

Ideas, Silly & Insane, from

BRO HAJJI

AND

DILLY HUSSAIN

**ON THE HISTORY OF THE DA'WAH OF IMAM MUHAMMAD BIN 'ABDULWAHHAB
AND THE ISSUE OF REVOLTING AGAINST THE LEADERS**

© Copyright SalafiManhaj 2020

URL: www.SalafiManhaj.com

E-mail: admin@salafimanhaj.com

Important Note:

The following document is an on-line book publishing of www.SalafiManhaj.com. This book was formatted and designed specifically for being placed on the Web and for its easy and convenient distribution. At the time of this e-book publishing, we are not aware of any other book similar to it, in terms of its translation from its original Arabic source. Since this book was prepared for free on-line distribution we grant permission for it to be printed, disbursed, photocopied, reproduced and/or distributed by electronic means for the purpose of spreading its content and not for the purpose of gaining a profit, unless a specific request is sent to the publishers and permission is granted.

IDEAS, SILLY & INSANE, FROM BRO HAJJI AND DILLY HUSSAIN!

**ON THE HISTORY OF THE DA'WAH OF IMĀM MUHAMMAD
BIN 'ABDULWAHHĀB
AND THE ISSUE OF REVOLTING AGAINST THE LEADERS¹**

By 'AbdulHaq ibn Kofi ibn Kwesi Addae ibn Kwaku al-Ashanti

¹ Written by 'AbdulHaq al-Ashanti (BA, MA and former PhD student, SOAS, University of London).
Dated Sunday 13th September 2020 CE.

Contents

3	Introduction
10	Historical Sources for the History of Najd and the Da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb - Debunking the Ignorant and Selective Reading of Na'eem Safdar ['Bro Hajji']
27	Understanding the Usage of the Term 'Irtidād' in the Historical Sources for the Da'wah Najdiyyah
28	Rulings of Takfeer Are Not Exclusive to the Da'wah Salafiyyah Najdiyyah, With Some Examples of Unqualified Takfeer Based on Desires, Past and Present- Where's 'Bro Hajji'?!
33	The Reality of the Remote and Rural Village Areas in 18 th Century Najd, Shām and Egypt and the Widespread Disbelief in Resurrection
38	The Ruling on Rejecting the Resurrection According to the Classical Scholars
42	Ottoman Scholars Who Tried to Establish Tawheed Within the Ottoman Empire During the 17 th Century, Including Abu's-Su'ud Effendī (896-982 AH/1490-1574 CE), Ibrāheem bin Muhammad bin Ibrāheem al-Halabī (d.945 AH/1538 CE), Shaykh ul-Islām Civizade Effendi (d. 954/1547 CE), Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Aqhisārī ar-Rūmī (d. 1043 AH/1632 CE), Kadizāde Mehmet (d. 1635 CE) and Muhammad al-Ustuwānī (d. 1072 AH/1661 CE)
47	The Significance of Imām 'Uthmān Dan Fodio and the Sokoto Caliphate in all this
49	Shaykh Sālih as-Sindī's Reply to Hātim al-'Awnī's Claim that ISIS is Interlinked to the Da'wah of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb
53	Revolt Against the Leaders, the Stances of the Salaf and the Established Consensus Among Ahl us-Sunnah- Evaluating Bro Hajji's Notions and Recent Articles on Islam21C
71	'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal (d.241 AH/855 CE)
72	'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Abū Ibrāheem Ismā'īl bin Yahyā al-Muzanī (d. 264 AH/877 CE)
76	'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Abū Bakr al-Isma'īlī (d. 371 AH/981 CE)
82	'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Abū 'Uthmān as-Sābūnī (d. 449 AH/1057 CE)
87	Conclusion

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

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

INTRODUCTION

Indeed all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His Aid and ask for His forgiveness, whomsoever Allāh guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allāh misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is no god worthy of worship except Allāh and I bear witness that Muhammad is His Messenger, to proceed:

An individual from Birmingham, who goes by the moniker 'Bro Hajji' (Mohammed Naeem Safdar), may Allāh rectify and reward him, has made a number of Youtube videos in the recent months regarding the da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*). He has also noted some historical events which he relays to form a similitude with modern extremist Khawārij groups. Although 'Bro Hajji' presents some details from a few well-known sources, he has been selective, either willfully or out of ignorance and we will give him the benefit of the doubt for being wholly ignorant of the full picture and the wider version of historical events. Moreover, he still regurgitates notions which are not particularly new and have also been picked up on by assorted Takfirīs and Sūfis over the years, before 'Bro Hajji' graced the scene with his Youtube videos.

Alongside him in this has been Dilly Hussain, may Allāh rectify and reward him, a politics graduate and Tahrīrī-influenced Neo-Ottomanist journalist who espouses ahistorical pan-Turkic views lately in regards to the Uyghur Muslim situation, and also imparts poor historical analysis as he advocates the simplistic and romantic Tahrīrī notion of the Ottoman Empire ruling over the entire Muslim world.² Pan-Turkism is Turkic ethno-nationalism which looks to form a Pan-Turkic cultural and political bloc of all countries which have a Turkic nomadic ethno-identity and has no interest in da'wah to Islām.³

² This simplistic, false and ahistorical notion, initially popularised in the UK by Hizb ut-Tahreer in the 1990s, has been critically assessed here:

<http://salafimanhaj.com/did-muhammad-ibn-abdulwahhab-revolt-against-the-ottomans-after-making-takfir>

³ They call this unified area 'Turān' which stretches from Mongolia all the way to Hungary, and even includes parts of Persia and the Middle East!? It started under the Crimean Tartars in Central Asia

As will be discussed in the conclusion of this offering, the contemporary Salafi 'Ulama have also been clear in their explanations of the issue of removing the unjust tyrannical oppressive leaders and there having to be the *ability* to do this in a way which *does not cause greater harm*. Both Dilly Hussain and Hajji appear to hold that Salafis have a complete blanket prohibition on the issue of removing the unjust leaders. With Hajji's own attitude based on personal and emotional issues due to his poor interactions with a few uninformed ignorant individuals who ascribe themselves to Salafiyyah. Yet Hajji then takes such isolated experiences to be entirely representative of Salafiyyah generally. A key trait among all is evident however – *'Ujb bi'n-Nafs, intisaar li'n-Nafs, Ghurūr, 'Ajala, Ghadab, Ta'ālum, jahl* and *kibr*. This is all a sign of the times as knowledge decreases and ignorance increases.

Dilly Hussain is apparently prepared to make faustian pacts with absolutely anyone and everyone who has an issue with the da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb, be it Tahrīrīs, Takfīrīs, Sūfīs and Ikhwānīs. This is all in order to buttress Dilly Hussain's Neo-Ottomanist da'wah. We have noted before elsewhere that in the UK in the 1990s *Hizb ut-Tabreer* with its roots in Shām where the Ottomans did rule over, began to praise the Ottoman Empire as if it was an all-encompassing Khilāfah in the sense that *all* Muslims around the world were under its authority and dominion. Although in West Africa Imām 'Uthmān Dan Fodio (Ibn Fūdī) for example had his own Empire, referred to as the Sokoto Caliphate, in the nineteenth century CE which was totally independent from Ottoman rule. In India, the Mughal Empire was also independent from Ottoman rule though it had relations with the Ottomans.⁴

In Morocco, the dynasties of the Sa'adīs and 'Alawīs were also not under the Ottomans whatsoever. In fact, the third Sa'adī ruler Muhammad ash-Shaykh in the 16th century fought against the Ottomans at the Battle of Tadla in 1554 CE and wanted the Ottomans out of Morocco. The Ottomans later had him assassinated in 1557 in a deceptive manner by Ottoman agents who claimed to have defected to him from the Ottoman Empire. He was regarded as an enemy to the Ottomans as he did not allow Morocco to become a vassal state for the Ottomans,

under the Russian Czars when they wanted to secure themselves as a political bloc. It is therefore akin to Zionism and Hitler's Pan-Aryanism in its ahistorical and mythical imagination of what constitutes its land mass and geographical extent.

⁴ An interesting book on this topic is by Naimur Rahman Farooqi, *Mughal-Ottoman Relations: A Study of the Political and Diplomatic Relations Between Mughal India and the Ottoman Empire, 1556-1748* (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delhi, 1989). Francis Robinson has also conducted some research on Mughal-Ottoman relations in his paper *Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared Knowledge and Connective Systems*. This research indicates that the Mughals had relations with the Ottomans but were not under their authority whatsoever.

as had occurred in Algeria. This killing was by the order of Hasan Pasha, the son of Barbarosa who ruled over Algeria. Abdullāh al-Ghālib, the son of Muhammad ash-Shaykh, in 1558 CE also fought against the Ottomans at the Battle of Wadi Laban.⁵ The Ottomans had to retreat as the Spanish were attacking Oran in Algeria at the same time. Likewise, Najd in Arabia was independent from Ottoman rule. Dr Sālih al-'Abūd answered this by saying:

لم تشهد " نجد " على العموم نفوذا للدولة العثمانية فما امتد إليها سلطانها ولا ألقى إليها ولاه عثمانيون ولا
جابت خلال ديارها حامية تركية في الزمان الذي سبق ظهور دعوة الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب رحمه

⁵ Muhammad ash-Shaykh was successful in fighting against the Portuguese who had encroached on Moroccan land in the mid-16th century. In 1541 he ousted the Portuguese from Agadir who had been there since 1505 trading in gold and slaves from West Africa. Muhammad ash-Shaykh had acquired weapons from European traders in the region. Muhammad ash-Shaykh had three sons, the oldest two dying while he was still alive so he was succeeded by 'Abdullāh al-Ghālib. When Abdullāh al-Ghālib came to power his three younger brothers fled Morocco for the Ottoman Empire, 'AbdulMumin, 'AbdulMālik and Ahmad al-Mansūr. The three brothers would spend 17 years exiled in Istanbul and they also travelled between Algeria and Istanbul. They were thus trained and instructed by the Ottomans. When 'Abdullāh al-Ghālib died in 1574 his son Abū 'Abdullāh Muhammad became the ruler.

Meanwhile his uncle, Abū Marwān 'AbdulMālik who had been in exile in the Ottoman Empire, was amassing an empire of Ottoman troops to invade Morocco. Which he did in 1576 and defeated his nephew at Fez, Sale and Taroudant. Both Abū 'Abdullāh Muhammad and 'AbdulMālik would die at the Battle of al-Qasr al-Kabeer [Ksar el-Kebir] in 1578, also known as the Battle of the Three Kings. Here Abū 'Abdullāh Muhammad aligned with the young king of Portugal Sebastian I against his uncle 'AbdulMālik. Ahmad al-Mansūr survived the battle and then became the ruler of Morocco and would preside over the Battle of Tondibi when he invaded and sacked the Songhai Empire at the time and enslaved the scholars of Timbuktu, Gao and Jenne. Indeed, this army which invaded Songhai was largely comprised of captured Portuguese from the Battle of the Three Kings the main one being the commander Judar Pasha.

The Battle of the Three Kings was a disaster particularly for Portugal as the captured nobles were ransomed by Ahmad al-Mansūr and this nearly bankrupted Portugal. Moreover, Portugal then weakened and were attacked by Spain and so later had to go into political alliance with the Spanish. The young king Sebastian and the Portuguese only got involved in the Battle of the Three Kings due to their commercial and business interests in the country and to thwart the Ottomans in the region. Abū 'Abdullāh Muhammad had also asked for assistance from them.

Even though the three brothers had been exiled in, and had contact with, the Ottoman Empire, Ahmad al-Mansūr the sixth Sa'adi ruler still did not allow Morocco to become a vassal state of the Ottomans. Hence, he was able to maintain Moroccan independence from the Ottomans and they did not meddle in internal Moroccan affairs. He also utilised diplomacy in such a way as to play off the Ottomans and various European powers against each other.

الله وما يدل على هذه الحقيقة التاريخية استقرار تقسيمات الدولة العثمانية الإدارية فمن خلال رسالة تركية عنوانها : " قوانين آل عثمان مضامين دفتر الديوان " يعني : " قوانين آل عثمان في ما يتضمنه دفتر الديوان " ، ألفها يمين علي أفندي الذي كان أميناً للدفتر الخاقاني سنة 1018 هجرية الموافقة لسنة 1609م من خلال هذه الرسالة يتبين أنه منذ أوائل القرن الحادي عشر الهجري كانت دولة آل عثمان تنقسم إلى اثنتين وثلاثين إيالة منها أربع عشرة إيالة عربية وبلاد نجد ليست منها ما عدا الإحساء إن اعتبرناه من نجد.... .

Najd never came under Ottoman rule, because the rule of the Ottoman state never reached that far, no Ottoman governor was appointed over that region and the Turkish soldiers never marched through its land during the period that preceded the emergence of the call of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb (may Allāh have mercy on him). This is indicated by the fact that the Ottoman state was divided into administrative provinces. This is known from a Turkish document entitled *Qawāneen Āl 'Uthmān Mudāmeen Daftar ad-Dīwān* [Laws of the Ottomans Concerning what is Contained in the Legislation], which was written by Yameen 'Ali Effendi who was in charge of the Constitution in 1018 AH/1609 CE. This document indicates that from the beginning of the eleventh century AH the Ottoman state was divided into 23 provinces, of which 14 were Arabic provinces. The land of Najd was not one of them, with the exception of al-Ihsa', if we count al-Ihsa' as part of Najd.⁶

Other historians in this field who have also affirmed this are Qeymuddin Ahmad, who noted:

In 1577, when the great Ottoman Sultan, Salim (1512-20), conquered Egypt, the Caliphate passed on to the Ottomans, and the Arabian Peninsula too came under their control. On account of its distant position and inhospitable terrain, however, Arabia was not under effective Turkish control. Local chiefs held sway in its different, geographically well-defined zones such as the Hijaz and Najd areas and the southern coastal areas.⁷

⁶ 'Aqeedat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb wa atharuha fī'l-Ālam al-Islami (unpublished), vol.1, p.27.

