set for the dhimmi. The Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) stated "Whoever harms a dhimmi has harmed me"¹⁶⁸ or as is stated in the hadeeth. It is also authenticated from him (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) that he said "Whoever kills a mu'aahad will not smell the fragrance of Paradise, the smell of which can be smelt for the distance of forty years."¹⁶⁹ Why? Because the Muslims honour their lives as they came with an agreement, they came with a trust and is not to be transgressed against with regards to his life, blood, honour, money, rights are obligatory to them in the Divine Legislation. The texts regarding the rights of the enemies, the rights of the people of dhimma, the rights of the people of

¹⁶⁸ Saheeh Muslim

¹⁶⁹ Saheeh Bukhaaree in *Kitaab ul-Jizyah* under the chapter 'The sin of the one who kills a mu'aahad who has not committed any crime.'

agreement (mu'aahadeen), the rights of the people with whom there is a trust, are various and the statements of the people of knowledge regarding the field is abundant. As for the harbee'oon, they are the ones whom between us and them is war and there are many regulations in regards to them and if we gain empowerment over them, they are respected if they are Christians and none of their children, women or elderly are killed. Whereas within other legislations everyone is to be killed! As is mentioned that within the Divine Legislation of Moosaa (alayhi salaam) that all are to be killed during war. As for the Divine Legislation of Islaam, Allaah allowed for only the fighter to be killed during battle, due to the benefits in the Divine Legislation for this. The dhimmi in an bode of Islaam has rights and within his home can do as he wills yet is not allowed to advertise what he does or anything from the prohibited actions. He can also not manifest his deen, this is for the mu'aahad and for the musta'min, as for the dhimmi there is some explanation required for this speech in relation to those countries which were conquered yet there were already churches there like in Shaam, Egypt, 'Iraaq and the likes of these countries.

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.22

'THE PEAK OF THE MATTER'

<http://inshallahshaheed.wordpress.com/lectures/>

Faysal continues with his *manhaj* of mass *takfeer*, stating after one hour and twenty-five minutes into the lecture:

“So can you imagine the hundreds and thousands and millions of Muslims who have apostated from Islaam without even realising it?!”!!!

SAMPLE LECTURE NO.23

'JIHAD'

<http://inshallahshaheed.wordpress.com/lectures/>

After the first minute he states:

“If you wage war against a deviant group it's not jihaad.”

Yet 'Ali (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) fought against the *khawaarij* at Nahrawaan and the companions did not make *takfeer* of them. After eighteen minutes he states:

“Our manhaj is the bullet not the ballot! You use the ballot in Algeria and you got a kick in your face. You use the ballot a second time in Turkey and you got a kick in your face. You use it a third time in Nigeria, Abiola, he won the election, yet they put him in prison, poisoned him and you got kick¹⁷⁰ in your face¹⁷¹ three times!”

Did the *salaf* say that “our manhaj is the bullet”, did the *salaf* say “our manhaj is the ballot” did the *salaf* say anything of the sort like this? The answer is clearly no, so where is Faysal getting all of this *baatil* from? He continues saying after twenty minutes into the lecture:

“Now is there any peace treaty between us and the Hindus? No! So you can go India and if you see a Hindu walking down the road you're allowed to kill him and take his money. Is that clear?”

How did he work out that there was no peace between India and the entire Muslim *ummah*? Can a Muslim enter a non-Muslim country under a contract and condition of security, trust and truthfulness and then lie, break the agreement and kill the citizens of that country? This is treachery not *jihad*! Then he says:

“So the best way to spread Islaam is not with *da'wah*, the best way to spread Islaam is *jihad*.”

This statement itself is an utter contradiction, as *da'wah* is a level of *jihad*! Yet Faysal, as per usual, neglects to mention this to his audiences of blind followers. He states in the question and answer session he states, with no evidence whatsoever has to which scholars have preceded him, After thirty-six minutes he says:

“So you want to go to jannah, put up your hands those who want to go to jannah. It's easy just kill a kaafir, just kill a kaafir!”!!

See how Faysal misguides the Muslims with his ignorant and irresponsible open-ended speech. Then Faysal states, in utter contradiction to his usual mass *takfeer* of Muslims and accusing the majority of Muslims of having apostasized from Islaam:

“So a man may have a weakness for Vodka or Tenants or he may have a weakness for betting on the National Lottery, one pound every week but when the Ameer says

¹⁷⁰ This is not a typo error he does actually state, in UK street style, “you got kick...”

¹⁷¹ See here how Faysal speaks as if he is talking to the whole *ummah* by using “**you used**” and “**your face**”, hereby attempting to invoke a collective emotive response.

“jihad” he will be the first to write his name down and put up his hand and go and fight. Is that clear? So if sahabahs drank alcohol and still they had the eemaan to fight why should you cut-off your Muslim brothers right now in our midst today? You can't do that to them, that's the khawaarij mentality and if you throw him out of the Muslim community which community should he enter into? The Christian community!? That's the khawaarij mentality so you should always give hope to the believers as long as they make tawbah.”

So where was all of this when Faysal threw the *Salafees* out of the fold of Islaam by referring to them as “no different from the followers of Musaylimah al-Kadhhab” and referring to the *salafees* as “the Jews of the ummah”¹⁷² and referring to the scholars as Rabbis and Monks, and his referring to the scholars as *kuffaar* that should be killed, see the quote below, and his referring to the Muslims of today as “being like the kaafirs of Quraysh”¹⁷³ and his saying that “hundreds, thousands and millions of Muslims have apostated without even realising it”!¹⁷⁴ In the lecture on ‘*Knowledge*’ (!?), sample lecture no.13 in our study, Faysal stated:

“So the Muslims in this country (i.e. the UK), the majority of them, they have no eemaan and no taqwaa, the average Muslim you meet on the street he has no eemaan and no taqwaa...”

After forty-nine minutes Faysal states, making *takfeer* of his own audience:

“Every Muslim would like to kill the kuffaar, unless you're a munaafiq and you have no al-walaa wa'l-baraa' in your heart or you love kaafirs. I wouldn't be surprised if some of you love Hindus and Sikhs and Buddhists and Christians, only munaafiqoon love kuffaar.”

So hereby he has accused his own audience of *jubaal* of being major hypocrites who love the *kuffaar*! What sort of nonsense is this? Then he states:

“You can even use chemical weapons to exterminate kaafirs. Now if you have cockroaches in your house would you spray them? Huh? Yes! With chemicals. Who has more dignity the cockroach or the kaafir? The cockroach, the Qur'aan tells you that! Which ayah in the Qur'aan tells you that? Huh?!”

¹⁷² As occurs in the lecture ‘*The Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafis*’, see sample lecture no.

¹⁷³ As occurs in the lecture ‘*Rejecting the Taghoot*’, see sample lecture no.10

¹⁷⁴ As occurs in the lecture ‘*The Peak of the Matter*’, see sample lecture no.22

So here Faysal again makes no distinction among the *kuffaar*, as the people of the book have a certain status in al-Islam to the extent that a Muslim man can marry a woman from the people of the scripture, but can a Muslim man marry a cockroach? Does Allaah allow Muslim men to marry the worst of creation?! Did Allaah describe the people of the book as being cockroaches in His book? Are there Christians living now who may go to Paradise? There are no doubt some Christians who live in far, remote, impoverished regions of the world who only know about Christianity, so such people Allaah may look into their hearts on the Day of Judgement, and Allaah knows best about this. Imaam Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaymeen (*raheemahullaah*) stated regarding the verse in the Qur'aan:

﴿وَأَوْحِي إِلَيَّ هَذَا الْقُرْآنُ لَأُنذِرَكُمْ بِهِ وَمَنْ بَلَغَ﴾

“This Qur'aan has been revealed to me that I may therewith warn you and whomsoever it may reach.”

{*al-'An'aam* (6): 19}

This indicates that the evidences are not established upon those whom the Qur'aan has not been conveyed to. Likewise are those whom the Qur'aan has been conveyed to in a distorted manner, the evidences are not established upon them either, but their excuse is not the same as the excuse of those whom the Qur'aan has not been conveyed to at all, because it is upon those whom the Qur'aan has reached in a distorted manner to further investigate. However they may trust the person who conveyed the Qur'aan to them to a point where they do not need to investigate (for themselves).

So the question: “Has Islaam been conveyed to the masses of non-Muslims in a manner which is not distorted?”

Then the answer is: “No not at all! And when the affair of those who act without wisdom emerged, it distorted the picture of Islaam even further in the eyes of the westerners and other than them. Those who plant bombs in the midst of people claiming that this is Jihaaad. The truth is that they harm Islaam and further turn people away from it.¹⁷⁵

Allaah makes a distinction in the beginning in the verse, so even though the people of the book are *kuffaar*, Allaah makes a distinction,

¹⁷⁵

Fataawaa

al-'A'imah,

p.55

see:

http://www.madeenah.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=208&Itemid=2

﴿لَمْ يَكُنِ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَالْمُشْرِكِينَ مُنْفَكِينَ حَتَّىٰ تَأْتِيَهُمُ الْبَيِّنَةُ﴾

“Those who disbelieve from among the people of Scripture (Jews and Christians) and the polytheists, were not going to leave (their disbelief) until there came to them the clear evidence.”