⁷ Qeyamuddin Ahmad (Professor of History at Patna University), *The Wahhabi Movement in India* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1994, 2nd edition), p.27.

Michael Field noted:

The Nejd, which is culturally and politically the dominant part of the Kingdom, was never part of the Ottoman Empire, and no part of the Kingdom was ever ruled by a European colonial power.⁸

Shahi stated in *The Politics of Truth Management in Saudi Arabia*:

Since the Abbasids in the tenth century, Najd had hardly ever been ruled by a major Islamic empire. Even the Ottomans, who made one of the largest empires in the world, which stretched from Baghdad to Budapest, had minimal reasons to invade and control the area. It did not have any economic, strategic or political significance for the Sultans of the Ottoman Empire. The rulers of the Ottoman Empire regarded the Arabian Peninsula as an insignificant and rather primitive zone whose only importance was the holy sites, such as Mecca and Madinah.⁹

Such historical nuances are completely absent from the discourse of Dilly Hussain and Hajji and indicate their lack of knowledge of history despite being able to read a few books on politics and history. Indeed, Dilly Hussain, with his emphasis on the pillar of political journalism (!!), should not delve into areas which he lacks knowledge in, namely history, ethnography and creed.

In regards this then those who err openly can be corrected likewise, openly. The Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) refuted the one who erred openly. When a delegation came to the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) as relayed in Saheeh Muslim in the hadeeth of 'Adiyy ibn Hātim. The spokesman of this group stood and spoke saying: "Whoever obeys Allāh and the Messenger, then he is guided, and whoever disobeys the two of them, then he is misguided." When the man's error was overt, the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) corrected the error openly. The Messenger of Allāh said (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*): "*What a wretched speaker for the people you are! Instead say: "And whoever disobeys Allāh and His Messenger".*" Hence, Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, and as did Shaykh al-'Allāmah 'Abdul'Azeez bin Bāz (*rahimahumullāh*), that: **Whoever errs openly is to be corrected openly.** Allāh mentioned when He said:

﴿إِلَّا الَّذِينَ تَابُوا وَأَصْلَحُوا وَبَيَّنُّوا﴾

⁸ Michael Field, *Inside the Arab World* (Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995), p.181

⁹ Afshin Shahi, *The Politics of Truth Management in Saudi Arabia* (Abingdon, Oxon and New York, NY: Routledge, 2013), p.45.

“Except those who repent, rectify and manifest (the truth)...”

{*al-Baqarah* (2): 160}

An example of Dilly Hussain's Neo-Ottomanist Manhaj can be observed in a recent podcast dated Sunday 11th September 2020 between Dilly Hussain and Hajji. They attempt to discuss the da'wah of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and the following points are to be noted:

- ❖ Dilly Hussain and Hajji initially appear to hold that it is indeed accurate that Najd was not under the rule of the Ottomans. They refer to al-Munajjid for this.
- ❖ Yet then Dilly Hussain suggests that what Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and Muhammad bin Saud did in establishing their state would still be *khurūj* anyway as they would have to fall under the Ottoman Empire?! This is a preposterous assertion.
- ❖ Dilly Hussain then takes exception that the Ottoman Empire were not advised by Imāms Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and Muhammad bin Saud. Dilly Hussain asks: **“where are the letters giving the Ottomans advice?”** This again is pure ignorance. Firstly, as we will see in this paper, there were many attempts by Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb and his students to impart advice and clarification of their da'wah via the Ottoman vassals that were present in the Hijāz, such as Shareef Ahmad bin Sa'eed and Ghālib bin Sa'eed – we will later see what the response was to the attempts at discussion, negotiation and communication. Secondly, if Dilly Hussain and Hajji hold that Najd was not under Ottoman rule anyway, why would they write letters?! As the Ottomans were not their leaders in the first instance?!
- ❖ It is also evident that both Dilly Hussain and Hajji deem *fighting and warfare between two entirely separate Muslim states* as being 'khurūj' and this is complete ignorance and stupidity. Two entirely separate Muslim states which have mutual enmity and then go to war against each other have not made 'khurūj'. If one party had a pledge of allegiance to the other and then reneged on this, at that point it would be regarded as khurūj. But *when two entirely independent Muslim states* go to war against each other, this is war and politics and not 'khurūj'.
- ❖ And in connection to the above, then Dilly Hussain and Hajji would be more accurate if they applied their idea to the likes of Muhammad 'Ali Pasha. As Egypt under his rule was a vassal state of the Ottomans, the same cannot be said of Najd in the 17th and 18th centuries. Muhammad Ali Pasha later fought against the Ottomans during the First Egyptian-Ottoman War (1831-33) and the Second Egyptian Ottoman War (1839-41). The French and Spanish siding with Muhammad Ali Pasha, while the British, Austrians,

Prussians and Russians aligned themselves with the Ottomans. Moltke published some of the letters he had written during that time as *Letters on Conditions and Events in Turkey in the Years 1835 to 1839*. Nicolas the First of Russia had also sent an army to aid the Ottomans against Muhammad Ali Pasha before in 1832 during the First Turko-Egyptian War. So non-Muslim military strategists and troops were used to fight against other Muslims – **this aspect of history is neatly brushed under the carpet by Dilly Hussain and Hajji either out of academic dishonesty or plain ignorance of actual history. We will give them both the benefit of the doubt and put this down to sheer unadulterated ignorance of actual history generally and of the da'wah of Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb specifically.**

- ❖ Following on from the above, in regards to the oft-repeated “siding with the disbelievers” argument, this indeed will be addressed in this paper. Not only as to why the Da'wah Najdiyyah regarded many who opposed them of doing this due to their accommodation and alignment with those who promoted shirk, but also as the Ottoman Empire also did this. Yet the Neo-Ottomanist Tahrīrīs remain silent on this historical matter. In 1791 CE the Ottomans could not sufficiently defend their territories to the extent that the British Prime Minister of the day, William Pitt, contemplated sending British troops to help the Sultan against the Czar of Russia during the Ottoman-Russian War.¹⁰ In 1838 during the First Egyptian-Ottoman War the German Field Marshall, head of the Prussian Army and military strategist Helmuth von Moltke the Elder, was requested by the Ottoman Sultan at the time Mahmud the Second to modernise the Ottoman army and advise Ottoman generals in their fight against Muhammad Ali Pasha.


HISTORICAL SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF NAJD AND THE DA'WAH OF IMĀM MUHAMMAD BIN 'ABDULWAHHĀB – DEBUNKING THE IGNORANT AND SELECTIVE READING OF NAEEM SAFDAR ['BRO HAJJI']

¹⁰ Selim Deringil (Boğaziçi University, History Department), *The Turks and Europe: Uninvited Guests of Sharers of a Common Destiny?* Paper presented to the *Center for European Studies*, 24 February 2005.

Some of the arguments are not new, they have been merely repackaged by new-age millennial bohemian narcissists. For instance, refer to Shaykh Sulaymān bin Sālih al-Kharāshī's book entitled *Thinā' ul-'Ulama 'ala Kitāb ad-Durar as-Saniyyah fi'l-Ajwibat in-Najdiyyah* [The Scholars Praise of the Book 'ad-Durar as-Saniyyah fi'l-Ajwibat in-Najdiyyah'] refuting the Saudi Sūfī Hasan al-Mālikī on some of the *exact same* contentions as has been presented by Muhammad Naem Safdar [aka 'Bro Hajji'].¹¹

Also Shaykh Sālih as-Sindī's response to Hātim al-'Awnī on the claim that ISIS is established on the method of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb, a translation of which is provided at the end of this paper. Also unfortunately, 'Bro Hajji' denigrates Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*) and deems the Imām as some sort of intellectual precursor of Takfiri groups and ISIS in particular, blindly following void views held by people such as Hātim al-'Awnī and Dr Yasir Qadhi. More elucidation is required to unravel some of what the brother has presented, in order to remove any doubts about the blessed da'wah to Tawheed and the issue of rebellion against Muslim leaders.

In keeping with the line of argumentation put forth for over 300 years by various Sūfī cults and those with personal machinations against Tawheed, 'Bro Hajji' after 21 minutes into his recent video replying against the brother Dr Khalid Green, refers to **“the crimes of Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb”** and supposed **“blood-stained activities similar to Da'eesh”**! This is a horrendous assertion evocative of anti-Islam homocons, not from one claiming to be involved in “da'wah”! We hope that 'Bro Hajji' will recant from this utterance with immediate effect. This is mockery and denigration of great scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah and Tawheed of the past. Allāh says,

 مَا يَلْفِظُ مِنْ قَوْلٍ إِلَّا لَدَيْهِ رَقِيبٌ عَتِيدٌ

“Man does not utter any word except that with him is an observer prepared [to record].”

{Qāf (50): 18}

Yet what makes such remarks all the more questionable is the fact that the text 'Bro Hajji' refers to, from *Tārīkh Ibn Ghannām*, is not even speaking about Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb as he had died before that incident even happened!!?

¹¹ Shaykh Sulaymān bin Sālih al-Kharāshī, *Thinā' ul-'Ulama 'ala Kitāb ad-Durar as-Saniyyah fi'l-Ajwibat in-Najdiyyah* [The Scholars Praise of the Book 'ad-Durar as-Saniyyah fi'l-Ajwibat in-Najdiyyah']. Riyadh, KSA: Dār ul-Qāsim. 1438 AH/2007 CE.

Some historical sources present the da'wah of the Imām in this way, with talk of “marauders”, “brigands”, “pillaging”, “pirates” etc. all of which conjures a particular image. Yet before we get into the history, it will initially be important to note that unlike the modern day Khawārij, Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*) has an entire corpus to which we can refer in order to know his position and views on takfeer. There is no need therefore for anyone to come along now and piece together their own deductions of his views based on reading history books or material not even authored by him later. A Takfīrī or Khārījī however has no such principles and makes takfeer based on sins and in accordance with unqualified deductions with no precedence except from the heritage of Dhu'l-Khuwaysarah. This cannot be compared to the qualified, classical and normative Islamic positions of an actual scholar who emphasised major inadequacies in a core matter which is known in the deen by necessity but had been abandoned, rejected, ridiculed and unknown by the people. Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb said in a letter to one of the scholars of 'Irāq:

Also from them [false allegations] is that you mentioned that I make takfeer of all the [Muslim] people except for those who follow me, this is incorrect. It is strange how this could even enter the mind of an intelligent person, or is this stated by a Muslim or a disbeliever or an astrologer or a madman?¹²

He also said:

As for the saying that we make takfeer generally then that is a falsehood invented by the enemies who block people from the deen by it. We say: glory be to Allāh! This is a sheer lie!¹³

Thus, he did not make takfeer via conjecture, and emphasised *verification* and *establishing proofs about people, safeguarding conditions and removing preventative factors* so that the ignorant is excused due to ignorance and proofs have to be established. The Imām (*rahimahullāh*) said in explaining this:

As for the assertion of the enemies that I hold them to be disbelievers only by conjecture, or I hold an ignorant person against whom no argument has been established to be a disbeliever, then these are sheer lies and false accusations by those who intend to drive the people away from the deen of Allāh and His Messenger.¹⁴

¹² *Ad-Durur as-Saniyyah*, vol.1, p.80

¹³ *Ibid.*1, vol., p.10

¹⁴ *Ar-Rasā'il ash-Shakhsiyyah, ar-Risālah ath-Thālitha* [The Third Treatise], pp.24-5

Shaykh 'Abdullāh bin Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb:

We say about those who have died: those nations are gone and we do not make takfeer except of those to whom the truth of our da'wah was conveyed to, clarified to and the proofs were established upon and then rejected it out of pride and stubbornness.¹⁵

Our Shaykh and teacher, Faisal bin Qazār al-Jāsim (*hafidhabullāh*) explains this in detail¹⁶ and notes that the teaching of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb therefore, when coming across those with practices of kufr which may be somewhat unclear, he deemed the person as ignorant and as having committed an action of kufr - **but takfeer cannot be made specifically of the person until the proof has been established.** As for in issues of Tawheed and practices of Shirk al-Akbar, linked to the fitrah and 'aql, upon which Allāh created people with the natural disposition toward, which necessitate entry into Jannah or Jahannam, which negate Tawheed from its very basis – then this is different according to the Imām. So when Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb talks about not making takfeer of the one who has been deceived by Shirk and supplicates to the dead, makes Tawāf around a tomb, shrine or grave, seeks assistance from the dead etc. – **he is not necessarily judging the person to be Muslim until this was ascertained.**

So when it is stated “**we do not make takfeer of the one who worships an idol**” the conclusion is *not* that such a person is a Muslim. The Imām withheld from deeming the person specifically as being a Mushrik or a disbeliever, **but at the same time did not hold the person to be a Muslim as they have done major actions contrary to Islām.** This is akin to the Ahl ul-Fitrah, who will be tested in the Hereafter as to their faith. If such people do not receive the proofs and still practice Shirk al-Akbar, even if they *ascribe* to Islām, their ruling is that of Ahl ul-Fitrah. So in this world they are treated as kuffār would: du'a is not to be made for them if they die, they do not inherit, they are not to be buried with the Muslims, they are not to be married