{*al-Bayyinah* (98): 1}

So if one's mother is a *kaafir*, does the cockroach get more respect and dignity? The key word here is 'dignity' and there is no doubt that *kuuffaar* still have to be respected, given their dignity, honour and rights and not be treated worse than animals which is what Faysal suggests. In the Hereafter their end will be worse than it is for animals but as for in this life then they have to be honoured. After one hour and thirteen minutes:

“So one of the aim and objective of jihaad is to protect your scholars so that the scholars will be able to speak the truth un-watered-down, uncensored tawheed, authentic tawheed, but the scholars today don't they tell you tawheed, they don't tell you al-walaa wa'l-baraa', they don't tell you about tawheed al-haakimiyyah...and the scholars of the apostate leaders you have to kill them because if they preach wrong Islaam you have to abduct them and kill them...the apostate leaders, the scholars and the armies of the apostate leaders, their army you have to kill them and the layman who supports the army, the layman who supports the army has to be killed aswell...these are the people you kill with jihaad.” !!

This is enough in proving his falsehood, extremism and outlandish statements! This means, because Faysal makes *takefeer* of the scholars in Saudi for example, the scholars there are all worthy of the above which he has stated! Look at the danger of the statements of Faysal and how it can be understood by the layman.

THE CLEAR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE 'AQEEDAH AND MANHAJ OF THE SALAF US-SAALIH AND THE 'AQEEDAH AND MANHAJ OF ABDULLAH FAYSAL

**(“SHEIKH FAISAL”), OMAR BAKRI MUHAMMAD
FOSTOK AL-MUDALLIS, ANWAR AL-AWLAKI AND THE
KHAWAARIJ OF THE ERA!**

We have assessed the main errors and extremities of Faysal and here we will specifically look at where they differ with the *manhaj* and *'aqeedah* of the early pious Muslims (*Salaf us-Saalih*) and how they purposefully cover up the true *manhaj* and *'aqeedah* of the *Salaf*.

The main issue which they cover up is the issue of obedience to the Muslim rulers which is from the *'aqeedah* of the *Salaf* and mentioned within their books quite clearly, yet the likes of Faysal and Omar Bakri somehow manage to overlook this?! Bakri for example, who since 2001 claimed that he was from the people of Sunnah:

- ✓ Still has not openly admitted his error of “teaching” and supporting the *Shree'ah madhhab* and claiming that it is from Islaam. Indeed, in the mid-90s bakri was well known for praising al-Khomynee.
- ✓ Still has not accounted for why in his book entitled *Essential Fiqh* (London: The Islamic Book Company, 1996)¹⁷⁶, page 3 he made the claim that he studied at *Umm ul-Qura'* in Makkah and *The Islamic University of Madeenah* when this is false!!! Indeed, he miraculously now claims that he studied at “Madarasah Saltiyyah” and makes no mention of *Umm ul-Qura'* and *Madeenah University*!!? Clear *tadless* and *kadhib* (deception and lying)! See page 7 of one of his ebooks here: <http://www.omarbakri.info/Books/Ahlus%20Sunnah%20Wal%20Jamma.pdf>
- ✓ Still has not clearly repudiated his previous heretical beliefs of rejecting *abad hadeeth* into *'aqeedah*.
- ✓ Still does not teach the books of the *'aqeedah* of the *Salaf* and is ignorant of them and omits aspects, such as the censure of revolting against the leaders and making *takfeer* of the Muslim rulers. Bakri conveniently overlooks of the statements of the Imaams

¹⁷⁶ The ISBN numbers for this book, which is still available via *Amazon* for example, are: **ISBN 10: 1899534008** and **ISBN 13: 978-1899534005**. The is also available via the website *Lawbooks Online*, conduct search here: <http://www.lawbooks-online.com/index.asp?search=bic&bic=LXP&offset=80>

- in this issue. So for example on pp.51-64 he gives 15 attributes of *Ahl us-Sunnah* and yet fails to mention the issue of refraining from *takfeer* and *kburoof*!
- ✓ Claims that Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal (*raheemabullaah*) incited the common people against the rulers. In ftn.123 on page 111 of his ebook which has been linked to above Bakri claims **“Imaam Ahmed rose against and publically championed people against the state...”**!?
 - ✓ Still has not made any clarification of his heresies in Arabic, he has no books or works in Arabic and has rather deceived ignorant youth in the UK into blindly following him. The fact that even his website which is dedicated to him provides no link to any Arabic-twin site and his wasting time in conducting paltalk lectures in English to his blind followers in the UK indicates the true agenda of this man who now claims to be from the people of *Sunnah* in *'aqeedah* and *manhaj*. So where are his books in Arabic we ask? And where is the clarification of his errors in Arabic? Where is the explanation for his claims of studying at *Umm ul-Qura* in Makkah and *The Islamic University of Madeenah*? When the reality is that he was an employee for the company *Eastern Electric* owned by Shamsaan and 'Abdul'Azeez as-Suhaybee in Riyadh. Then he went to the branch in Jeddah and during that time he did not study in any university, rather he went to America for a few months to study English and suddenly left and went to London and became the *muftee* of *Hiẓb ut-Tahreer*.¹⁷⁷

STATEMENTS OF SCHOLARS ABOUT REVOLTING AGAINST A MUSLIM RULER

¹⁷⁷ 'AbdurRahmaan ibn Muhammad Sa'eed Dimashqiyyah, *Hiẓb ut-Tahreer* (Istanbul, Turkey: Maktabah al-Ghurabaa', 1417 AH/1997CE), pp.63-66

Shaykh 'AbdulLateef bin 'AbdurRahmaan bin Hasan Aal ush-Shaykh stated in *ad-Durur as-Sunniyyah fee Ajwibat-Najdiyyah*,¹⁷⁸ vol.7, pp.177-78:

وأضرب لك مثلاً بالحجاج بن يوسف الثقفي، وقد اشتهر أمره في الأمة بالظلم
والغشم والإسراف في سفك الدماء وانتهاك حرمت الله، وقتل من قتل من سادات
الأمة: ك"سعيد بن جبير" وحاصر ابن الزبير وقد عاذ بالحرم الشريف، واستباح الحرمه،
وقتل ابن الزبير- مع أن ابن الزبير قد أعطاه الطاعة وبايعه عامة أهل مكة والمدينة واليمن
وأكثر سواد العراق، والحجاج نائب عن مروان... ولم يعهد أحد من الخلفاء إلى مروان، ولم
يبايعه أهل الحل والعقد- ومع ذلك لم يتوقف أحد من أهل العلم في طاعته والانقياد له
فيما تسوغ طاعته فيه من أركان الإسلام وواجباته.

وكان ابن عمر- رضي الله تعالى عنهما- ومن أدرك الحجاج من أصحاب رسول الله- صلى
الله تعالى عليه وآله وسلم- لا ينازعونه ولا يمتنعون من طاعته فيما يقوم به الإسلام، ويكمل
به الإيمان.

وكذلك في زمن التابعين، ك: ابن المسيب، والحسن البصري، وابن سيرين، وإبراهيم
التيمي، وأشباههم ونظرائهم من سادات الأمة.
واستمر العمل على هذا بين علماء الأمة من سادات الأمة وأئمتها، يأمرون بطاعة
الله ورسوله، والجهاد في سبيله مع كل إمام بر أو فاجر، كما هو معروف في كتب أصول
الدين والعقائد

¹⁷⁸ This was compiled by 'AbdurRahmaan bin Qaasim and was printed by Daar ul-Iftaa', Riyadh and the second printing was in 1385 AH/1965 CE, while the fifth edition was printed in 1413 AH/1992 CE, the sixth printing was in 1417 AH/1996 CE. There is also a print dated 1420 AH/1999CE. The seventh edition was printed in 1425 AH/2004 CE.

وكذلك بنو العباس: استولوا على بلاد المسلمين قهراً بالسيف، لم يساعدهم أحد من أهل العلم والدين، وقتلوا خلقاً كثيراً، وجمّاً غفيراً من بني أمية وأمرائهم ونوابهم، وقتلوا ابن هبيرة أمير العراق، وقتلوا الخليفة مروان، حتى نقل أن السفاح قتل في يوم واحد نحو الثمانين من بني أمية، ووضع الفرش على جثثهم، وجلس عليها، ودعا بالمطاعم والمشارب!!! ومع ذلك فسيرة الأئمة ك: الأوزاعي، ومالك، والزهري، والليث بن سعد، وعطاء بن أبي رباح مع هؤلاء الملوك لا تخفى على من له مشاركة في العلم واطلاع . والطبقة الثانية من أهل العلم، ك: أحمد، ومحمد بن إسماعيل، ومحمد بن إدريس، وأحمد بن نوح، وإسحاق بن راهويه، وإخوانهم... وقع في عصرهم من الملوك ما وقع من البدع العظام، وإنكار الصفات، ودعوا إلى ذلك، وامتحنوا فيه، وقتل من قتل، ك: أحمد بن نصر، ومع ذلك فلا يعلم أن أحداً منهم نزع يداً من طاعة، ولا رأى الخروج عليهم... "أه

A similitude can be put to you with al-Hajjaaj bin Yoosuf ath-Thaqafee and he became famous in the Ummah for his oppression, suppression, excess in blood-shed and dishonouring the sanctities of Allaah and killing whoever from the notables of the Ummah: such as Sa'eed bin Jubayr and besieging Ibn az-Zubayr even though he had sought refuge in the Haram, Hajjaaj made lawful the sanctified and killed Ibn az-Zubayr. Even though Ibn az-Zubayr had pledged obedience to him along with the people of Makkah, Madeenah, al-Yemen and the majority of al-'Iraq. Hajjaah was the deputy of Marwaan, but neither did any of the Khulafaa' nor any of the influential people in authority pledge allegiance to Marwaan. Yet with this, none of the people of knowledge withheld from obedience to him and complying with him in those matters where obedience is allowed from the pillars of Islaam and its obligations. Ibn 'Umar (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) and whoever was present from the Companions of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wasallam*) at the time did not challenge him or prevent anyone from obeying him in those things which Islaam instructs and perfect eemaan. It was likewise during the time of Hajjaaj for the Successors (Taabi'een) like: Ibn ul-Musayyib, al-Hasan al-Basree, Ibn Seereen, Ibraaheem at-Taymee and their likes from the illustrious people of the Ummah. This way continued among the leading scholars of the Ummah who instructed obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, and jihaad in the way of Allaah with every leader whether righteous or sinful as is well-known in the

books of Usool ud-Deen (Religious Principles) and 'Aqaa'id (Creed). And likewise during the epoch of Banu 'Abbaas (the Abbasids), for they gained ascendancy over the Muslim lands via the sword, and none of the people of knowledge and deen helped them in this, and they killed many from creation such as killing a large amount of the Bani Umayyah (Ummayyids) and their leaders and deputies. They killed Ibn Hubayrah, the leader of 'Iraq and they killed the Khaleefah Marwaan, to the extent that it has been transmitted that they killed around 80 members of Banu Umayyah in just one day and they laid a blanket over their corpses and sat on them calling for food and drink!!! Yet with all of this, the way of the Imaams of the time such as: al-Awzaa'ee, Maalik, az-Zuhree, al-Layth ibn Sa'd, 'Ataa' bin Abee Rabaah with those kings is not hidden from anyone who has any share of knowledge and awareness. The third stage of scholars included: Ahmad, Muhammad bin Ismaa'eel, Muhammad bin Idrees, Ahmad bin Nooh, Ishaq bin Raahawayh and their brothers, and during their time were kings with major innovations, such as denying the Attributes of Allaah and calling to that and they (the scholars from the People of *Sunnah*) were put to the test in this regard. And whomsoever was killed during this era such as Ahmad bin Nasr, yet with all of this it is not known that any of them removed the hand of obedience and did not view that khurooj (revolting and rebelling) should be made against those leaders.

Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah (*rabeemabullaah*) stated in the fifth volume of *Minbaaj us-Sunnah* on page 112:

And likewise an-Najaashi who was a Christian king of his country would not have been obeyed by the people whom he ruled over in accepting Islaam and only a few people accepted Islaam with him. If he embraced Islaam openly the people would have left him. For this reason, when he died there were no Muslims to pray over him in his country. The Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) in Madeenah prayed over Najaashi, the people went out to a musalla and arranged rows in order to pray the janazah for an-Najaashi and the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) prayed over him.¹⁷⁹ He then informed them that an-Najaashi had died saying "Indeed, your righteous brother from the people of Habasha (Ethiopia) died today." Many of the

¹⁷⁹ Shaykh 'Ali stated: This indicates that *Salaat ul-Janaazah* (the funeral prayer) is to be prayed in a *musalla* and not in a *Masjid*. It is permissible to pray *Salaat ul-Janaazah* in a *Masjid* but it is better if it is prayed in a *musalla* (a wide open area wherein the people go out to pray).

symbols and institutions of Islaam, or most of them, were not established in Habasha due to his (an-Najaashi's) inability to implement them there.

Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabee al-Atharee stated about this:

This is a very precise point as an-Najaashi therefore was aware of many of the symbols and institutions of Islaam and knew about them yet was unable to implement and apply them. I stopped and appended some notes at this point here as some people confuse the story of an-Najaashi wherein it is stated that an-Najaashi had not been made aware of the regulation of the Divine Legislation and did not know about any of the symbols and institutions of the Divine Legislation, but this is clear in the text from Shaykh ul-Islaam who stated: **'Many of the symbols of Islaam, or most of them, were not established in Habasha due to his (an-Najaashi's) inability to implement them there.'** He did not make *hijra*, he did not make *jibaad*, he did not make *Hajj*, indeed it is even stated that he did even pray the five daily prayers, fast or give the Divinely Legislated *Zakat!* Because if all of that was made apparent to his people and they saw all of that and that he was doing all of that they would have rejected him and objected and thus it would not have been possible for him to have opposed them.¹⁸⁰

Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah continues:

We know absolutely that it was not possible for him to rule amongst his people with the Qur'aan¹⁸¹ and Allaah obligated His Messenger in Madeenah that if the People of the Book come to him he should not judge between them except with what Allaah had revealed and warned him from the fact that the People of the Book swerve him away from some of what Allaah has revealed. For example, the punishment and ruling upon zinaa, blood-money, the recompense for killing another soul, an eye for an eye etc. So an-Najaashi was not able to rule with the rule of the Qur'aan as his people would not have accepted that.

Shaykh 'Ali Hasan therefore highlights:

We can say now, and I do not intend to make it easy or to make excuses without right however, we are speaking about the reality which is that most of the rulers in this era, if not all of them unfortunately, from the Muslims not to mention the non-Muslims,

¹⁸⁰ In a class given at the *Imaam al-Albaanee Centre* 'Ammaan, Jordan on Thursday 16th March 2006 CE

¹⁸¹ Meaning: to rule with what Allaah has revealed.

rule for the sake of a greater state! They are not able to behave and are not able to do anything which opposes them (that greater state). Therefore, they do not reject Islaam and they do not reject the rule of Islaam rather, they rule according to some of the regulations of Islaam and all praise is due to Allaah as *masajid* are widespread, the institution of the month of *Ramadaan* is widespread and we see that there is stern opposition if one breaks the fast to eat and the restaurants are all closed during the daytime in *Ramadaan*, therefore the main symbols and institutions of Islaam are clearly apparent and present. We see that the institution of *Hajj* has a great importance in all of the countries of the Muslims along with establishing support for the people who make *Hajj*. We also see the collection boxes for *Zakat* even if it is made obligatory upon the people strictly by these Muslims countries, it is still coordinated, arranged and organised along with exhortation to pay it. Indeed, in some Muslim countries they want to make it obligatory to give *Zakat*. All of this indicates that the main symbols and institutions of Islaam are apparent and are present along with importance attached to Islaam, but to they apply all of Islaam? So they fall into the same as that an-Najaashi did before them. They (leaders) are not able to rule totally according to what Allaah has revealed because their people do not agree with that. As the greater states, the hypocrites, the people who do not want the Divine Legislation of Allaah do not agree with their leaders in this and doing it would lead to tribulations and dangerous affairs. We do not say all of this out of defending them, making light of the matter or out of making light of their condition rather we make this clear in order for the Divinely Legislated ruling on the issue to be clear. So to make *takfeer* of such leaders is not permissible along with the excuses which we have just mentioned and Allaah knows best.

So if all of these regulations have been verified in theory and practice and the narrations regarding an-Najaashi (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) are apparent as the correct foundation of this issue then we must go to another important related issue. It is an issue which the opposers try to utilise, as they try to utilise the other issue yet without really taking full account of either of them, and it is the issue of revolting against the rulers. Most of those who make *takfeer* of the Muslim rulers are the very same people who revolt against the Muslim rulers, incite and rouse the people against the leaders and talk about them as to destabilise the trust, security and *eemaan* of the *ummah*. Few of them seek to ascertain if such a ruler may be a sinner and thus revolting against him is permissible as those who seek this type of research in reality are not the people

to debate with as they are few in these times. Rather, who have become popularised during this era are those who make *takfeer* of the leaders and legitimise revolting against them based upon making *takfeer* of them. Revolting against the Muslim rulers is an affair which according to the consensus of the *ummah* is not permissible and we will speak initially about the Muslim rulers who oppose the Divine Legislation in a small portion, or a large portion, yet they are still within the fold of Islaam as they have not expelled themselves from the religion and they have not become *kuuffaar* due to what they have done or due to actions that they have committed. The texts from the scholars regarding this issue are plentiful and very abundant, I will highlight some of it which is stronger than if it comes merely from my own self, as if statements emerge from the scholars they are stronger proofs and evidences and especially if there is a consensus (of the Muslim scholars) mentioned within them.