¹⁵ *Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, vol,1, p.134

¹⁶ See part 9 of the Shaykh's lecture here entitled *ad-Da'wah al-Islāhiyyah li Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb: Mawqif ul-Imām min at-Takfeer* [The Reform Da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb: The Imām's Stance on Takfeer, Part 9]:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I_Zpjer8lL8&list=PLqrzhTjEHlPAFiOIaiMCKZoibzuUwpsZ9&index=4&pbjreload=101

etc. If they die, Allāh will judge them and on the Day of Judgement they will be given a test. This was stated by Imām Bin Bāz, *rahimabullāh*.¹⁷

The 'Ulama have *not* said that whoever is involved in Shirk al-Akbar *even with pronouncing Islām on the tongue* is a Muslim. This is a clear and strong view, as there are those who were raised on kufr and Christianity and recognised Tawheed and the worship of Allāh, and did not indulge in Shirk al-Akbar, so what is the excuse for the one raised within an Islamic society? Let's look at what some of the Indian scholars and some Hanafī scholars have stated on this matter:

Shah Muhammad Ismā'īl¹⁸ mentioned a number of categories of Shirk such as:

Shirk in making du'ā to the Awliyā and seeking assistance from them; Shirk by making vows and slaughter to the Awliya; Shirk in seeking assistance from the Awliya'; Shirk in naming by ascribing children to the Awliya with the meaning that they give other than Allāh, such as "AbdunNabī" ['Slave of the Prophet'], "Hibbat 'Alī" ['Gift of 'Alī'], "Hibbat Husayn" ['Gift of Husayn'], "Hibbat ul-Murshid" ['Gift of the Guider'], "Hibbat ul-Madār", "Hibbat Sālār" and all of these names are given out of aspiring for calamities to be averted from them; swearing oaths to other than Allāh; sending a nail to other than Allāh in the name of a Walī from the Awliyā of Allāh; binding to a son something tied to his leg in the name of a Walī from the Awliyā of Allāh; prostrating to other than Allāh;¹⁹ believing in the unseen realm ['Ilm ul-Ghayb] other than Allāh; affirming that other than Allāh controls the affairs...²⁰ - all of that is shirk and makes a person become a Mushrik.²¹

Ahmad as-Sirhindī (d. 1034 AH/1623 CE) stated:²²

¹⁷ 'Abdul'Azeez bin 'Abdullāh bin 'AbdurRahmān bin Bāz, *Majmū' Fatāwā wa Maqālāt Mutanawwi'ah* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār ul-Qāsim, 1420 AH, ed. Muhammad bin Sa'd ash-Shuway'ir), vol.9, 398.

¹⁸ He is Muhammad Ismā'īl bin 'AbdulGhanī bin 'AbdulHaleem al-'Umarā ad-Dehlawī al-Hanafī. He was born in Delhi in 1193 AH/1779 CE and died in 1246 AH/1831 CE, of his works are *Taqwiyat ul-Imān* and *Tanweer ul-'Ayn'ayn fī Ithbāt Raf' il-Yadayn*, and other books.

¹⁹ See *al-Bahr ur-Rā'iq*, vol.5, p.124; *al-Marqāh*, vol.2, p.202 and *Rūh ul-Ma'ānī*, vol.17, p.213.

²⁰ See the statements of the Hanafī scholars regarding this in *al-Bahr ur-Rā'iq*, vol.2, p.892; *Rūh ul-Ma'ānī*, vol.17, p.213 and *al-Ibdā'*, p.189.

²¹ *Taqwiyat ul-Imān*, vol.19, p.21 (Urdu version) and an-Nadwī, *Risālat ut-Tawheed*, vol.25, p.33.

²² He is Ahmad bin 'AbdulAhad as-Sirhindī al-Hanafī al-Māturīdī an-Naqshabandī, he authored *Bayān ul-'Aqā'id* which is in accordance with the Madhhab of the Māturīdiyyah and also a work entitled *at-Tahdheeb* which is a Sūfī work. He also has a treatise affirming Prophethood which is a

Shirk is split into two categories: first: Shirk in Wājib ul-Wujūd [Necessary Existence];²³ second: Shirk in 'ibādah [worship].

Imām Ahmad al-Aqhisārī ar-Rūmī (d. 1043 AH/1632 CE), *rahimahullāh*, of the Shaykhs within the Ottoman Empire and had written a treatise on the prohibition of acts of Shirk at graves,²⁴ and Shaykh Subhān Baksh al-Hindī, stated when they mentioned six categories of Shirk:

Shirk ut-Taqreeb which is worship to other than Allāh in order to gain closeness [taqarrub] to Allāh.²⁵

We should also refer to al-Aqhisārī's introduction to his magnum opus *Majālis ul-Abrār wa Masālik ul-Akhyār Mabā'iq al-Bida' wa Maqāmi' al-Asrār* [Gatherings of the Righteous and Paths of the Good in Destroying Innovation and Suppressing Evils]. A hidden gem against the opposers. This work was studied and edited by 'Ali Misrī Surayjān Fawrā as a doctoral thesis submitted to the Islamic University of Madeenah in 1428 AH/2008 CE.

refutation of Shī'ah, he also has other works. He died in 1034 AH at the Sirhind Madrasah and was buried there, for his biography see *Nuzhat ul-Khawātir*, vol.5, pp.43-55.

²³ The notion of 'Wājib ul-Wujūd' ['Necessary Existence'] has its roots in Greek philosophy and influenced the speculative theology of the Māturīdīs and Asharīs. Allāh neither named nor described Himself as 'Wājib ul-Wujūd' in the manner which al-Laqqānī affirms in his acknowledgement of the meaning 'Wājib ul-Wujūd' in his *Jawharat ut-Tawheed*. The Hanafī- Māturīdī therefore also utilise the term a lot, contrary to the way of the Salaf. As they deem 'Wujūd' ['existence'] as the first 'Necessary Attribute' of Allāh. So for example, Muhammad William Charles wrote a treatise entitled *Divine Transcendence in Islam* which is a long-winded Māturīdī text which refers to their main texts and scholars, such as Abū Hafs an-Nasafī, Fakhr ar-Rāzī, Taftazānī and others. It is also explained in a way that is full of theological speculative rhetoric which the common Muslim cannot understand or comprehend at all! On the first page, in keeping with Māturīdī thought:

This transcendent existence is what the Islamic religious scholars call the Necessary Existent (Wajib ul-Wujud), it is what Aristotle called the Primal Cause, or the Unmoving Mover. (!!?)

So he uses the ideas of Aristotle, before any mention of the Qur'ān and Sunnah, to explain what he regards to be the correct creed!? Pure kalām.

For more on this see: Hassān bin Ibrāheem ar-Radeey'ān, *'Aqeedat ul-Ashā'irah: Dirāsah Naqdiyyah li-Mandhūmat Jawharat it-Tawheed li'l-Laqqānī* [The Ash'arī Creed; A Critical Study of the Poem Jawharat ut-Tawheed by al-Laqqānī]. Riyadh, KSA: Dār ut-Tawheed, 2013, pp.129-131.

²⁴ He is Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Aqhisārī al-Hanafī who was also known as "ar-Rūmī" who was from the 'Ulama of the Ottoman Empire. He authored a book on the prohibition of acts of shirk and bida' at the graves. He also has authored a number of classifications and taught the *Shari'* sciences as well as giving *fatāwā*. For his biography see *Hidāyat ul-'Ārifeen*, vol.1, p.157 and *Mu'jam ul-Mu'allifeen*, vol.2, p.83.

²⁵ *Majālis ul-Abrār 'ala Khazeenat il-Asrār*, pp.150-152.

It is a superb work of over 800 pages and 'Ali Fawrā conducted an excellent study with a detailed introduction. His edit and annotated commentary was based on six manuscripts of the magnum opus from the Maktabah Sulaymāniyyah in Turkey (Yasma Bagislar Collection, no.865, which is the best quality copy as it was transcribed six years after the death of al-Aqhisārī, and the library has other copies); Maktabat Makkah al-Mukarramah (which is the Indian copy); the King Faisal Centre for Islamic Studies and Research in Riyadh (which has a number of copies including one copied from the version at the British Museum in London); and the Islamic University of Madeenah microfilm. This work has been somewhat hidden, due to its strong stance against Shirk al-Akbar at graves as was prevalent within the Ottoman Empire. It totally undermines the claims of the 'traditional Islam' adherents, modern Ash'arīs and Maturīdīs that the emphasis on Tawheed and Shirk was invented by Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and has only become popularised since the 1980s due to "Gulf Arab Petro-dollars".

Al-Aqhisārī references Ibn ul-Qayyim extensively in his words on Tawheed and Shirk. Even 'Ali Fawrā's version has not been published although the thesis is available and will be linked to in the footnotes. It does show that there were scholars within the Ottoman Empire fighting against Shirk al-Akbar, and more on this will be mentioned later insha'Allāh. Al-Aqhisārī ar-Rūmī says:

I will make clear the correct doctrine [I'tiqādāt Saheehah] and the actions of the Hereafter [A'māl al-ākhirah] and I will warn against seeking assistance from graves and other [such actions] which are done by the disbelievers and the people of innovation who are misled [Ahl ul-Bida' ad-Dālah] and misleading sinners. This is because I have seen many people in these times that have made some graves into idols [Awthān], praying at them and offering sacrifices there. Actions and statements emerge from them unbecoming of the people of faith [Ahl ul-Īmān]. So I wanted to clarify what the Divine Legislation has relayed in this regard, so that truth is distinguished from falsehood for whoever requires Tas-heeh of īmān and Ikhlās from the plot of Shaytān, and safety from the Nirān [the fire], and entry into Dār ul-Janān[the abode of paradise].²⁶

²⁶ Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Aqhisārī al-Hanafī, *Majālis ul-Abrār wa Masālik ul-Akhyār Mahā'iq al-Bida' wa Maqāmi' al-Ashrār* [Gatherings of the Righteous and Paths of the Good in Destroying Innovation and Suppressing Evils]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Islamic University of Madeenah, KSA, ed. 'Ali Misrī Surayjān Fawrā, 1428 AH/2008 CE, pp.2-3 (of the main edited text of the work). It can be downloaded here:

<https://barelwism.files.wordpress.com/2020/05/majalis-al-abrar-rumi-best-print-muhaqqaq.pdf>

More on him will be mentioned later insha'Allāh. At-Tahānawī²⁷ mentioned a number of types of Shirk including:

Shirk in 'ibādah; Shirk in obedience; Shirk in tasmiyah [naming]; Shirk in knowledge; Shirk in qudrah [ability].²⁸

Imām Waleeullāh ad-Dehlawī (d. 1176 AH/1762 CE)²⁹ mentioned a number of categories of Shirk such as:

Shirk in sujūd; Shirk in seeking help; Shirk in vowing; Shirk in tasmiyah [naming]; Shirk in obedience in tahreem [prohibiting] and tahleel [legalising]; Shirk in slaughtering; Shirk in swearing oaths Shirk in pilgrimage for other than Allāh.³⁰

So who were those upon whom Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*) made takfeer? Shaykh Faisal Jāsim has elucidated these categories:³¹

And here:

<https://waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=8919>

²⁷ He is Muhammad bin 'Alī bin Hāmid bin Sābir al-Hanafī al-'Umarī at-Tahānawī who was a Mutakallim (a speculative rhetorical theologian), writer, *faqeeh* and Māturīdī. He lived before 1158 AH, for his biography see *Nuzhat ul-Khawātir*, vol.6, p.278 and *Mu'jam ul-Mu'aliffeen*, vol.11, p.47.

²⁸ *Kashshāf Istilahāt il-Funūn*, vol.4, pp.146-153.

²⁹ He is Ahmad Waleeullāh bin 'AbdurRaheem bin Wajeehuddeen al-'Umarī ad-Dehlawī one of the scholars of the *deen* who authored works such as *al-Fawz ul-Kabeer*, *al-Budūr ul-Bāzighah*, *Hujjatullāhi Bālighah* and many other works. He died in 1176 AH in the city of Delhi, refer to *Nuzhat ul-Khawātir*, vol.6, p.398, no.415 for his biography.

³⁰ *Hujjatullāhi Bālighah*, vol.1, p.183 and in the newer edition: vol.1, p.543; also see *al-Budūr al-Bāzighah*, vol.125, p.127.

³¹ See part 9 of the Shaykh's lecture here entitled *ad-Da'wah al-Islāhiyyah li Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb: Mawqif ul-Imām min at-Takfeer* [The Reform Da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb: The Imām's Stance on Takfeer, Part 9]:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I_Zpjer8lL8&list=PLqrzhTjEHlPAFiOIaiMCKZoibzuUwpsZ9&index=4&pbjreload=101

- Those who committed Shirk al-Akbar: making Istighāthah by the dead, making Tawāf around tombs, shrines and graves, supplicating to other than Allāh etc.
- Those who know Tawheed, and then subsequently curse, reject and dislike it, and hate those who call to Tawheed and hate the spread of Tawheed.
- Those who dislike the people of Tawheed and make takfeer of the people of Tawheed, deeming the people of Tawheed “Khawārij”.
- Those who initially acknowledge Tawheed and then hate it more than Jews and Christians, censuring the people of Tawheed.
- Those who prevent people from Tawheed and have enmity against Tawheed.
- Those who adorn Shirk and encourage people into it, putting forth doubts encouraging people to commit Shirk.
- Those who strive against Tawheed for Shirk (fitnah) to remain, expending wealth and energy to this end.
- Those who participate with the people of Shirk in their practices of Shirk while they also curse the people of Tawheed, without being compelled to be there with them in such instances.
- Those who love the people of Shirk and its people, and loves for Shirk to be manifest, and does not hate Shirk or the actions of the people of Shirk.
- Those who join the people of Shirk in their land, and does not oppose what they do, to the extent that the people of Shirk consider such people as being with them. This category subsequently fights with the people of Shirk against whoever they fight against.
- And more.

Shaykh Faisal Jāsim has also explained that there were three core categories of people whom were opposed to the da'wah of Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb:

- Scholars of both Najd and the Hijāz who were arch-enemies of the da'wah due to their advocacy of shirk and bida', or their *alignment and support* of those who participated in Shirk al-Akbar. None of his contemporaries denied this reality about Shirk, such as asking the dead in graves for help, going around tombs and graves, seeking blessings from trees, making vows to other than Allāh etc. was widespread for centuries across the Muslim world. However, they either defended these actions or said there were just prohibited and not Shirk al-Akbar which necessitated leaving the deen after the proofs had been established. Or they did not acknowledge Shirk in Ulūhiyyah and 'Ibādah, only in Rubūbiyyah.

- Local leaders and tribal rulers who feared the loss of their land, power and authority. Due to this they had aligned with those who promoted grave-worship, and had previously been supportive of the da'wah.
- The common people who merely blindly followed what the above two categories propagated about the da'wah.

So not all of those who had opposed the da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb had actually *endorsed* grave-worship, but had either *aligned* with those who did or had been treacherous and broken pacts, accords and covenants.³² This will soon be detailed. As for the historical books which have been referred to by 'Bro Hajji' are:

1. Husayn Ibn Ghannām, *Tārikh Najd*.
2. 'Uthmān bin 'Abdullāh bin Bishr,³³ *'Unwan al-Majd fī Tārikh Najd* [The Title of Glory in the History of Najd].

There are also other primary historical sources for the history of Najd and the Arabian Peninsula such as:³⁴

- Shaykh Ibrāheem bin 'Ubayd al-'AbdulMuhsin, *Tadhkirat Ūla'n-Nahy wa'l-'Urfān bi-Ayyamillāh al-Wāhid id-Dayān wa Dhikru Hawādith iz-Zamān*.
- Shaykh Sālih bin 'Abdul'Azeed bin 'AbdurRahmān bin 'Uthaymeen,³⁵ *Tas-beel us-Sābilah fī Tabaqāt il-Hanābilah*. This book is in manuscript form. Shaykh 'Abdullāh al-Bassām

³² See the parts 5 and 6 of the Shaykh's lectures here on the topic:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MCbs6dLBL-M&list=PLqrzhTjEHPAFiOIaiMCKZoibzuUwpsZ9&index=13>

Also see Shaykh Faisal Jāsim, *Idā'āt fī Tārikh id-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah an-Najdiyyah, Halqah ar-Rābi'ah: Mawqif ul-'Ulama fī Najd wa Muheetuhā min ad-Da'wah al-Islāhiyyah* [Shedding Light on the History of the Najdi Salafi Da'wah, Part 4: The Stance of the 'Ulama of Najd and the Surrounding Regions Towards the Reform Da'wah].

<http://www.al-jasem.com/archives/2270>

³³ The Najdian historian, al-'Allāmah 'Uthmān bin 'Abdullāh bin Bishr ash-Shaqrāwī al-Hanbalī as-Salafī (1210-1290 AH/1795-1873 CE). He also authored *as-Suhayl fī Dhikr il-Khayl*. Shaykh 'Abdullāh al-Bassām stated about his book *'Unwān ul-Majd*:

It is the most valuable, comprehensive, trustworthy and just of all that has been classified from the histories of Najd.

For his biography refer to *'Ulama Najd*, vol.5, pp.115-126; *al-Mustadrak 'ala's-Suhub il-Wābilah*, p.709; *al-A'lām*, vol.4, p.209; *Mu'jam ul-Muallifeen*, vol.2, p.363. They put the year of his death at 1288 AH.

³⁴ Refer to 'Abdullāh Muhammad ash-Shimrānī, Shaykh Sālih Āli Shaykh (intro.), *Imām al-Muhaddith Sulaymān bin 'Abdullāh Āli Shaykh, 1200-1233 AH: Hayātuhu wa Āthāruhu* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār ul-Watan, 1422 AH/2001 CE), pp.14-22.

(*rahimahullāh*) stated about the author of the book: "He gives biographies of all the Hanbali scholars from Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal until his time. It is a huge book in five large volumes. He compiled it based on a number of books that he transmitted from." The book was edited by Shaykh Bakr Abū Zayd (*rahimahullāh*).

- Shaykh 'AbdurRahmān Ibn Muhammad bin Qāsim,³⁶ *ad-Durar as-Saniyyah fi'l-Ajwibat in-Najdiyyah*.
- Shaykh Muhammad bin 'Uthmān al-Qādī, *Rawdat un-Nādhireen 'an Māthar 'Ulama Najd wa Hawādith as-Saneen*.
- Shaykh 'Abdullāh bin 'AbdurRahmān al-Bassām, *'Ulama Najd Khilāl Thamāniyyat Qurūn* [The Islamic Scholars of Najd Over Eight Centuries].
- Shaykh 'AbdurRahmān bin 'AbdulLateef Āl Shaykh,³⁷ *Mashāheer 'Ulama Najd wa Ghayrahum*.
- Shaykh Ibrāheem bin Muhammad bin Duwayyān,³⁸ *Tārikh Ibn Duwayyān*.
- Shaykh Ibrāheem bin Sālih bin 'Īsā,³⁹ *Tārikh Ibn 'Īsā*, 2 vols.

³⁵ The noble Shaykh, Sālih bin 'Abdul'Azeez bin 'AbdurRahmān bin 'Uthaymeen (1320-1412 AH/1902-1991 CE), he studied with the 'Ulama of his land Buraydah and then travelled to India where he studied and gained *ijāzah*. He then resided in Makkah al-Mukarramah. For a biography of him refer to *'Ulama Najd*, vol.2, pp.488-494 and *Takmilat Mu'jam ul-Muallifeen*, p.238.

³⁶ Al-'Allāmah 'AbdurRahmān bin Muhammad bin Qāsim al-'Āsimī al-Qahtānī (1319-1392 AH/1901-1972 CE), he was the one who compiled the *fatāwā* of the Imāms of guidance and of the *Salafī da'wah* such as Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah. He also annotated works such as *al-Ājrūmiyyah* and *ar-Rawd al-Murabbi'*. For his biography refer to *'Ulama Najd*, vol.3, pp.202-208.

³⁷ Shaykh 'AbdurRahmān bin 'AbdulLateef bin 'Abdullāh bin 'AbdulLateef bin 'AbdurRahmān bin Hasan (1332-1406 AH/1914-1986 CE). He was an encyclopaedia of knowledge of *Sharee'ah*, Arabic language and history. He resided in Makkah al-Mukarramah where he later died. For his biography refer to *'Ulama Najd*, vol.3, pp.83-87 and *Takmilat Mu'jam ul-Muallifeen*, p.682.

³⁸ The scholar and Faqeeh, Ibrāheem bin Muhammad bin Sālim bin Duwayyān (1275-1353 AH/1859-1934 CE). He was a man of *zuhd* and *wara'* who possessed superb handwriting and thus copied many books by hand in his library. He authored *Raf' un-Niqāb 'an Tarājim il-As-hāb* and *Manār us-Sabeel fi Sharh id-Daleel*. For his biography refer to *Mashāheer 'Ulama Najd*, p.222; *'Ulama Najd*, vol.1, pp.403-410; *Rawdat un-Nādhireen*, vol.1, pp.48-50 and *al-'Ālām*, vol.1, p.72.

³⁹ The respected scholar and famous scholar Ibrāheem bin Sālih bin 'Īsā al-Qadā'ī (1270-1343 AH/1854-1924 CE). He used to document everything he encountered and did not tire from writing and he corresponded with the 'Ulama. He was also well-versed in *fiqh*, *farā'idh*, *hadeeth*, Arabic linguistics and was a reference point for literature, history and knowledge of lineages. He authored *'Aqd ud-Durar fīmā waqa'a fi Najd min al-Hawādith fi Awākhir al-Qarn ath-Thālith 'Ashar wa Awā'il ar-Rābi'* *'Ashar* [The Pearled Necklace Around the Events in Najd During the End of the 13th

- Shaykh Muhammad bin 'Umar al-Fākhirī,⁴⁰ *Tārīkh al-Fākhirī*. This is a work prior to Ibn Bishr's history. It discussed the events that took place at Dir'iyyah in 1233 AH/1817 CE.
- Shaykh Sulaymān bin 'AbdurRahmān bin Muhammad Āl Hamdān,⁴¹ *Tarājim al-Muta'akbirī al-Hanābilah* [Biographies of the Later Hanbali Scholars]. This manuscript of this book however has no introduction and may have been authored by the Shaykh straight from memory. Also the book has no arrangement of the biographies according to obituaries.
- *Tārīkh Shaykh Hamad bin Muhammad La'būn* which has been edited by Dr 'Abdul'Azeez bin 'Abdullāh La'būn of King Saud University.

It is worth noting that the enemies of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb were the ones to first initiate hostilities on account of *religion primarily* and not politics, not Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and those students with him, as the historical record will demonstrate. Extraordinarily, none of which has been mentioned in the pronouncements of 'Bro Hajji'. Indeed, Ibn Ghannām mentions in his *Tārīkh*, vol.1, p.31 that the enemies of the da'wah to Tawheed:

Century and the Beginning of the 14th]. He also authored *Tārīkh Ba'dh il-Hawādith al-Wāqī'ah fī Najd* [The History of Some Events that Occurred in Najd]. For a biography of him refer to '*Ulama Najd*, vol.1, pp.318-331; *Rawdat un-Nādhireen*, vol.1, pp.44-46; *al-'A'lām*, vol.1, p.44.

⁴⁰ The Shaykh and historian, Muhammad bin 'Umar bin Muhammad bin Hasan bin Fākhir al-Musharrafi al-Wahbi at-Tameemi (1186-1277 AH/1772-1860 CE). He was a scholar, writer and historian, he authored a treatise on the history of Najd which became a source reference for those historians who came after him such as Ibn Bishr and Ibn 'Isā. For a biography of him refer to *Rawdat un-Nādhireen*, vol.2, pp.207-208; '*Ulama Najd* (Old Print), vol.3, pp.922-923; *Mu'jam ul-Mu'allifeen*, vol.3, p.564; *al-Mustadrak 'ala's-Suhub il-Wābilah*, vol.3, p.1023; the introduction to *Tāreekh Ba'dh il-Hawādith al-Wāqī'ah fī Najd*, pp.8-9, 20. Shaykh 'Abdullāh al-Bassām also wrote a biography of him in '*Ulama Najd* (Newer Print), pp.246-248.

⁴¹ Shaykh, al-Qādī Sulaymān bin 'AbdurRahmān bin Muhammad Āl Hamdān (1322-1397 AH/1904-1977CE) a teacher at Masjid ul-Harām. With all his *zuhd* and worship he was still stern on his opposers and frank in presenting his views without flattering anyone (Mujāmalah), this led to some difficulties that he experienced from other scholars during his time. He authored *ad-Durr an-Nadeed Hāshiyat Kitāb ut-Tawheed* and *Hidāyat ul-Areeb il-Amjad fī Ma'rifat ar-Ruwāt 'an al-Imām Ahmad*. For a biography of him refer to: '*Ulama Najd*, vol.2, pp.295-300; *Rawdat un-Nādhireen*, vol.1, pp.149-151 and *Takmilat Mu'jam ul-Muallifeen*, p.216. His student was al-'Allāmah Bakr Abū Zayd (*rahimahullāh*) wrote a lengthy biography of him in the introduction to *Hidāyat ul-Areeb il-Amjad*, pp.'J'-'M'.

Hastily applied to the Shaykh that he was a magician, falsifier and liar. They judged him to have kufr and that his blood and wealth, and that of those with him, was permitted to take.

Not mentioned, or rather not even known (!), by 'Bro Hajji'.

One of the arch-enemies of the da'wah to Tawheed, Dahlān,⁴² transmitted that the scholars of Makkah at the time issued takfeer on Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and his students, saying:

...they [i.e. the scholars of Makkah at the time] looked at their beliefs and debated them, and they found them to be full of disbelief. So after the proofs were established on them, the Shareef Mas'ūd Qādī ordered that the proof of their kufr be written publicly so that all would know. He also instructed that those Malāhidah be imprisoned...when the 'Ulama of Makkah tested them they found them to not follow except the deen of the Zanādiqah [heretics].⁴³

Not mentioned, or maybe not known (!), by 'Bro Hajji'?! Takfeer, claims of 'Ilhād', 'Zanādiqah' [heretics], accusations of beliefs of kufr. So who first made takfeer of whom? Who issued 'blood thirsty rulings' on whom? Who incited whom?! Who are the Khawārij issuing takfeer of whom?! This is clear takfeer without principles! Ibn 'Afāliq (d. 1164 AH/1750 CE)⁴⁴ judged Shaykh

⁴² Ahmad ibn Zaynī Dahlān (d.1304 AH), a partisan Sūfī judge who lived in Makkah and was a Shāfi'ī Muftī who spread much in the way of propaganda against Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb. Some of his propaganda tracts have been rendered into English by the likes of Gibril Fouad Haddād, who follows a modern brand of Naqshabandī Sufism under the auspices of Hishām Kabbānī and invented in recent years by Nāzim Qubrusī. GF Haddād also translates the views of the Hulūlī Sūfī Ibn 'Arabī in books supposedly on 'correct Islamic belief'!!?