Imaam Aboo 'Uthmaan as-Saaboonee (d.449 AH), author of '*Aqeedatus-Salaf wa Ashaab ul-Hadeeth*, stated:

":...ويرون الصلاة-الجمعة وغيرها-خلف كل إمام مسلم، براً كان أو فاجراً، فإن الله-

عزّ وجلّ-فرض الجمعة وأمر بإتيانها فرضاً مطلقاً مع علمه تعالى بأن القائمين يكون

منهم الفاجر والفاسق، فلم يستثن وقتاً دون وقت، ولا أمراً بالنداء للجمعة دون أمر،

ويرون جهاد الكفار معهم، وإن كانوا جوراً، ويرون الدعاء لهم بالإصلاح والعطف إلى

العدل، ولا يرون الخروج بالسيف عليهم، ولا القتال في الفتنة، ويرون الدار دار إسلام

لا دار كفر- كما رأته المعتزلة- ما دام النداء بالصلاة والإقامة بها ظاهرين، وأهلها

ممكنين منها آمنين" اعتقاد أهل السنة للإسماعيلي ص(50-51) والنقل عن النقول

الواضحة... ص(23)

The People of Hadeeth view that the establishment of the Jumu'ah and the two 'Eeids and other than that from all of the prayers that are made behind a

Muslim Imaam, righteous or sinful, as long as he is not a disbeliever who is outside the fold of the religion.¹⁸² They (the People of Hadeeth) make du'aa for the Muslim rulers for success and righteousness,¹⁸³ and they¹⁸⁴ do not view (that it is permissible to make) revolt against them (the Muslim rulers) even if they see from the deviation from justice towards injustice, oppression, transgression and its likes.¹⁸⁵

Imaam Aboo Ja'far at-Tahaawee, author of '*Aqeedah Tahaawiyah*', which was explained by Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafee, states:

"ولا نرى الخروج على أئمتنا وولاة أمورنا وإن جاروا ولا ندعوا عليهم، ولا ننزع يداً
من طاعة، ونرى طاعتهم في طاعة الله عز وجل فريضة ما لم يأمرنا بمعصية، وندعو لهم
بالصلاح والمعافاة" شرح الطحاوية" ص(371)

We do not view (that it is permissible to) revolt against our leaders or those who are responsible for our affairs and even if they transgress we do not make du'aa against them¹⁸⁶ and we do not take back the covenant of obedience from them¹⁸⁷ and we view that obedience to them is from obedience to Allaah and

¹⁸² Shaykh 'Ali stated: If such a person is a disbeliever who is outside the fold of the religion then the issue of revolting against him is not something that would need to be researched at all. The issue of revolting against a non-Muslim ruler has to be referred back to weighing up between the benefits and harms and it also has to be referred back to the *fataawaa* of the scholars.

¹⁸³ Shaykh 'Ali stated: To the extent that Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal (*raheemahullaah*) would say "**If my du'aa would be accepted, I would make du'aa for the sultaan (governer/ruler)**", as if the ruler is rectified then so would the people under him and also the affairs of the society.

¹⁸⁴ i.e., the people of *hadeeth* who are the saved sect and the aided group.

¹⁸⁵ See translato: Aboo 'Uthmaan Ismaa'eel ibn 'AbdurRahmaan as-Saaboonnee, '*Aqeedat us- Salaf wa As-haab ul-Hadeeth* [The Creed of the Pious Predecessors and the People of Hadeeth], London: Brixton Mosque Islamic Centre, 1420 AH/1999 CE, pp.93-4.

¹⁸⁶ Shaykh 'Ali stated: Some people make du'aa against the Muslim leaders or curse and slander them and this is not from the characteristics of the people of truth.

¹⁸⁷ Shaykh 'Ali stated: This obviously means by extension removing themselves from the obedience of Allaah as the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said "*There is no obedience to the creation in disobedience to the Creator*" and he (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) also said "*Obedience is only in that which is good.*" If the

obligatory¹⁸⁸ as long as they do not command to disobedience and we make du'aa to Allaah for them to have correctness and good health.¹⁸⁹

As for the consensus which indicates this clearly is that which was stated by Imaam an-Nawawee (*raheemahullaah*) in his explanation of *Sabeeh Muslim* wherein he stated:

وأما الخروج عليهم وقتالهم فحرام باجماع المسلمين وإن كانوا فسقة ظالمين

As for revolting against the rulers and leaders and fighting against them then it is haraam (impermissible) according to the consensus of the Muslims even if they are sinful transgressors.¹⁹⁰

Al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalaanee transmitted this in his book *Fath al-Baaree* vol.13, p.7) from Imaam Ibn Battaal, who has an explanation of *Sabeeh Bukhaaree* which has been published:

ونقل الحافظ ابن حجر-رحمه الله-الإجماع على عدم جواز الخروج على السلطان الظالم:

فقال قال ابن بطال: "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 حقن الدماء وتسكين الدهماء"فتح الباري(7/13)

The fuquraa (Islamic jurists) have reached consensus that obedience must be made to the leader who becomes dominant (*mutaghallib*)¹⁹¹ and making *jihad*

issue is in regards to that which opposes the Divine Legislation and the affair of the Allaah and His Messenger, then obedience in this regard is not permissible.

¹⁸⁸ Meaning: responding in obedience to the leader is as if you have responded in obedience to Allaah, it is obligatory.

¹⁸⁹ Instead of making *du'aa* against them we make *du'aa* for them as Imaam Ahmad (*raheemahullaah*) mentioned.

¹⁹⁰ Meaning: even if those Muslim rulers are sinners and transgressors.

¹⁹¹ Shaykh 'Ali stated: Here we must stop at this word "**mutaghallib (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-Mutaghallib*). It is when a person opposes the Divine Legislation and revolts against

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.¹⁹²

Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabee al-Atharee notes:

Some people have thrown doubt upon this foundation which we have mentioned and they have tried to refute it due to some events that took place at the dawn of Islamic history which stemmed from the tribulations which took place between the companions of the Prophet (*radi 'Allaah 'anhum*). They thus use as a proof against the consensus the examples of al-Husayn, 'Abdullaah ibn Zubayr, and those who were with them from the people of Madeenah in revolting against Banee 'Umayyah. This was at the beginnings of Islamic history when the companions were still present. There are two aspects to refute this doubt:

1. All of this is stemmed from the tribulation which took place among the companions (*radi Allaahu 'anhum*) about the Messenger of Allaah said: *"If my companions are mentioned then be silent"* so it is not permissible to use as an evidence an issue which was a tribulation which is prohibited to enter, use as an evidence or even discuss. This is evidence in itself and it opposes the text, opposes any benefit and opposes the general evidences from the Divine Legislation.
2. The second thing is that many of the people of knowledge noted that this disagreement took place in the beginning however the consensus which was later established opposed it (revolt). The statement from Imaam an-Nawawee wherein he stated: **'This difference was in the beginning and then the consensus developed**

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.

¹⁹² Shaykh 'Ali stated: As now the leader would have been expelled from the condition of being a Muslim due to falling into clear *kufr*. For this reason, the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said: *"Until you see clear (buwaahan) kufr, for which you have with you evidence from Allaah."* Pay attention here: *"you have with you (indakum)"* meaning that this evidence is firmly settled in you hearts and is clear in front of your eyes, not any type of *kufr* rather it must be clear, explicit and apparent!

that prevented revolting against the Muslim leaders.¹⁹³ There are other statements such as that in *at-Tabdeeb wa't-Tabdbee* of al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalaanee who mentioned in whilst highlighting the biography of al-Hasan ibn Saalih ibn Hayy. He noted: **'This was in the affair in the past at the beginning of Islaam and then the ummah agreed upon the opposite.'**

As for the evidence for the consensus then a consensus cannot be verified except with evidences, so what are the evidences for this consensus which are used by many of the people of knowledge? As we said from it (the evidences) are the statements from an-Nawawee, Ibn Battaal, al-Haafidh ibn Hajar and other people of knowledge. The evidences are abundant and we will highlight the most important evidences. From the evidences are the *hadeeth* of 'Ubaadah ibn Saamit which is in *Saheeh Muslim* wherein the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) stated: "We pledged allegiance¹⁹⁴ to the Messenger of Allaah that we hear and obey and in what we love and what we hate and in what is hard for us and what is not hard for us and even in things which we do not like and not that we should not dispute over leadership and not try to challenge those who possess it and are responsible for its affairs and try to wrestle it from them." Except if you see, as the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) stated, clear explicit (*buwaaban*) *kufr*, which is apparent, explicit and uncovered in which there is no difference or doubt regarding it. Importantly, this is not to be decided upon by the common people or by the riff-raff and rabble, this is decided upon by the people of knowledge who are firmly grounded in knowledge as they are the people who understand the state of affairs and estimate it with a just estimation. "Until you see clear (*buwaaban*) *kufr*, for which you have with you evidence from Allaah." Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah (*raheemahullaah*) appended to this *hadeeth* in his book *Minbaaj us-Sunnah* saying: **'This issue is a clear obligation from the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) even if the ruler takes from the people unjustly and gives precedence to himself over the people and falls in oppression. But this hadeeth prohibits us from challenging the rulers and trying to wrestle rulership from them.'** Meaning: even if they are oppressors, it is incumbent to obey and if they take