⁴³ *Khulāsāt ul-Kalām fī Bayān Umarā' il-Bilād il-Harām*, p.238

⁴⁴ Muhammad ibn 'AbdurRahmān ibn 'Afaliq (d.1163 AH/1750 CE) from al-Ahsa and a contemporary of Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb who witnessed the beginnings of the *da'wah*. The manuscript of the treatise wherein Ibn 'Afaliq states his lies against Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb is present in the *State Library* of Berlin, it was quoted by 'Abdul'Azeez ibn Muhammad Āl 'AbdulLateef in *Da'āwa al-Munāwi'een li Da'wat al-Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb* [The Propaganda of the Adversaries of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb's Preaching], Riyadh: Dār ul-Watan, 1412 AH, p. 58. Ibn 'Afaliq wrote a letter to the 'Ameer of 'Uyaynah 'Uthmān ibn Mu'ammār, trying to incite Ibn Mu'ammār against Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb. Yet when Ibn Mu'ammār did not agree with the claims of Ibn 'Afaliq, Ibn 'Afaliq then began writing against Ibn Mu'ammār and accusing him of also making *takfeer* of Muslims! Refer to the book by Professor Sulaiman Bin Abdurrahman al-Huqail (Professor of Education at Imām Muhammad bin Saud University, Riyadh), *Muhammad Bin Abdulwahhāb: His Life and the Essence of his Call*

Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb to have kufr, shirk and ilhād!!? In his letter to Ibn Mu'ammār he transmitted sections from Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb's book *Kashf ush-Shubuhāt* and commented on them saying:

Look at this clear kufr, this Mulhid is negating the message of Allāh's Messenger. O 'Abdullāh, look at these corrupt words of kufr and zandaqah. Those people are kuffār who this Mulhid has mentioned and what they say has no benefit and does not grant them entry into Islām regardless of what they say as they do not say 'la ilaha il Allāh, Muhammad ur-Rasūlullāh.'⁴⁵

A'ūdhubillāh, this is clear takfeer and takfeer based on pure jahl and dhulm. Ibn Fayrūz (d. 1216 AH/1801 CE) remarked:

...do not stop from making takfeer of them, and their blood and property is permitted to take for whoever has a mustard seed of deen.⁴⁶

'Uthmān bin Sind al-Basrī (d. 1250 AH/1834 CE) stated, when talking about events of the year 1218 AH/1803 CE: **"I do not doubt that any of those Wahhābīs have the same status as Musaylimah al-Kadhhāb."**⁴⁷ SubhānAllāh, words ironically similar to the view of some of the modern Khawārij and their comments about the so-called 'Saudi Salafis', courtesy of Abdullāh El-Faisal al-Jamaykī!⁴⁸ Indeed, it was most likely from here when he got such statements showing how the modern-day Khawārij take their methodology from their brethren in excessive takfeer from the enemies of Tawheed and Sunnah. The following historical events also show the enmity against Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb's da'wah to Tawheed and indicates that he and his students *did not initiate hostilities* and in fact on many occasions worked towards peaceful resolutions:

- In 1139 AH/1727 CE when Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb went to his father in Huraymalā', the Shaykh was harmed greatly there. This was instigated by Sulaymān bin Muhammad bin Suhaym as noted by Muqbil adh-Dhakeer in his book *al-'Uqūd ad-Dariyyah fī Tarīkh il-Bilāl an-Najdiyyah* within the *Khizānat ut-Tarāwīkh an-Najdiyyah*, vol.7, p.122. **Not mentioned, or perhaps not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.**

(Riyadh: Ministry of Islamic Affairs, Endowments, Dawah and Guidance, KSA, First Edition, 1421 AH/2001 CE), with an introduction by Sheikh Saleh Bin Abdulaziz Al-Sheikh, p.163.

⁴⁵ *Al-Wahhābiyyah Deenun Jadeed*, p.461.

⁴⁶ Document in manuscript form.

⁴⁷ *Matālī' us-Su'ūd bi Tayyib Akhbār il-Wālī Dāwūd*, p.292.

⁴⁸ For more on his abominable statements refer to Abu Ameenah 'AbdurRahmaan as-Salafi and 'AbdulHaq al-Ashanti, *Abdullah El-Faisal al-Jamayki: A Critical Study of his Statements, Errors and Extremism in Takfeer*. London: Jamiah Media, 2010.

- Some of the rural tribal leaders, such as the head of the Bani Khālid tribe in al-Ahsā' angered by the growing popularity of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb, wrote a letter to the leader of al-'Uyaynah, 'Uthmān bin Mu'ammār, inciting him to kill, torture or expel Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb. **Not mentioned, or not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.**
- The Ashrāf of Makkah made *takefeer* and *tadleel* of the Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb, and then incited the Ottoman Empire to attack him and the fledgling state which would later become the First Saudi State. **Not mentioned, or maybe not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.** Shareef Mas'ūd bin Sa'eed, who assumed his position in 1146-1172 AH/1733-1758 CE wrote a letter to the Ottoman Sultan in 1162 AH/1749 CE inciting him to launch an attack on Dir'iyyah. **Not mentioned, or possibly not known (!), by 'Bro Hajji'.** At this time the da'wah was based in Dir'iyyah and had not expanded.
- Ismā'īl Haqqī Jārshalī notes in his book *Ashrāf Makkah al-Mukarramah wa Umarā'uhā fi'l-'Abd il-'Uthmānī* [The Ashrāf of Makkah al-Mukarramah and their Leaders During the Ottoman Era], pp.179-180 that the Ottomans replied in 1163 AH/1750 CE. He also states that the Ashrāf informed the Ottomans that **"a man in al-'Uyaynah had appeared with a 'bad Madhhab' and void Ijtihād views which went against the Four Madhhabs"**.
- The Ashrāf of Makkah from 1162-1218 AH/1749-1803 CE banned Muslims from Najd from making Hajj or 'Umrah. **Not mentioned, or even not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.** Ibn Bishr notes under 'Events of 1162 AH' that: "Mas'ūd bin Sa'eed the Shareef of Makkah imprisoned pilgrims from Najd and a number died while imprisoned."⁴⁹ This is even though Imāms Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and Muhammad bin Sa'ud tried repeatedly for the Shareef to allow pilgrims entry, even if they had to pay, but the Shareef rejected these offers. **Not mentioned, or perhaps not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.**
- In 1185 AH/1771 CE a delegation headed by Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez al-Husayyin went to Makkah, under the direction of Imāms Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and Muhammad bin Sa'ud in order to clarify the reality of their da'wah. This was requested by Shareef Ahmad bin Sa'eed. However, the scholars of Makkah at the time incited the Shareef to continue to block pilgrims from Najd from entry. **Not mentioned, or not known (!), by 'Bro Hajji'.** Shaykh al-Husayyin went again in 1203 AH/1789 CE, but the delegation amounted to nothing. A third delegation went in 1211 AH/1797 CE led by Shaykh

⁴⁹ Ibn Bishr, *'Unwān ul-Majid*, vol.1, p. 59.

Hamad bin Nāsir bin Mu'ammār, as requested by Shareef Ghālib bin Sa'eed, however yet again the 'Ulama of Makkah at the time advised the Shareef against allowing pilgrims from Najd entry. Simons states in *Saudi Arabia: The Shape of a Client Feudalism*, p.151: **"In 1796, doubtless with many a reservation, he led a military expedition into Nejd, there to be comprehensively defeated with a great loss of weapons and equipment...In 1798 the Shareef Ghalib suffered another humiliating rout, when both weapons and large sums of money fell into Saudi hands, whereupon Ghalib appealed to Abdul Aziz for peace."**⁵⁰

- Ibn Bishr in *'Ummān ul-Majd*, vol.1, p.61 under 'Events of 1164 AH' notes that the leader of Durmah, Ibrāheem bin Muhammad bin 'AbdurRahmān, broke his agreement with Imāms Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and Muhammad bin Sa'ud and killed the Qādī of Dir'iyyah and other students, and took their wealth. **Not mentioned, or maybe not known (!), by 'Bro Hajji'.**
- In 1165 AH/1752 CE, the people of Huraymalā' also broke their agreement due to incitement at the time by the brother of Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb. **Not mentioned, or even not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.**
- In 1166 AH/1753 CE the people of Manfūhah broke their agreement and rejected the da'wah and expelled their Imām for Salāh and 70 others who later fled to Dir'iyyah. **Not mentioned, or possibly not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.**
- In Dalam, the people there also broke their agreement and oppressed the preachers to Tawheed, threatening them with death. **Not mentioned, or not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.**
- In 1191 AH/1777 CE the people of Harmah turned against 'Uthmān bin Hamad bin 'Uthmān, due to the da'wah to Tawheed. This is noted in the *Tārīkh* of Ibn La'būn, p.186. **Not mentioned, or perhaps not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.**
- Shaykh 'Abdullāh al-Bassām refers to the 'Year of the Slaughter of the Mutawwa' in 1196 AH/1782 CE, where the people of Buraydah, ar-Rās and Tanūmah united to kill the students of knowledge in Qaseem and its surrounding areas under the order of Sa'dūn bin 'Urayr.⁵¹ The people in Qaseem, who had an agreement with Imāms Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and Muhammad bin Sa'ud, broke the agreement by rounding up the students of knowledge and supporters of the da'wah in the villages surrounding Qaseem and then proceeded to massacre all of them. **Conveniently not mentioned, or rather not known, by 'Bro Hajji'.** Al-Fākhirī (d. 1277 AH/1861 CE)

⁵⁰ Geoff Simons, *Saudi Arabia: The Shape of a Client Feudalism*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1998.

⁵¹ 'Abdullāh al-Bassām, *Tuhfat ul-Mushtāq fī Akhbār Najd wa'l-Hijāz wa'l-'Irāq*, p.224.

stated in his *Tārīkh*, p.149: “In 1196 AH occurred the slaughter of the Mutawwa’.” Ibn La’būn (d. 1257 AH/1841 CE) stated in his *Tārīkh*, p.194: **“In the year 1196 AH Banu Khālid approached Qaseem and they [i.e. the people of Qaseem] turned back on the deen and killed whoever ascribed to the deen”** then he listed the names of Imāms of Masājid and teachers. Ibn Bishr noted in *’Umwān al-Majd* that Sa’dūn bin ’Urayr, when he arrived in Buraydah, he was greeted by the people who gave him two teachers named ’Abdullāh al-Qādī and Nāsir ash-Shibīlī. He killed them both immediately without mercy.⁵² In ‘Tharmada’ the same happened with the students of knowledge and supporters of the da’wah. **Not mentioned, or not known, by ‘Bro Hajji’.**

- The Egyptian historian al-Jabartī in his *Tārīkh*, when discussing events of Rabī’ al-Ākhir 1228 AH/April 1813 CE, notes that the Muftī of the Ottoman Empire at the time incited the forces of Muhammad ’Ali Pasha to fight against the First Saudi State on the grounds of them being: **“kuffār due to their takfeer of Muslims and regarding them as Mushrikeen and rebellion against the Sultān. So whoever fights against them is a Ghāzī, a Mujāhid and, if killed, a Shaheed.”**⁵³ **Not mentioned by ‘Bro Hajji’.** So in many instances al-Jabartī describes the Ottoman and Egyptian forces as being **“Mujāhideen”** and **“returning from fighting the kuffār”** and that the women and children of the First Saudi State were taken as enslaved and sold among the despotic forces of Ibrahim Pasha. **Not mentioned, or not known, by ‘Bro Hajji’.** Al-Jabartī in fact praised the da’wah of Imām Muhammad bin ’AbdulWahhāb and strongly criticised Muhammad Ali Pasha in his *Tārīkh*, yet this was suppressed by the initial printers and publishers of his history. More on this will be mentioned later!
- In regards to the attack on Dir’iyyah by Ibrahim Pasha, Simons states: **“The British in India had welcomed Ibrahim Pasha’s siege of Diriyah: if the ‘predatory habits’ of the Wahhabists could be extirpated from the Arabian peninsula, so much better for British trade in the region. It was for this reason that Captain George Forster Sadleir, an officer of the British Army in India (HM 47th regiment), was sent from Bombay to consult Ibrahim Pasha in Diriyah.”**⁵⁴ So who was serving who?! Who was aiding who? And who had Muwālah with who?! **Not mentioned, or not known, by ‘Bro Hajji’.**

⁵² Ibn Bishr, *’Umwān ul-Majd*, vol.1, pp.145-146.

⁵³ ’AbdurRahmān bin Hasan al-Jabartī, *Tārīkh ’Ajā’ib ul-Āthār fi’t-Tarājim wa’l-Akhhār*, vol.4, p.406.

⁵⁴ Simons, *op.cit.*, p.155.

The Year of the Slaughter of the Mutawwa' was also mentioned by other historians of Najd such as:

- Ibrāheem bin Sālih bin 'Isā in *Tārikh Ba'hd ul-Hawādith al-Wāqi'ah fī Najd*, vol.1, p.149.
- Sālih bin 'Uthmān al-Qādī (d. 1351 AH) in his *Tārikh* as relayed in *Khizānat ut-Tawārikh an-Najdiyyah*, vol.8, p.15.
- Ibrāheem bin Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Duwayyān (d. 1353 AH/1934 CE) in his *Tārikh* as found in *Khizānat ut-Tawārikh an-Najdiyyah*, vol.3, p.180.

This indicates that the initial conflict with Imāms Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and Muhammad bin Sa'ud and the people in the region was due to *creed and belief* and not mere politics.⁵⁵ Due to such actions enmity towards the Ottoman State developed in later generations after Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb. These relationships would in later centuries overlap with fratricide and politics, as seen within the Second Saudi State.