¹⁹³ See *Sharh Saheeh Muslim*, vol.12, p.229

¹⁹⁴ Shaykh 'Ali stated: "*Bayah'naa Rasullullaah...*" means: that we are the ones who pledge allegiance to the Messenger, we are the doers and the messenger of Allaah is the *maf'ul bihi*. But if we say "*Bayyah'naa Rasullullaah*" means that we are the *maf'ul-bihi* and the messenger of Allaah is the one who made bay'ah to us.

anything without right it still is not permissible to revolt against them. He continued saying: **'This is a prohibition of revolting against them as they are the people who wield the reins of leadership, Allaah has commanded us to obey them and they the power and they utilise it to fulfil what they do.'**¹⁹⁵ Imaam al-Kirmaanee, who has an explanation of Saheeh Bukhaaree before al-Haafidh ibn Hajar and in fact Ibn Hajar benefited from his explanation, stated: **'This hadeeth indicates that a ruler should not be toppled due to his fisq (sin) because in doing so would lead to tribulation, spilling of blood, dissension and enmity and the harms of this is worse than the harm of him remaining in his position of leadership.'**

There is another *hadeeth* which certifies the same meaning of preventing revolting against the leaders, rulers and those in charge of the responsibilities. It is the *hadeeth* which is also in *Saheeh Muslim* from Umm Salamah (*radi Allaahu 'anha*) wherein she said: "The Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said: "Rulers will gain authority over you. You will know, recognise and accept that which is righteous and you will reject that which is evil."¹⁹⁶ So whoever hates that has freed himself and whoever gives advice has saved himself, but the problem is with the ones who are satisfied and go along with that (evil)." They (the companions) said: "Should we not fight them?" He (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said "No! As long they pray" and in another *hadeeth* "No! As long as they establish the prayer" meaning: as long as they permit you to pray and the prayer is the greatest practical symbol of Islaam so as long as the prayer is established and permitted then this is the greatest sign of Islaam after the two testimonies of faith. Ibn Taymiyyah stated in *Minhaj us-Sunnah*:

¹⁹⁵ Shaykh 'Ali stated: Meaning that they have the authority, power and ability of command and to implement and rule according to it. it is not a mere saying and for this reason the Muslims who currently dwell in the West, what do we say to them? We say to them that is not permissible to instigate chaos, revolt and agitation and we do not say this in thinking that such rulers (in the West) are Muslims as they are neither Muslims nor do they say that they are Muslims however the greater benefit is not to cause destabilisation and agitation in those countries, not to mention in the Muslims countries aswell, does not bequeath anything except for tribulation, inquisition, calamity which is not known except by the Lord of the Worlds.

¹⁹⁶ Shaykh 'Ali stated: In regards to the *hadeeth* about "whoever sees an evil then let him change it with his hand, or with his tongue (by speaking) or with his heart" then changing with the heart is for the common people and likewise their rejection is via their hearts. As for changing the evil by speaking then this is for the scholars and the people of knowledge. Another *hadeeth* which was authenticated by our Shaykh (i.e. Imaam al-Albaanee, *raheemahullaah*) and makes clear that advice to the ruler differs from advice to the common people, wherein the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) said "Whoever has advice for the Muslim ruler then he should not be given openly, rather it should be done privately."

The Messenger of Allaah prohibited the Muslims from fighting against the rulers along with informing the Muslims that they will see some sins (from the leaders). **This is a clear proof that it is impermissible to revolt against the rulers by means of the sword (i.e. with weapons) as this is the same as the khawaarij, zaydiyyah and mu'tazilah view as permissible.**

Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah stated about the revolt of Husayn (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) in *Minhaaj us-Sunnab*:

For this reason, when Husayn (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) wanted to go out to the people of 'Iraaq after they had written many letters to him. The notables of the people of knowledge and deen such as Ibn 'Umar, Ibn 'Abbaas and Abee Bakr ibn Abdirahmaan ibn il-Haarith ibn il-Hishaam advised him not to go as they thought that he would be killed.¹⁹⁷ To the extent that some of them said "may you place your trust in Allaah from being killed."¹⁹⁸ It would emerge that the affair was as they had said and there was not in his (Husayn's) insurrection any benefit for the deen and no benefit for the dunya¹⁹⁹, rather those oppressors and transgressors were established the earth, they seized him until he was killed unjustly and was martyred. And in his insurrection and his being killed was a great corruption which would not have occurred had he remained in his country. He only intended to establish good and ward off from evil, yet he did not achieve anything.²⁰⁰ Rather, evil increased in his revolt and due to his death and the good was diminished with that and that (his revolt, death and occurred as a result of the action) became a reason for great evil, as the killing of Husayn caused tribulation just as the killing of 'Uthmaan caused tribulation. So all of this makes clear that what the Prophet (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*) instructed regarding patience with the oppression of leaders and avoiding fighting them or trying to revolt against them is the most rectifying affair of the servants (of Allaah) in the dunya and the Hereafter and whoever opposed

¹⁹⁷ When Husayn (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) said that he wanted to go they told him not to go.

¹⁹⁸ Meaning: before he went out they said "you will be killed."

¹⁹⁹ Shaykh 'Ali stated: Also, we neither throw doubts on the intentions of Husayn nor do we throw doubt upon his desire to spread the *deen* and we do not throw doubt on his safeguarding that which is more complete and better, however is it from the conditions that he (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) will not be mistaken? What happened, happened, which indicated that he (*radi Allaahu 'anhu*) was not correct in that matter.

²⁰⁰ Therefore, his intention in revolting was what? To establish good and ward off evil.

this intentionally²⁰¹ or mistakenly²⁰², no rectification was realised with his action rather corruption. For this reason, the Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) praised his Hasan²⁰³ by saying “my son here is a sayyid and through him Allaah will resolve a matter between two great groups of the Muslims.²⁰⁴” The Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam) did not praise anyone for fighting during a tribulation, for revolting against the leaders, for withdrawing obedience to the ruler, or for splitting off from the jamaa'ah (the congregation of Muslims).

Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafee in *Sharh ut-Tabaawiyah*, p.370 mentions:

وأما لزوم طاعتهم وإن جاروا؛ لأنه يترتب على الخروج من طاعتهم من المفاسد

أضعاف ما يحصل من جورهم بل في الصبر على جورهم تكفير السيئات ومضاعفة

الأجور، فإن الله تعالى ما سلطهم علينا إلا لفساد أعمالنا وجزاء من جنس

العمل. فعلينا الاجتهاد في الاستغفار والتوبة وإصلاح العمل. فإذا أراد الرعية أن

يتخلصوا من ظلم الأمير الظالم فليتركوا الظلم...

Adhering to obedience to them (i.e. the leaders), even if they oppress, because revolting against them will result in greater corruptions than their oppression. Rather, to be patient with their transgression absolves one from evil actions and multiplies the rewards. Allaah has only placed such leaders over us due to our corrupt actions so the results are from the actions being done, so it is for us to strive in seeking forgiveness from Allaah and to repent and rectify our actions...**So if the people want to be free from the oppression of the oppressive leader they have to leave off oppression themselves.**

And there are many more statements from the scholars to destroy the ideology of *kburooj*.

²⁰¹ Meaning: to intend corruption.

²⁰² He wants rectification yet does not realise it.

²⁰³ Hasan, the brother of Husayn, Husayn revolted so Hasan was better.

²⁰⁴ The *hadeeth* is in Bukhaaree.

**THE 'AQEEDAH OF IMAAM AHMAD IBN HANBAL
(D.241AH)**

Imaam Ahmad mentions in his *Usool us-Sunnah* that revolt against a Muslim leader is not to be made. He states under point 53:

And whoever revolts against a leader from among the leaders of the Muslims, after the people had agreed upon him and united themselves behind him, after they had affirmed the khilaafah for him, in whatever way this khilaafah may have been, by their pleasure and acceptance or by (his) force and domination (over them), then this revolter has disobeyed the Muslims, and has contradicted the narrations of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alayhi wassallam). And if the one who revolted against the ruler died he would have died the death of ignorance.

Then point 54:

And the killing of the one in power is not lawful, and nor is it permissible for anyone amongst the people to revolt against him. Whoever does that is an innovator, (and is) upon other than the Sunnah and the (correct) path.²⁰⁵

Therefore, the claim of Omar Bakri in his treatise on *Ahl us-Sunnah* in ftn.123 on page 111 of his ebook which has been linked to previously that **“Imaam Ahmed rose against and publically championed people against the state...”** is false.

THE 'AQEEDAH OF ABOO BAKR AL-ISMAA'EELEE

(D.371AH)²⁰⁶

²⁰⁵ For both and Arabic and English texts see *Foundations of the Sunnah by Imaam Ahmad ibn Hanbal* (Birmingham: Salafi Publications, 1417 AH/1997 CE), pp.37-38

²⁰⁶ The info in this section is taken from al-Haafidh Abee Bakr Ahmad bin Ibraaheem al-Ismaa'eelee, Jamaal 'Azoon (ed.), intro. By Shaykh Hamaad bin Muhammad al-Ansaaree, *Kitaab 'Itiqaad Ahl is-Sunnah* (Riyadh, KSA: Daar Ibn Hazm, 1420 AH/1999 CE), pp.9-18.