UNDERSTANDING THE USAGE OF THE TERM 'IRTIDĀD' IN THE HISTORICAL SOURCES FOR THE DA'WAH NAJDIYYAH

Ibn Ghannām in his *Tārikh Najd* in a few instances in his history refers to **'the people of so and so made ridā'**, this has been rendered by most as meaning that such and such tribe or people of a particular region had 'apostated'. Now in this regard one can say that the language which Ibn Ghannām utilised was *Shari'* terminology and this needs to be understood in this context, rather than as if reading a general political history. Shaykh Faisal Jāsim (*hafidhabullāh*) discusses this in detail in his research paper entitled *Idā'āt fī Tārikh id-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah an-Najdiyyah, Halqah ath-Thamiah: Tārikh Najd li Ibn Ghannām wa Ibn Bisr, Qirā'ah Hādī'ah wa Nadhrab Fabisab* [Shedding Light on the History of the Najdi Salafi Da'wah, Part 8: The History of Ibn Ghannām and Ibn Bisr, a Sober Reading and Detailed Reflection]:

- The expression 'irtidād' as used by Ibn Ghannām does not necessarily mean apostasy. It can mean that the people in question broke a treaty and reneged on a pledge, thus 'turning back' from their treaty obligations.

⁵⁵ For more on this see Shaykh Faisal Jāsim (*hafidhabullāh*) research paper entitled *Idā'āt fī Tārikh id-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah an-Najdiyyah, Halqah as-Sābi'ah: ad-Dalāil fī Ithbāt anna Sarā' ad-Da'wah al-Islāhiyyah ma' Khusūmihā 'Aqdī la Siyāsī* [Shedding Light on the History of the Najdi Salafi Da'wah, Part 7: Evidences Confirming that the Conflict Between the Reform Da'wah and its Opponents was Creedal Not Political].

- This was also mentioned by Imām ash-Shāfi'ī (*rahimahullāh*) who mentioned in *al-Umm*, vol.9, p.206 that Riddah is by leaving the deen and also Riddah is by not adhering to a due right and hence **“whoever reneges on something it is permitted to refer to him via [the expression] ‘irtadda ‘an kadha’ [‘he apostated from such and such...’].”**
- Al-Khattābī also said similar in *Ma‘ālim us-Sunan*, vol.2, p.6 when he said: **“Riddah is an Arabic noun and whoever turns back on something which he is supposed to do has ‘irtadd’ [apostated] from it.”**
- So Ibn Ghannām used ‘Riddah’ in both senses, but not in all cases did he intent leaving the deen.
- Likewise when Ibn Ghannām talks about ‘the Muslims attacked such and such...’ or the ‘forces of the Muslims’ or ‘the Muslims were killed’ – this does not necessitate that the other side are being described as having kufr. As this dichotomy is used to also indicate that the opposing side are rebels, brigands, renegades and heretics, this is often the context when such language is utilised by historians. Ibn Katheer in *al-Bidāyah wa’n-Nihāyah* uses this language when discussing the Khawārij at Nahrawān.

Moreover, according to the view of the students of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and their Ijtihād, some of these villages, aswell as in Riyadh and Ahsā' left the deen on account of the Muwālah to the people of shirk in 1178 AH by inviting Hibatullāh al-Makramī, a Bātinī from Najrān, to come to their aid. Although they had none of that in their land, they had allegiance with, and gave support to, those who were spreading shirk. Indeed, Simons states in *Saudi Arabia: The Shape of a Client Feudalism*, p.151: **“Between then and 1795 the British helped Kuwait to repel Saudi assaults on the town...”**⁵⁶

RULINGS OF TAKFEER ARE NOT EXCLUSIVE TO THE DA'WAH SALAFIYYAH NAJDIYYAH, WITH SOME SAMPLES OF UNQUALIFIED TAKFEER BASED ON DESIRES, PAST AND PRESENT

As outlined earlier, Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*) was a scholar of the classical Islamic tradition with a normative scholarly basis and did not come with anything new. Due to the situation of the people at the time and the ignorance and entrenchment in Shirk al-Akbar, it appeared to many that he had come with something altogether novel. The reality however was that Shirk had become widespread across the Islamic lands. Earlier we noted the Manhaj of the Imām in Takfeer in order to assess if he was, as Hajji claims, some sort of

⁵⁶ Geoff Simons, *Saudi Arabia: The Shape of a Client Feudalism*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1998.

precursor to the Takfīrī bandits and modern Khawārij cults. Thus, we noted that according to the Imām:

- Takfeer is not issued via conjecture
- There must be detailed verification
- Proofs must be established about people
- Requisite conditions safeguarded
- The removal of preventative factors such as *Junūn* [insanity], *Isḳḥār* [intoxication], *Sinn* [age, i.e. being prepubescent], *al-Ikrāh* [compulsion], *Nisyān* [forgetfulness], *al-Khata'* [error], *Ta'weel* [misinterpretation], *Jahl* [ignorance] ec. So that the ignorant is excused due to ignorance.
- The one who commits Shirk al-Akbar is neither judged as being a disbeliever without the above process being applied, nor is the person deemed a Muslim. They have the ruling of Ahl ul-Fitrah.

Now this is all in stark contrast to what the enemies of the Imām employed and also as to what has been seen throughout history, where absolute no rigorous method for rulings of Takfeer are known to have even been utilised. So:

- Salāhuddeen al-Ayyūbī executed the Sūfī Suhrawardī in 1191 CE. However, at least here there appears to have been an enquiry.
- The Ottomans fought against the Mamluks, after making takfeer of them. Saleem the First regarded the Mamluks as being kuffār.⁵⁷
- The Ottomans made takfeer of the offspring of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb. This was relayed by the Egyptian historian al-Jabartī in his *Tārīkh* when discussing events of Rabī' al-Ākhir 1228 AH that the Mufti of the Ottoman Empire at the time incited the forces of Muhammad 'Ali Pasha to fight against the First Saudi State on the grounds of them being **“kuffār, due to their takfeer of Muslims and regarding them a Mushrikeen and rebellion against the Sultān. So whoever fights against them is a Ghāzī, a Mujāhid and, if killed, a Shaheed.”**⁵⁸ So in many instances al-Jabartī describes the Ottoman and Egyptian forces as being “Mujāhideen” and **“returning from fighting the kuffār”** and that the women and children of the First Saudi State were taken as slaves and sold among the despotic forces of Ibrāheem Pasha. Al-Jabartī in fact later praised the da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and strongly criticised

⁵⁷ For more on this see Reem Meshal (May 2010), “Antagonist Shari'as and the Construction of Orthodoxy in Sixteenth Century Cairo.” *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 21(2), p.193.

⁵⁸ 'AbdurRahmān bin Hasan al-Jabartī, *Tārīkh 'Ajā'ib ul-Āthār fī't-Tarājīm wa'l-Akhhbār*, vol.4, p.406.

Muhammad Ali Pasha in his *Tārikh*. To the extent that this part of his *Tārikh* was banned in Egypt in 1870, this ban was lifted in full a decade later when the *Tārikh* was published in full by the Bulaq Printers in Cairo. In fact, a 2007 article by Muhammad bin 'Abdullāh Āl Rāshid entitled *Da'wat li 'Iyyadat un-Nadbr fī Kitāb 'Ajā'ib ul-Āthār fī't-Tarājim wa'l-Akhhār li'l-Jabartī* [A Call to Review the Book 'The Marvellous Chronicles of Biographies and Events' by al-Jabartī] are some interesting details. Āl Rāshid states: "In the book authored by Ustādh Anwar al-Jundī (1917-2002 CE) about the life of al-'Allāmah Ahmad Zakī Pasha, aka 'Shaykh ul-'Arūbah (1284-1353), published within *Silsilat A'lām ul-'Arab*, no.29, he speaks about the book depository known as *Khizānat uz-Zakiyah* and the rare collections within it.⁵⁹ Al-Jundī states on p.112: 'a copy of the fourth part of al-Jabartī's *Tārikh* contains many sections which were omitted from the Bulaq Print (in 1880 CE) as it attacked Muhammad 'Ali Pasha, and around 50 pages were omitted.'" Āl Rāshid continues: "Ustādh Anwar al-Jundī mentions about this depository on p.118: 'today if you were to ask about this repository 'where is it?' we will say to you: it has been locked away and abandoned in room no.18 of the fort of the Dār ul-Kutb building. Its volumes consist of 18700 pages which occupy two large rooms.' Written by Ustādh al-Jundī in the introduction to his *Tārikh* on 21st December 1963 CE." Ustādh Āl Rāshid also said at the end of his article: "...it is apparent that huge segments regarding the da'wah of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb were omitted, as he [i.e. al-Jabartī] wrote that which did not please the publishers of the first edition, such as praise of the da'wah of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb while his [i.e. al-Jabartī's] stance on Muhammad 'Ali Pasha was well-known. As a result, those pages were removed [from the first published edition of al-Jabartī's *Tārikh*]. For Shaykh al-Jabartī lived through the events which occurred during the epoch of Muhammad 'Ali Pasha and al-Jabartī had also met some of the Āl Saud and Āl ush-Shaykh who had been exiled from ad-Dir'iyyah to Egypt after its destruction in 1233 AH, and he described their situation. For this reason, Ustādh Muhammad Adeeb Ghālib (d. 1415 AH) in 1385 AH extracted this topic from al-Jabartī's *Tārikh* and published it as *Min Akhhār al-Hijāz wa Najd fī Tārikh il-Jabartī* [The Report of the Arabian Peninsula and Najd from the History of al-Jabartī] in 278 pages.

⁵⁹ In 1911, Zakī Pasha obtained a permanent official permit for a special section of the Dār al-Kutub, the Egyptian National Library, to be allocated for his private collection of books and manuscripts, which became known under his name as *al-Khizāna al-Zakiyya*. The collection contained his books and manuscripts which he had started gathering since his student days in the 1880s.

See Umar Ryad, "An Oriental Orientalist: Ahmad Zakī Pasha (1868-1934), Egyptian Statesman and Philologist in the Colonial Age." *Philological Encounters*, 3 (2018), pp.150-153

Shaykh al-Jabartī also had connection with Shaykh 'AbdurRahmān bin Hasan bin Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (1193-1285 AH) as he was one of his [al-Jabartī's] four Shaykhs who gave him Ijāzah in Riwayāh.⁶⁰

- Then there are the Takfirī groups renowned for their mass takfeer at the drop of a hat: Abū 'Isā al-Qurashī al-Urdunī in Pakistan, who dons a black turban and black robe, announced a Khilāfah outside of the control of the Tālibān, after he had made takfeer of the Tālibān and rebelled against it! He then made takfeer of the ISIS leader Abū Bakr al-Baghdādī! The Taliban make takfeer of their enemies; ISIS make takfeer of al-Qā'idah; Boko Haram make takfeer of their enemies.
- In the magazine (*'al-Ansār*), no. 90, page 12 and it was distributed by the magazine *'al-Ansār* issue no. 147, page 4, dated: al-Khamees (Thursday) 14 Dhu'l-Hijjah 1416 AH corresponding to 2/5/1996 CE, in the magazine *'al-Qitāl* that was published as the formal mouthpiece of the Armed Islamic Group (GIA) in Algeria, in issue no. 32, under the title **'Editorial Words: this is how jihād is, reviving the way of the Salaf'** they relay that there were some parents who wanted to marry their daughter to a policeman in Algeria, and the policeman asked for her hand in marriage. The parents accepted this, but the brother of the girl, who was with the *GLA*, went to his parents in order to "establish the proofs on them". He said to his parents: **"This policeman is a Tāghūt, disbeliever it is not permissible that my sister marries him."** The parents rejected what the boy said, so he killed them!
- Abdullāh Faisal al-Jamaykī.⁶¹ Faisal said after 45 minutes into the lecture *al-Wala' wa'l-Bara'*: **"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".**

⁶⁰ Muhammad bin 'Abdullāh Āl Rāshid, *Da'wat li 'Iyyadat un-Nadhr fi Kitāb 'Ajā'ib ul-Āthār fi't-Tarājim wa'l-Akhhār li'l-Jabartī* [A Call to Review the Book 'The Marvellous Chronicles of Biographies and Events' by al-Jabartī]. Al-Jazirah Newspaper (KSA), Sunday 13th May 2007/26th Rabī' uth-Thānī 1428 AH, no.12645. <http://www.al-jazirah.com/2007/20070513/wo5.htm>
Accessed September 2020.

⁶¹ For more on his abominable statements refer to Abu Ameenah 'AbdurRahmaan as-Salafi and 'AbdulHaq al-Ashanti, *Abdullah El-Faisal al-Jamayki: A Critical Study of his Statements, Errors and Extremism in Takfeer*. London: Jamiah Media, 2010.

Just to give that answer “it’s okay” you become a kāfir!”⁶² He also said in the vile lecture *The Devil’s Deception of the 21st Century House Niggers*: **“Anyone who listens to this tape, of this man and doubt that he’s a kāfir you become a kāfir! If you listen to this person Abū Usāmah trying to put Islām down and Muslims down and jihād down, if you have an atom’s weight of doubt in your heart that he’s a kāfir, you yourself become a kāfir.”** In a lecture by Faisal entitled *Challenges Facing the Youth*, he says: **“If he is a supporter of kufr, a Saudi Salafi, you have to kill him and chop off his head...”**

- the Rāfidah make takfeer of Ahl us-Sunnah. Husayn bin Shaykh Muhammad Āl 'Asfūr ad-Dirāzī al-Bahrānī ash-Shi'ī stated in his book *al-Mahāsin an-Nafsāniyyah fī Ajwibatil-Masā'il al-Khurāsāniyyah* (Beirut), p.147: **“Their reports, peace be upon them, emphasis that the Nāsib is the one who is called: “a Sunni”...the intent of Nāsibah is the people of tasannun.”** While Yusuf al-Bahrānī in his book *al-Hadā'iq un-Nādirah fī Abkām il 'Itrati't-Tāhirah*, vol.12, pp.323-24: **“When the term ‘Muslim’ is applied to a Nāsib at that point it is not permissible to take his wealth, due to Islām. This is as opposed to the correct view of a group (of Shi'a scholars) past and present, who judge the Nāsib with kufr (disbelief) and najāsah (filth) whose wealth it is permissible to take and even kill.”⁶³** In relation to this it is worth noting that many authors have highlighted this treachery throughout history. A recent example that is related to this is the fact that Hilary Mann, formerly of the US National Security Council, said on BBC2's *Newsnight* (UK) on Friday 7th December 2007 CE that after 9/11 she had several liaisons with Iranian diplomats who even advised her on what places in Afghanistan to bomb and where the US should strike!!? She said that their enmity to Afghanistan was more so than even that of the US.
- and the Hūthīs now make takfeer of the Salafis in Yemen and the Saudi State; and Sūfī groups in Iraq, such as the Naqshbandī Army led by 'Izzat bin Ibrāheem bin Khaleel ad-Dūrī, aligned with al-Qā'idah against the 'Irāqī Shi'a in 2004, and more recently with ISIS.

⁶² The lecture can be referred to here:
<https://archive.org/details/AlWalaWalBaraloveAndHateForTheSakeOfAllah.mp3>

⁶³Dr 'Imād 'Alī 'AbdusSamī', *Khiyānāt ush-Shi'a wa Atharuhā fī Hazā'im al-Ummah al-Islamiyyah* [The Treachery of the Shi'a and its Impact in the Defeats of the Islamic Nation], pp.19-20.

So where is the condemnation of 'Bro Hajji' of the above samples of takfeer?! If he is serious and sincere in his hatred and sensitivity against unbridled takfeer and its rulings being issued haphazardly and indiscriminately, will he care to furnish us with his expositions of the above?! Takfeer *has* unfortunately been used and weaponised for personal desires, political reasons to expand states, to gain resources and fight against enemies. In the case of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb however, he had principles for takfeer which are qualified, succinct, logical, documented and reasoned. It is both unjust and totally incorrect for 'Bro Hajji' to deduce, based on scant reading, poor research and personal issues with some who ascribe to Salafiyyah, that the Imām was akin to a Takfīrī-Khārijī. We hope that 'Bro Hajji' will amend this stance with immediate effect and if not then humiliation is feared for him.

THE REALITY OF THE REMOTE AND RURAL VILLAGE AREAS IN 18TH CENTURY NAJD, SHĀM AND EGYPT AND THE WIDESPREAD DISBELIEF IN THE RESURRECTION

Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb makes much reference to the rural and remote village areas of Najd and the ignorance which was among them, along with their distance from the Divine Legislation. Although there were scholars in Najd prior to the Shaykh there were largely specialised in Hanbalī fiqh and *Qada'* [judicial matters] and did not clarify Tawheed for the common people in the manner the Shaykh did. Even Ibn Qā'id an-Najdī (d. 1097 AH/1687 CE), who wrote a treatise on creed, studied in Shām and Misr, and later died in Misr. So his treatise may have been based on interactions he had in those lands. While even two other students of the Muhaddith Muhammad Hayāt as-Sindī (d. 1163 AH/1750 CE) such as as-San'ānī (d. 1182 AH/1769 CE) and as-Saffārīnī (d. 1188 AH/1775 CE), in Yemen and Palestine respectively, wrote on the correct creed but not to the extent of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb with his works for all people.

The shirk in the region had its roots with the Buyids from the 5th century AH who assumed power after the Abbasids and were Rāfidah and extended their influence over Iraq and the

Arabian Peninsula. They built tombs over graves throughout their rule. Ibn Ghannām states in his *Tarikh Najd* when discussing the circumstances of the Najd before the da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb:

Most of the people during his time were engrossed in the filth to the extent that they were entrenched in shirk before the emergence of the purified Sunnah. The people began to worship Awliyā' and Sāliheen [righteous people] in opposition to Tawheed and deen, making Istighāthah by them, asking them during times of difficulties and seeking nearness to them, the dead and the living. And many believed in benefit and harm in inanimate objects such as stones and trees.

Then Ibn Ghannām said:

Most of the people would supplicate to the Prophets and righteous people, the living and the dead, striving and making efforts [in this], tried by their beliefs in them.

Then Ibn Ghannām states that within the lands of Najd such as Jubaylah and elsewhere were graves of the Sahābah which people used to go and make du'a. While in the region of Fida' was a palm tree known as 'al-Fahhāl' to which both men and women used to go and seek blessings from and if a woman had not yet got married she would go to it. A woman would hug the tree saying "O Fahl ul-Fuhūl, I want to get married before I become unable" believing that it could help them. Ibn Ghannām also states that at the end of Dir'iyyah was a large cave which the people claimed a woman called Bint al-Ameer hid inside from some people who tried to harm her. They tried to get her and so she screamed and made du'a to Allāh and the cave collapsed to protect her. The people would go to the cave and throw bread and meat inside it while asking for help, assistance and protection! While in Makkah the people used to go to the grave of Abū Tālib bin Hassan bin Abī Numayy', one of the Shurafā' of Makkah who ruled from 1601-1603 CE and supplicate to it for help. Ibn Bishr states in *'Unwān ul-Majd*:

Shirk at that time [of the da'wah] became widespread in Najd and elsewhere, along with beliefs in stones, trees and graves, building on them, seeking blessing from them and making vows to them. As was seeking assistance from jinn, making vows to them, giving food to them, making hospices for them to ask them to cure the seek, swearing oaths by other than Allāh, and likewise of major and minor shirk.

This ignorance was also noted by Abū Shāmah al-Maqdisī (d. 665 AH/1268 CE),⁶⁴ al-Buhūtī (d. 1051 AH/1641 CE) and as-San'ānī all wrote about the jahl and shirk which was prevalent during their day in the cities of Damascus, Sanā', Baghdad and Cairo. Shaykh Qāsim al-Hanafī stated in *Sharh ad-Durur a-Bihār*.

What takes place by most common people is that they go to the graves of some righteous people saying “O master so and so return what I have lost” or “cure my sickness” and presenting gold and silver [at these sites] is bātil according to the Ijmā' from a number of aspects. Of these is: to the extent that they think the dead can influence worldly matters and this belief is kufr...the people have been tried by that especially during the birthday of Ahmad al-Badawī.⁶⁵

Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*) commented on the above saying:

Reflect, he was in Egypt, the headquarters of 'Ulama, and how this became widespread among the people of Egypt and the 'Ulama had no ability to avert it. Contemplate on his words ‘most of the common people’, do you think that the times became rectified after this?

Abū Shāmah al-Maqdisī said in his book *Bā'ith 'ala Inkār il-Bida' wa'l-Hawādith*.

Via these ways kufr became apparent with the worship of idols, and of this category is the trial of that which has become widespread and what Shaytān has adorned for the common people in perfuming walls and columns, and every place having specific seats where people talk about seeing righteous people in dreams who tell them to do things which they do. They preserve these actions and waste Allāh's obligations and the Sunan and they think they are gaining nearness to Allāh by this. They transgress this further by exalting the places where this happens in their hearts, exalting them,

⁶⁴ Abū Shāmah was a Damascene Shāfi'ī scholar who was one of the Mujtahid scholars (according to his biographers) who emphasized returning to the Qur'ān and Sunnah, opposing bida' and asserting ijtihād for those qualified scholars. All of this was before Shaykh ul-Islām Taymiyyah. Abū Shāmah's famous works include *al-Bida wa'l-Hawādith* [Innovations and Newly-Invented Matters], *Kitāb ur-Rawdatayn fī Akhbār id-Dawlatayn*, *Mukhtasar al-Mu'ammal fī'r-Radd ilā'l-Amr il-Awwal*, *al-Muhaqqaq min'Ilm il-Usūl fīmā yata'allaq bi Afāl ir-Rasūl*, *al-Murshid al-Wajeez ilā 'Ulūm tata'allaqu bi'l-Kitāb il'Azeez*.

⁶⁵ I could not find much in terms of a biography for him, however he may have been a contemporary of as-Sakhāwī. The quote is also found in Shaykh Sulaymān bin 'AbdurRahmān al-Hamdān, *ad-Durr an-Nadeed 'ala Abwāb it-Tawheed* (Jeddah, KSA: Maktabat us-Sahābah, 1413 AH/1992 CE), p.93.

hoping for the sick to be cured by them, fulfilment of their wants, making vows to them be these springs, a tree, a structure or a stone. In Damascus, may Allāh protect it from this, are a number of places where this occurs such as 'Awaynat ul-Hūmah outside the Bāb Tūmah, and an adorned and perumed column inside Bāb us-Sagheer and a dried accursed tree by Bāb Nasr, may Allāh ease it being cut and uprooted for how much it resembles Dhāt ul-Anwāt.

Indeed, some of the Bedouins and people in these areas did not believe in the resurrection! Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*) stated:

It is well-known among all what the rural areas are like, or most of them. For the arrogant and stubborn is unable to deny...Anza and Āl Dhufayr and their likes are all famous and the followers acknowledge the resurrection and do not doubt it.⁶⁶

He also said in his treatise to the 'Ulama of land of the Noble Sanctuary:

I issued a ruling on the kufr of the rural areas who reject the [belief] in the resurrection and in Jannah and the Hellfire. They also reject women's inheritance, even though have knowledge that Allāh's Book is present with the Hadr [settled rural population], and that Allāh's Messenger (sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam) was sent with that which they reject. So when I issued the ruling on their kufr, although the majority of common people in our land rebuff that [rejection], and [of the kufr] of their hateful elite who claim to have knowledge, they said "whoever says la ilaha il Allāh does not disbelieve even if s/he rejects the resurrection and rejects the Divine Legislation in totality".⁶⁷

Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb spoke about a core belief found among most people within the rural areas specifically, the rural areas of Najd and the Hijāz. He did not intend the average common person who resided in these two regions. He also stated in his treatise to Sulaymān bin Suhaym:

Woe to you, after this how can you instruct to follow what most of the people are doing?! As it is well-known that people in our land and in the

⁶⁶ *Mu'allifāt ush-Shaykh al-Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb*, p.25.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p.41

Hijāz reject the resurrection, and they are more than those who acknowledge it.⁶⁸

This indicates that although there were those who had sound belief, the majority did not have the correct belief in Islām and in fact had rejected huge aspects. None of the enemies of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb rejected his depiction of the rural areas. Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb stated in his treatise to Muhammad bin 'Īd:

The condition of the rural areas, or of most of them, are well-known to all...your 'Ulama say "it is well-known that this is the condition of the rural areas which is not to be denied however they say "la ilaha il Allāh" and this protects them from kufr and even if they did all of that."⁶⁹

Shaykh Faisal Jāsim in a recent research paper entitled *Idā'āt fī Tārīkh id-Da'wah as-Salafīyyah an-Najdiyyah, Halqah ath-Thālithah: Hukm ul-Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (rahimahullāh) 'alā Ahli z-Zamānihi* [Shedding Light on the History of the Najdi Salafi Da'wah, Part 3: Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb's Ruling on the Peoples of his Time], states in this regard:

With this, the Shaykh did not intent his words to be a ruling of kufr on all of the rural peoples of Najd and the Hijāz. Rather he indicated as to the kufr beliefs which were widespread among the people at that time. Just as he applied the ruling of kufr on the one who fell into such kufr and not the ones who were saved from it.⁷⁰

Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb's position on the people of the rural areas not believing in the resurrection was stated by other scholars who in fact preceded him with the observation. Shaykh Muhammad as-Sanūsī (*rahimahullāh*), who died in 850 AH [1446 CE], stated about the rural areas of Shām during his time: **"Many of the people in the rural areas reject the resurrection."⁷¹** While of the contemporaries of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb who reached the same conclusion about the rural areas, were Shaykh Muhammad al-Khalīlī ash-Shāfi'i (*rahimahullāh*), a Shāfi'i Mufti of Jerusalem who died in 1147 AH/1735 CE.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p.235

⁶⁹ Ibid., pp.25-26.

⁷⁰ Shaykh Faisal Jāsim, *Idā'āt fī Tārīkh id-Da'wah as-Salafīyyah an-Najdiyyah, Halqah ath-Thālithah: Hukm ul-Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (rahimahullāh) 'alā Ahli z-Zamānihi* [Shedding Light on the History of the Najdi Salafi Da'wah, Part 3: Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb's Ruling on the Peoples of his Time]. See: www.al-jasem.com/archives/2262

Accessed November 2019.

⁷¹ *Sharh 'Aqeedat it-Tawheed al-Kubrā*, p.37.

Shaykh al-Khalīlī ash-Shāfi'ī stated in his *Fatāwā* in regards to the Arabs of Sa'ādīnah, the Banu 'Atiyyah and others in Shām [the Levant], Egypt, the Hijāz and other Bedouin Arabs that they accept the messengership of the Prophet (*sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) however they reject the resurrection.⁷² Shaykh Ibrāheem al-Bayjūrī al-Azharī (*rahimahullāh*), who died in 1276 AH/1859 CE, stated when speaking about the rural areas of Egypt:

And the likes of this is abundant among the people, as from them are those who believe that the Sahābah are prophets, and this is kufr. And from them are those who reject the resurrection.⁷³

So in Najd and Arabia at the time of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb, Shirk al-Akbar and kufr beliefs were widespread and manifest.

THE RULING ON REJECTING THE RESURRECTION ACCORDING TO THE CLASSICAL SCHOLARS

Allāh Says,

﴿اللَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ لِيَجْمَعَنَّكُمْ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ﴾

“Allāh – there is no deity except Him. He will surely assemble you for [account on] the Day of Resurrection, about which there is no doubt.”