Before we come to the relevant text from Aboo Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee's *T'tiqaad Ahl us-Sunnah* we will look at his biography. Al-Hasan bin 'Ali al-Haafidh stated in *Taareekh Jurjaan*²⁰⁷:

Shaykh Aboo Bakr should have classified his own *Sunan* as he was able to write much due to his knowledge, understanding and honour.

Aboo 'Abdullaah al-Haakim stated, as reported in *Siyar 'A'laam un-Nubalaa*, vol.16, p.294:

Al-Ismaa'eelee was one of his time, a Shaykh of the *Muhadditheen* and *Fuqubaa* and most noble of them in leadership....there is no difference among the scholars of the two sciences and their intelligentsia about Aboo Bakr.

Adh-Dhahabee stated in *Siyar*, vol.16, p.292: **“the Imaam, Haafidh, Hujjah, Faqeeh, Shaykh ul-Islaam.”** As-Subkee stated in *Tabaqaat ash-Shaafi'iyyah al-Kubraa*, vol.3, p.7: **“The Imaam of the people of Jurjaan,²⁰⁸ the reference point in Fiqh and Hadeeth, the author of classifications.”**

His Birth, Life and Death:

He is the Imaam, Haafidh, Hujjah, Faqeeh, Shaykh ul-Islaam Aboo Bakr ibn Ibraaheem bitn Ismaa'eel bin al-'Abbaas al-Jurjaanee al-Ismaa'eelee ash-Shaafi'ee the author of *as-Sabeeh* and the Shaykh of the Shaafi'iyyah, he was born in 277 AH/890CE. He wrote down hadeeth with his own handwriting while he was young and started seeking knowledge in 289AH. He classified narrations which bore witness to his leadership in *fiqh* and *hadeeth*. Hamza stated **“Aboo Bakr died in Ghazzah in Rajab 371 AH/June 902 CE aged 94 years of age.”**

His Works:

²⁰⁷ Hamza as-Sahmee, *Taareekh Jurjaan*, p.70.

²⁰⁸ 'Jurjaan' is the Arabic name for 'Gorgan' which is the capital city of the Golestan Province in Northern Iraan and is south-east of the Caspian Sea.

Dr. Ziyad Muhammad Mansoor mentioned in *Kitaab ul-Mu'jam fee Asaamee Shuyookh Abee Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee* (al-Madeenah al-Munawwarrah: Maktabah al-'Uloom wa'l-Hikam, 1410 AH/1990 CE, First Edn.)²⁰⁹ 17 works:

1. *al-Mu'jam fee Asaamee Shuyookhibi*
2. *al-Mustakbraj 'alaa Sabeeh il-Bukhaaree*
3. *al-Madkhal ilaa Sabeeh il-Bukhaaree*, with objections and answers to them.²¹⁰
4. *al-Musnad al-Kabeer*
5. *Musnad 'Umar*
6. *Musnad 'Ali*
7. *Musnad Yahyaa al-Ansaaree*
8. *Hadeeth Yahyaa bin Abee Bakr.*
9. *al-Fawaa'id*
10. *al-'Awaalee*
11. *Kitaab Abaadeeth il-'A'mash*
12. *Hadeeth*, which has the *abaadeeth* of other *hadeeth* scholars, *al-Majmoo'* 31.
13. *Su'alaat us-Sabmee*
14. *Mu'jam us-Sabaabah*
15. *Su'alaat ul-Barqaanee*
16. *Risaalah fi'l-Aqeedah*, this was mentioned by as-Saaboonee²¹¹ and Ibn Taymiyyah.²¹²
17. *Kitaab fi'l-Fiqh*
18. *Kitaab 'Itiqaad Abl us-Sunnah*
19. *Jamu' Hadeeth Mis'ar*,²¹³ this was mentioned by Ibn Rajab al-Hanbalee.²¹⁴

²⁰⁹ See vol.1, pp.166-68 with some slight additions to it.

²¹⁰ Ar-Rawdaanee, *Sillatul-Khalaf bi-Mawsool as-Salaf*, p.407, this text was overlooked by the editor of *al-Mu'jam*.

²¹¹ *Sharh Hadeeth in-Nuzool*, pp.51-2

²¹² *Ibid.* and pp.9-10

²¹³ This book was overlooked by the editor Dr Ziyad Muhammad Mansoor in *al-Mu'jam*.

²¹⁴ *Fath ul-Baaree*, vol.1, p.292, vol.7, p.445, vol.8, p.218

His 'Aqeedah:

Al-Haafidh Aboo Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee had *Salafee* beliefs in accordance with the way of the *Ahl ul-Hadeeth wa'l-Athar*. For this reason, Ibn Katheer stated: "He compiled books then benefitted and refined, and he mastered criticism and creed."²¹⁵

This makes clear three matters:

- ❖ That he has a book entitled *T'iqaad Abl us-Sunnah*
- ❖ His statements regarding *'aqeedah* which have been transmitted by many Imaams of this issue.
- ❖ His treatise on *'aqeedah* which was sent to the people of Jeelaan.

Al-Haafidh Aboo 'Uthmaan Ismaa'eel bin 'AbdurRahmaan as-Saaboonnee stated in *'Aqeedah Salaf wa Asbaab ul-Hadeeth*, p.27:

I read in the treatise of Shaykh Aboo Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee to the people of Jeelaan that he said 'Indeed, Allaah descends to the Heavens of the Dunya in accordance with the most correct understanding from the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu alayhi wassallam*)...'

Aboo 'Uthmaan as-Saaboonnee also transmitted the following from al-Ismaa'eelee:

As for the wording and recitation (*Lafdh*) of the Qur'aan then Shaykh Aboo Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee (*rabeemahullaah*) mentioned in his treatise that he classified to the people of Jeelaan. He said in it: 'Whoever claims that his recitation of the Qur'aan is created intending the Qur'aan has spoken with the speech of those who say the Qur'aan is created.'

His Biographical Sources

- ❖ *Taareekh Jurjaan* [The History of Gorgan], pp.108-116, no.98
- ❖ *Al-Kaamil ji't-Taareekh*, pp.9, 16
- ❖ *Al-Muktasar fee Akbbaar il-Bashr*, vol.2, p.122
- ❖ *Taareekh Ibn al-Waradee*, vol.1, p.305
- ❖ *Al-Muntadham*, vol.7, p.108, no.144
- ❖ *Tadhbkeirat ul-Huffaadh*, vol.3, p.947, no.897
- ❖ *Al-Ansaab*, vol.1, 'laam', 36, 'alif'
- ❖ *Al-Tbar*, vol.2, p.358

²¹⁵ *Al-Bidaayah wa'n-Nihaayah*, vol.11, p.298

- ❖ *Tabaqaat ush-Shaafi'iyyah al-Kubraa*, vol.2, 80
- ❖ *Shadbaraat udb-Dhabab*, vol.3, p.75
- ❖ *Al-Bidaayah wa'n-Nihaayah*, vol.11, p.298
- ❖ *Maraat ul-Janaan*, vol.2, p.396
- ❖ *Tabaqaat ul-Huffaadh*, pp.381-2
- ❖ *Duwal ul-Islaam*, vol.1, p.229
- ❖ *Tabaqaat ul-Fuqubaa* by Shiraazee, pp.116, 121
- ❖ *Tabaqaat ush-Shaafi'iyyah* by Ibn Hidaayatillaah, p.95
- ❖ *Wafayaat ul-'A'yaan*, vol.3, p.168
- ❖ *Al-Waafee bi'l-Wafayaat*, vol.6, p.213, no.2678
- ❖ *Tabyeen Kadhib al-Muftaree*, p.192
- ❖ *Mu'jam ul-Buldaan*, vol.2, p.122
- ❖ *Tabaqaat ul-'Abbaadee*, p.86
- ❖ *Al-Lubaab*, vol.1, p.58
- ❖ *As-Siyar*, vol.16, pp.292-96
- ❖ *Al-'Tlaan bi't-Tawbeekh*, p.141
- ❖ *Kashf udb-Dhunoon*, p.1735
- ❖ *Al-'A'laam*, vol.1, p.83
- ❖ *Hidaayat ul-'Aarifeen*, vol.1, p.66
- ❖ *Mu'jam ul-Mu'allifeen*, vol.1, p.135
- ❖ *Taareekh ut-Turaath al-'Arabee*, vol.1, p.329

Tracing the Book 'Itiqaad Ahl us-Sunnah to Aboo Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee:

The creed of al-Ismaa'eelee was affirmed by Ibn Qudaamah²¹⁶ where he said:

...ash-Shareef Abu'l-'Abbaas Mas'ood bin 'AbdulWaahid bin Matr al-Haashimee informed us²¹⁷ saying: al-Haafidh Abu'l-'Ulaa Saa'id bin Sayyaar al-Harawee informed us saying: Abu'l-Hasan 'Ali bin Muhammad al-Jurjaanee informed us saying: Abu'l-Qaasim Hamzah bin Yoosuf as-Sahmee informed us saying: Aboo Bakr Ahmad bin Ibraaheem al-Ismaa'eelee informed us iin

²¹⁶ In *Dhamm it-Ta'weel*, p.17

²¹⁷ The Arabic used here is 'Abnaa' which is an abridgement of 'Akhbaranaa' (he informed us...).

his book *T'itiqaad Abl us-Sunnah* saying: 'Know, may Allaah have mercy on us and you, that the madhdhab of the people of hadeeth, the people of *Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah* is...'

Via Ibn Qudaamah and transmitted by adh-Dhahabee²¹⁸ who said: "Ismaa'eel ibn 'AbdurRahmaan bin al-Faraa' informed us: Shaykh Muwaffaquddeen 'Abdullaah..." *al-'Allaamah* al-Albaanee²¹⁹ stated about this *isnaad*: "All of the men in the *isnaad* are trustworthy and well-known except for Mas'ood bin 'AbdulWaahid al-Haashimee, I did not find a biography of him." Adh-Dhahabee mentioned the accuracy of this *isnaad* saying in his book *al-Arba'een*: "We heard this creed with an authentic *isnaad* from him (meaning: from al-Ismaa'eelee)."²²⁰ Ibn Taymiyyah stated in *Dar' at-Ta'aarud*:

The statements which do not have any basis in the Book, *Sunnah* and *Ijmaa'* are the negated statements which are stated by the *Jabmiyyah*, *Mu'tazilah* and others. They describe the people who affirm the Attributes mentioned in the confirmed texts who say: The Qur'aan is not created or that Allaah will be seen in the Hereafter or that Allaah is Above the Worlds, as being "*Mujassima*" (anthropomorphists) and "*Hashwiyah*" (worthless ones). Yet these three matters have been agreed upon by the *Salaf* of the *Ummah* and its Imaams. The *ijmaa'* of *Abl us-Sunnah* from the statements of the *Salaf* in these matters has been corroborated by more than one of the Imaams, such as: Ahmad bin Hanbal, 'Ali bin al-Madane, Ishaq bin Ibraaheem, Daawood bin 'Ali...and like **Abee Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee**..."²²¹

Al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalaanee stated in *Fath ul-Baaree*, transmitting from al-Ismaa'eelee what is connected to the division between *emaan* and Islaam: "Al-Ismaa'eelee relayed this from the people of *Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah* who said "They are both differ in their evidences when compared..."²²²

'Aqeedah on Dealing with the Rulers from Aboo Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee:

In his *T'itiqaad Abl us-Sunnah*, Aboo Bakr al-Ismaa'eelee states in point no.43:

They (*Abl us-Sunnah*) view that the prayer, whether it is congregational or any other, should be made behind every Muslim Imaam, good or sinful, because Allaah made the congregational

²¹⁸ *Al-Uluww*, p.167; *Tadhkiratul-Huffaadh*, vol.3, p.449 and *Siyar*, vol.16, p.295

²¹⁹ *Mukhtasar al-Uluww*, p.49

²²⁰ *Al-Arba'een fee Sifaat Rabb ul-'Aalameen*, p.118.

²²¹ *Al-Arba'een fee Sifaat Rabb ul-'Aalameen*, p.118.

²²² *Fath ul-Baaree*, vol.1, p.105

prayer obligatory specifically and absolutely. This is even though Allaah knew that some of those who establish it will be immoral and sinful, and he did not exempt any time or instruct to make another congregation.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

The *Sahaabah* (*ridwaanullaabi 'alayhim*) used to pray behind those whose sin they knew about as 'Abdullaah ibn Mas'ood and others prayed behind al-Waleed bin 'Uqbah bin Abee Mu'eet and he used to drink alcohol. He prayed *Subh* with four *Rakaats* and 'Uthmaan ibn 'Affaan whipped him for that. 'Abdullaah bin 'Umar and other Sahaabah used to pray behind al-Hajjaaj bin Yoosuf and the Companions and Successors used to pray behind Ibn Abee 'Ubayd who was accused of *Ilhaad* and calling to misguidance.²²³

Then he states:

44 – They view *jibaad* against the *kuffaar* with the leaders even if the leaders are sinful and immoral.

45 – They view that du'aa should be made for the leaders so that they be righteous and just.

46 – They do not view that khurooj be made against the leaders with the sword (i.e. with weapons).

47 – Nor should there be any fighting during fitna (tribulations).

48 – They view that the transgressing group be fought against with the just Imaam.

49 – They view that the abodes are places of Islaam (Daar ul-Islaam) and not Daar ul-Kufr as the Mu'tazilah say. As long as the call to prayer is made and the prayer established apparently and the people are established (with their deen) in it with safety.²²⁴

So here alone we can see how the likes of Bakri, Aboo Hamza, Awlaki and Faysal disregard the true *'aqeedah* of the *Salaf* and cover it up.

²²³ *Majmoo' ar-Rasaa'il wa'l-Masaa'il*, vol.5, p.199

²²⁴ See *Kitaab 'Itiqaad Ahl is-Sunnah*, pp.55-56

THE 'AQEEDAH OF ISMAA'EEL BIN YAHYAA AL-MUZANEE (D. 264 AH)²²⁵

He was the author of *Sharh us-Sunnah* and was an Imaam of the Muslims, the 'Ulama testified to his knowledge, virtue, *zuhd* (asceticism) and *wara'* (abstemiousness). He is Aboo Ibraaheem Ismaa'eel bin Yahyaa al-Muzanee, the companion of ash-Shaafi'ee, he died in 264 AH. This Imaam lived through the reign of eleven different *khulafaa'* from the Abbasid Empire:

- Haaron ar-Rasheed (d.193 AH/809 CE)
- Muhammad al-Ameen (d.198 AH/814 CE)
- Al-Ma'moon (d.218 AH/833 CE)²²⁶
- Al-Mu'tasim (d. 227 AH/842 CE)²²⁷
- Al-Waathiq (d. 232 AH/847 CE)²²⁸
- Al-Mutawakkil (d. 247AH/861 CE)²²⁹
- Al-Muntasir (d. 248 AH/862 CE)
- Al-Musta'een (d. 252 AH/866 CE)
- Al-Mu'tazz (d. 255 AH/869 CE)

²²⁵ The info in this section is abridged from Jamaal 'Azzoon (ed.), *Ismaa'eel bin Yahyaa al-Muzanee (d.264 AH) wa Risaalatahu Sharh us-Sunnah* (Riyadh, KSA: Daar Ibn Hazm, 1420 AH/2000 CE), pp.10-47.

²²⁶ He was the one who tested all of the scholars of his time with saying if that the Qur'aan was created, he wrote to his deputies and threatened the scholars. Most of the scholars went along with the heretical creed out of fear except for Ahmad ibn Hanbal and Muhammad ibn Nooh, they were both chained and sent to be tried by al-Ma'moon who was in Tarsoos (currently in Turkey), but al-Ma'moon died before their arrival. Adh-Dhahabee, *Duwal al-Islam*, p.132

²²⁷ He also tested the people with the creed of the Qur'aan being created and wrote to the different lands saying that this should be the creed. See *Siyar 'A'lam un-Nubalaa*, vol.10, p.291

²²⁸ He tested the people with the creed of the Qur'aan being created also during 231 AH, during this time Ahmad ibn Nasr al-Khazaa'ee was executed for refusing to give into the heretical creed. See adh-Dhahabee, *Duwal al- Islam*, p.139

²²⁹ He revived the *Sunnah* and killed the innovation of the creed of the Qur'aan being created. See *ibid.*, p.149

- Al-Muhtadee (d. 256 AH/870 CE)
- Al-Mu'tamid (d. 279 AH/892 CE)

This Imaam lived in Egypt among a large portion of *Huffaadh*, *Muhadditheen*, *Fuqahaa*, *Quraa'*, *Zubbaad* and others. Such as the likes of:

- the 'Aalim of Egypt Abee Muhammad 'Abdullaah Ibn Wahb al-Fihree (d. 197 AH);
- Imaam Abee 'Abdillaah ibn Idrees ash-Shaafi'ee (d. 204 AH), who was with al-Muzanee a lot and affected him greatly.
- The *Muhaddith* of Egypt Sa'eed Abee Maryam al-Haafidh (d. 224 AH)
- The Shaykh of Egypt Harmalah bin Yahyaa at-Tujaybee al-Haafidh al-Faqeeh, the compiler of *al-Mukhtasar* and *al-Mabsoot*, he died in 223 AH
- Haafidh ul-Misr Ahmad ibn Saalih al-Misree, one of the notable who died in 248 AH

Outside of Egypt during the time of al-Muzanee were:

- Sufyaan bin 'Uyaynah, the Shaykh of the Hijaz who died in 197 AH
- The *Haafidh* of the era Aboo Daawood Sulaymaan bin Daawood at-Tayaalsee (d.204 AH)
- Shaykh ul-Ummah Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 241 AH)
- Shaykh ul-Islaam, the *Haafidh* of the era Muhammad bin Ismaa'eel al-Bukhaaree (d. 256 AH)
- The *Haafidh* of Khurasaan,²³⁰ Muslim bin al-Hajjaaj al-Qushayree (d. 261 AH)

And there were others whom al-Muzanee comprehended and lived at the same as, during this time there were great academic achievements wherein the scholars authored precious compilations, classifications and books and the treatise of al-Muzanee was influential during that time.

²³⁰ The descriptions of these notable are taken from the book *Duwal ul-Islaam* by adh-Dhahabee

He was born in the year when al-Layth bin Sa'd died 175 AH²³¹ and it is apparent that his family had a love for knowledge and its people and they had a righteous and academic upbringing. The scholars of the sister of al-Muzanee mentioned that she used to attend the gatherings of knowledge given by Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee and ar-Raafi'ee used to transmitted narrations from her in his Book of *Zakat*.²³² Ibn us-Subkee mentioned her as did al-Isnawee in *at-Tabaqaat*.²³³ His biographers do not go in depth in mentioning his teachers rather they restrict them to the following:

1. Muhammad ibn Idrees ash-Shaafi'ee²³⁴
2. 'Ali bin Ma'bad bin Shaddaad al-Basree²³⁵
3. Nu'aym bin Hamaad²³⁶
4. Asbagh bin Naafi²³⁷

²³¹ Adh-Dhahabee, *Siyar*, vol.12, p.492

²³² From his book *al-'Azeez* which was his commentary of *al-Wajeez* of al-Ghazaalee, it is also known as *as-Sharh ul-Kabeer*. [TN]

²³³ As-Suyootee, *Hasanul-Muhaadhirah*, vol.1, p.399. Al-Isnawee in vol.1, p.44 said "I do not know the date of her death". It is worth brining to attention here two relatives of al-Muzanee:

First: ar-Rabee' bin Sulaymaan al-Muraadee, the brother of al-Muzanee via suckling (having suckled from the same woman as babies). Adh-Dhahabee reports in *Siyar*, vol.12, p.392 with a chain of transmission to Abi'l-Fawaaris as-Sindee saying "**al-Muzanee died in 264 AH and ar-Rabee' died in 270 AH**", adh-Dhahabee said "**Between their suckling at birth was six months**".

Second: His nephew, at-Tahaawee, the famous Imaam and author of *al-'Aqeedah Tahaawiyyah*.

²³⁴ Soon will come some speech regarding the influence of Imaam Shaafi'ee on al-Muzanee.

²³⁵ A resident of Egypt and one of its senior Imaams, he narrated from Muhammad bin al-Hasan *al-Jaami' al-Kabeer* and *al-Jaami' as-Sagheer*. He died in 218 AH, see *Siyar 'A'lam un-Nubalaa'*, vol.10, p.631

²³⁶ Ibn Mu'awiyah al-Khazaa'ee, the Imaam, *Allaamah, Haafidh*, he arrived in Egypt and did not leave it until al-Mu'tasim presided over it and thus he was asked about the Qur'aan being created and he refused to answer with what al-Mu'tasim wanted. He was imprisoned in Saamaraa' where he remained until death in 228 AH. See *Siyar*, vol.10, p.595. Al-Muzanee was asked about his beliefs about the Qur'aan and narrations, as will be mentioned shortly.

²³⁷ Ibn Sa'eed bin Naafi' Aboo 'Abdullaah al-Umawee al-Misree al-Maalikee, he died in 225 AH. See *Siyar*, vol.10, pp.656-58

Ibn Yoonus stated in his *Taareekh*²³⁸: “The companion of ash-Shaafi’ee, he was of great worship and virtue, trustworthy in *hadeeth*, the dexterous scholars did not differ over him, he was one of those who was abstinent in the *Dunya* and was from the best of Allaah’s creation, his qualities are many.”²³⁹

Aboo Ishaq ash-Sheeraazee stated: “He was an abstinent scholar, a debater, a proof, emerged in the detailed meanings.”²⁴⁰ Amru bin ’Uthmaan al-Makkee said:

I have not seen anyone with abundant worship from those who I have met from the people of Makkah than him. I have not met anyone from the people of Shaam and Alexandria and its surrounding areas and fortified areas with as such efforts as al-Muzanee. And I have not seen anyone as constant in worship than him. And I have not seen anyone who has exalted knowledge and its people than al-Muzanee, he was the most intense on himself in *wara’* which he bequeathed to the people. He used to say “I am from the characteristics of ash-Shaafi’ee (*rabeemabullaah*).”²⁴¹

Aboo Sa’eed bin as-Sakkaree stated: “When I saw al-Muzanee I realised that I had not seen one who worships Allaah more than him or understands the details of *fiqh* more than him.”²⁴² Al-’Abbaadee said “He was an ascetic and abstinent scholar he had nice statements when debating...”²⁴³ Ibn ’AbdulBarr stated:

He was a scholar and *Faqeeh*, a well known reference point, he had great abilities in debating and was understanding of the different aspects of speech and argumentation. He had good speech and was the foremost from the *madbhab* of Shaafi’ee and his statements memorising its principles with precision. He has many books in the Shaafi’ee *madbhab* that no one else ever equalled. The people tired after him, he was the most knowledgeable from the companions of Shaafi’ee in debating, he had detailed knowledge and his books and abridgements circulated

²³⁸ His history has not lost its precious heritage and nothing of it exists except for transmissions of praise in biographies. See the book Dr. Bashhaar ’Awwaad adh-Dhahabee and his methodology in the book *Taareekh ul-Islaam*, p.234 wherein he mentions among the publications his abridgement of Ibn Yoonus’ *Taareekh*.

²³⁹ *Wafayaat ul-’A’yaan*, vol.1, p.218

²⁴⁰ *Siyar*, vol.12, p.493 with a chain of transmission back to him and that which is in *Tabaqaat ul-Fuqahaa*, p.89 of ash-Sheeraazee: “A proof of the detailed meanings...”

²⁴¹ Al-Bayhaqee, *Manaaqib ush-Shaafi’ee*, vol.2, p.351, with an *isnaad* back to him.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, vol.2, p.351

²⁴³ *Tabaqaat ul-Fuqahaa ush-Shaafi’iyyah*, p.9

throughout the different regions of the earth, east and west. He was pious, abstinent, religious and patient with little and simple-living.²⁴⁴

Ibn ul-Jawzee said:

The companion of Shaafi'ee (*raheemabullaah*) he was a deft *Faqeeh*, trustworthy in *hadeeth* and was of abundant worship and virtue he was from the best and gracious of Allaah's creation and adhered to the fortified frontline areas (*Ribaat*).²⁴⁵

Ibn Khallikaan said "The Imaam of the Shaafi'ees and the most knowledgeable of them of his way (i.e. the way of Shaafi'ee), his *fataawaa* and whatever had been transmitted from him."²⁴⁶

Adh-Dhahabee said "The Imaam, *Allaamah*, *Faqeeh* of the religion, the knowledgeable *Zaabid*."²⁴⁷ As-Subkee stated "The great Imaam, the supporter of the *madhdbab*, a mountain of

knowledge, the decisive debater, the *Zaabid*, the abstemious, the one detached from the *Dunya*."²⁴⁸ al-Isnawee (772 AH/1371 CE) stated "He was an ascetic Imaam and *Zaabid*, detached from the *dunya*, exalted among the companions of Shaafi'ee."²⁴⁹

'Aqeedah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imaam Aboo Ibraaheem Ismaa'eel bin Yahyaa al-Muzanee²⁵⁰:

In *Sharh us-Sunnah*, points 14 and 15 states:

14 - Obedience to the People in Authority in that which pleases Allaah and staying away from whatever angers Allaah.²⁵¹

²⁴⁴ *Al-Intiqaa' fee Fadaa'il ath-Thalaathatil-A'immah il-Fuqahaa*, p.110

²⁴⁵ *Al-Muntadham*, vol.12, p.192

²⁴⁶ *Wafayaat ul-'A'yaan*, vol.1, p.218

²⁴⁷ *Siyar*, vol.12, p.492

²⁴⁸ *Tabaqaat ush-Shaafi'iyyah al-Kubraa*, vol.1, p.238

²⁴⁹ *Tabaqaat ush-Shaafi'iyyah*, vol.1, p.34

²⁵⁰ See Ismaa'eel bin Yahyaa al-Muzanee, Jamaal 'Azoon (ed.), *Kitaab Sharh us-Sunnah* (Riyadh, KSA: Daar Ibn Hazm, 1420 AH/2000 CE), p.85.

²⁵¹ Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafee in *Sharh ut-Tahaawiiyyah*, p.370 mentions:

Having obedience to them (the leaders), even if they oppress, because revolting against them will result in greater corruptions than their oppression. Rather, to be patient with their transgression absolves one from evil actions and multiplies the rewards. Allaah has only placed such leaders over us due to our corrupt actions so the results are from the actions being done, so it is for us to strive in seeking forgiveness from Allaah and to repent and rectify our actions...**So if the people want to be free**

15 – Withholding from making *takfeer* of the people of the *Qiblah* (i.e. Muslims) and being free from whatever they do as long as they do not innovate any misguidance. Whoever of them innovates any misguidance is outside the fold of the people of the *Qiblah* and has departed from the *deen*. So one gains nearness to Allaah by freeing oneself from him, abandoning him, hating him and staying away from what he has innovated.

from the oppression of the oppressive leader they have to leave off oppression themselves.”