{*an-Nisā'* (4): 87}

And Allāh Says,

﴿زَعَمَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا أَنْ لَنْ يُعَذِّبَهُمُ اللَّهُ بِمَا عَمِلُوا ذَلِكَ عَلَى اللَّهِ يَسِيرٌ﴾

“Those who disbelieve have claimed that they will never be resurrected. Say, “yes, by my Lord, you will surely be resurrected; then you will surely be informed of what you did.

And that, for Allāh, is easy.””

⁷² *Fatāwā Muhammad al-Khalīlī*, vol.2, p.282.

⁷³ *Hāshiyat ul-Bayjūrī 'ala Jawharat it-Tawheed*, p.78.

{at-Taghābun (64): 7}

So what is the ruling on the one who denies belief in a core aspect of creed, particularly the resurrection, according to the classical scholars? The classical scholars - out of consideration that 'Bro Hajji' deems the contemporary scholars of Sunnah as all being "boot-lickers", as he stated in his video about Dr Khalid Green. Abu'l-Hasan al-Ash'arī states in *Maqālāt ul-Islāmiyyeen*:

In summary what Ahl ul-Hadeeth wa's-Sunnah adhere to is acknowledgement of Allāh, His Angels, His Books, His Messengers, that the Hour is approaching, about which there is no doubt, and that Allāh will resurrect whoever is in the graves.

Ibn Hazm stated:

As for whoever claims that the souls transfer from body to body then this is the view of the proponents of Tanāsukh [transmigration and reincarnation] and it is [regarded as] kufr according to all of the people of Islām.⁷⁴

Ibn Hazm also said:

واتفقوا أن البعث حق وأن الناس كلهم يبعثون في وقت تنقطع فيه سكناهم في الدنيا

And they agreed that the resurrection is true and that all people will be resurrected at a time when their worldly life will come to an end.⁷⁵

Ibn 'AbdulBarr stated:

The Muslims have reached consensus that whoever rejects resurrection has no īmān and no testimony and in that is what is appropriate and sufficient. As what is in the Qur'ān regarding certain acknowledgement of resurrection after death [is known] and there is no avenue to reject that.⁷⁶

Abu Hāmid al-Ghazālī stated:

وأما ما يتعلق من هذا الجنس بأصول العقائد المهمة، فيجب تكفير من يغير الظاهر بغير برهان قاطع، كالذي ينكر حشر الأجساد، وينكر العقوبات الحسية في الآخرة، بظنون وأوهام واستبعادات من غير برهان قاطع، فيجب تكفيره قطعاً، إذ لا برهان على استحالة رد الأرواح إلى الأجساد.

⁷⁴ Ibn Hazm, *al-Muhalla'*, vol.1, p.31

⁷⁵ Ibn Hazm, *Marātib ul-Ijmā fi'l-'Ibādāt wa'l-Mu'āmalāt wa'l-'Itiqādāt*. Beirut: Dār Ibn Hazm, 1419 AH/1998 CE, ed. Hasan Ahmad Isbir Abu'l-Barā'. p.271

⁷⁶ Ibn 'AbdulBarr, *at-Tamheed*, vol.9, p.116.

As for what this genus is connected to in terms of important principles of beliefs, then takfeer of whoever changes the apparent without a definitive proof is a must. Such as whoever rejects the bodily gathering and sensory punishments in the Hereafter based on thoughts, delusions and presumed impossibilities without decisive proof, has to have takfeer made of them decisively. As there is no proof of the impossibility of souls returning to their [worldly] bodies.⁷⁷

Qādi 'Iyyād stated:

«وكذلك قطع على كفر من قال بتناسخ الأرواح وانتقالها أبد الآباد في الأشخاص، وتعذيبها أو تنعيمها فيها، بحسب زكائها وخبثها، وكذلك من أنكر البعث والحساب.. فهو كافر بإجماع؛ للنص عليه، وإجماع الأمة على نقله متواتراً». اهـ

Likewise, we decisively hold the kufr of the one who speaks of the Tanāsukh [transmigration] of souls and their eternal transition in people, and their punishment and reward based on their purity or filth (i.e. reincarnation). Likewise, whoever rejects the resurrection and judgement...is a disbeliever according to consensus as stipulated and the consensus of the Ummah in transmitting this [ruling] via multiple routes of transmission.⁷⁸

Al-Ījī stated:

Ahl ul-Milal [the people of religion] have reached consensus from their later ones that the gathering of bodies can happen, the philosophers rejected this.⁷⁹

Ad-Dadeer al-Mālīkī stated:

One disbelieves if it is said that “souls transmigrate and reincarnate”, meaning: whoever says that “when a person dies their soul transfers to

⁷⁷ Abū Hāmid al-Ghazālī, *Faysal ut-Tafriqah Bayna'l-Islām wa'z-Zandaqah*. Beirut: Dār ul-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1414 AH. p.86.

Also see Sherman Jackson's translation, *On the Boundaries of Theological Tolerance in Islam: Abu Hāmid al-Ghazālī's Faysal al-Tafriqa Bayna al-Islam wa al-Zandaqah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. p.109.

⁷⁸ Al-Qādi 'Iyyād bin Mūsā al-Yahsubī, *ash-Shifā' bi't-Ta'reef al-Mustafā*. Cairo: 'Isā al-Bābī al-Halabī Printers, ed. 'Ali Muhammad al-Bijāwī.

⁷⁹ *Al-Mawāqif fi 'Ilm il-Kalām*, p.372.

another like it or better if they were a good person or lower than it if they were a bad person, or the same if they were the same” - is a disbeliever, as this [notion] contains rejection of resurrection.⁸⁰

Ad-Dusūqī also stated this in his *Hāshiyah*⁸¹ as did 'Ilish in his *Sharh*.⁸² Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafī stated:

إحياء الأموات بعد القيامة، والإيمان بالمعاد مما دل عليه الكتاب والسنة والعقل والفطرة السليمة

Revival of the dead after the Day of Judgement, and īmān in Mi'ād is what the Book, Sunnah, intellect and sound natural disposition indicates.⁸³

Ibn Nujaym affirmed the kufr of the one who rejects resurrection.⁸⁴ Ash-Shirbīnī mentioned that rejection of resurrection is included among the types of apostasy⁸⁵ as did Qalyūbī⁸⁶ and Ibn Hajar al-Haytamī.⁸⁷ Yahya bin Hamza al-'Alawī stated:

You should know that there is no difference among Ahl ul-Qiblah [i.e. the Muslims] and others, except something which has been relayed from some of the philosophers, regarding the accuracy of resurrection.⁸⁸

Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

As for the Munāfiqūn from this Ummah who do not acknowledge the wordings of the Qur'ān and well-known Sunnah, then they distort words from the proper place and say “these are just parables put forth” so as to negate spiritual resurrection. Those [who say this are] the Qarāmitah al-Bātiniyyah who have the same views as those held by the Majūs and Sā'ibah...**those are kuffār who have to be fought according to the agreement of the people of īmān, as Muhammad (sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam) had clarified that comprehensively and decisively.⁸⁹**

These are not the statements of ‘insidious Wahhabists’.

⁸⁰ *Ash-Sharh as-Sagheer*, vol.6, pp.146-47.

⁸¹ *Hāshiyat ud-Dusūqī 'ala'sh-Sharh il-Kabeer*, vol.4, p.269.

⁸² Muhammad 'Ilish, *Sharh Manh al-Jaleel*, vol.4, p.464.

⁸³ Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafī, *Sharh 'Aqeedah at-Tahawiyyah*, vol.2, p.589.

⁸⁴ *Al-Bahr ar-Rā'iq*, vol.5, p.132.

⁸⁵ *Mughnī ul-Muhtāj*, vol.4, p.135

⁸⁶ *Hāshiyat Qalyūbī wa 'Umayrah*, vol.4, p.175.

⁸⁷ *Al-I'lām*, p.374.

⁸⁸ Yahya bin Hamza al-'Alawī, *al-Ifhām li Afīdat al-Bātiniyyah it-Tughām*, p.123.

⁸⁹ Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.4, p.313, and also see vol.4, pp.282-83.

OTTOMAN SCHOLARS WHO TRIED TO ESTABLISH TAWHEED WITHIN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE DURING THE 17TH CENTURY

In another video 'Bro Hajji' relays a passage from *ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, vol.5, p.374 and vol.9, pp.291-292 which states **"whoever does not make takfeer of the Mushrikeen from the Turkish state and the grave worshippers..."** yet this was not uttered by Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb, it is not known precisely who uttered it though it is also ascribed to his later students and grandchildren.⁹⁰ In any case, some of the scholars have noted that the scholars of the Da'wah Najdiyyah according to their Ijtihād applied this to those forces who they deemed to be *fighting to establish Shirk* in Najd under the banner of Muhammad 'Ali Pasha and the Ottomans, not a generalised statement of the Turkish masses.

⁹⁰ Many Salafi scholars from outside of Najd have problematised such statements and apply caution on such rulings within the Da'wah Salafiyyah Najdiyyah. This is a valid ikhtilāf on the matter, and they still concur with the da'wah to Tawheed and absolve Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb from the accusation of takfeer.

According to these scholars, particularly of the First Saudi State such as Shaykh Sulaymān bin 'Abdullāh bin Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimabullāh*) who authored *Tayseer ul-'Aẓeeẓ il-Hameed fī Sharh Kitāb it-Tawheed* and *ad-Dalā'il*, it was quite simple. On the one hand is the da'wah which was focused on bringing people back to Tawheed, the people were ignorant and had to be educated, and the Sunnah will be revived in terms of levelling graves, shrines and tombs. While on the other hand were those who opposed Tawheed for a number of reasons outlined earlier and were fighting with the enemies of Tawheed to establish Shirk al-Akbar. So this dichotomy posited by the Shaykhs of the Da'wah Najdiyyah was clear: either you support Tawheed and those who preach it as this is what Islām is based on, and if not then you are opposed to this and an aider of Shirk al-Akbar. This was their Ijtihād. As was also the position and Ijtihād of scholars in other parts of the Muslim world, including the Ottoman Empire itself! Such as:

- Mehmed Ali al-Birgīvī (d. 981 AH/1573 CE).
- Abu's-Su'ud Effendī (896-982 AH/1490-1574 CE).
- the Hanafī jurist, Imām and Khateeb of Muhammad al-Fātih's Masjid in Istanbul Ibrāheem bin Muhammad bin Ibrāheem al-Halabī (d.945 AH/1538 CE) who authored *Tasfeeh ul-Ghabī fī Tanẓeeh Ibn 'Arabī* which was a reply to as-Suyūtī's *Tanbeeh ul-Ghabī bi Tabrī'at Ibn 'Arabī*.
- the Ottoman Shaykh ul-Islām Sadi Celebi.
- the Ottoman Shaykh ul-Islām Civizade Effendi (d. 954/1547 CE) who in the mid-16th Century said whoever does not make takfeer of Ibn 'Arabī is a kāfir himself and that there should even be a posthumous execution, to the dismay of the Ottoman Sultan of the day Sulaymān.⁹¹
- Imām Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Aqhisārī ar-Rūmī (d. 1043 AH/1632 CE).
- Kadizāde Mehmet (d. 1635 CE).
- Vadi Mehmed (d. 1685 CE).
- Muhammad al-Ustuwānī (d. 1072 AH/1661 CE).

Some of them may have had some Tasawwuf however more in the sense of Tazkiyat un-Nafs as they strongly condemned the innovations of the Sūfīs in the Ottoman realm and the forms of dhikr which were not from the Sunnah. Therefore, within the Ottoman Empire during the century before Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb were Turkish Fuqahā and 'Ulama opposed to Shirk al-Akbar and bida' and called to Tawheed.

⁹¹ For more on this see Cankat Kaplan (2019), "An Anti Ibn 'Arabī Polemicist in Sixteenth Century Ottoman Istanbul: Ibrahīm al-Halabī (d. 1549) and his Interlocutors." MA thesis, Central European University, Budapest, p.83.

Maybe the most important in this regard was Imām Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Aqhisārī ar-Rūmī (d. 1043 AH/1632 CE) who was in the Ottoman Empire and is significant here. He was born as a Christian in Cyprus and taken away as a child when the Ottomans had conquered the Island. He lived in Akhisar where he became a Hanafī jurist. Some biographies state that he was a Sūfī, but his works are free of any major emphasis on Tasawwuf and he refutes the Sūfis and their practices, although his use of the term in *Majālis* appears to refer more to Tazkiyat un-Nafs. Moreover, there were other people who had the nisba 'Aqhisārī' who were Sūfis and he is often confused with them.

He wrote a treatise on the prohibition of acts of Shirk al-Akbar at graves entitled *Radd 'ala'l-Quburiyyah*. This work is hardly known, and appears to have been somewhat neatly ignored, as his emphasis on Tawheed, refuting manifestation of Shirk and opposing bida' was strong. His introduction to his magnum opus *Majālis ul-Abrār* has preceded wherein he stated:

I will make clear the correct doctrine [I'tiqādāt Saheehah] and the actions of the Hereafter [A'māl al-ākhirah] and I will warn against seeking assistance from graves and other [such actions] which are done by the disbelievers and the people of innovation who are misled [Ahl ul-Bida' ad-Dālah] and misleading sinners. This is because I have seen many people in these times that have made some graves into idols [Awthān], praying at them and offering sacrifices there. Actions and statements emerge from them unbecoming of the people of faith [Ahl ul-Īmān]. So I wanted to clarify what the Divine Legislation [Shar'] has relayed in this regard, so that truth is distinguished from falsehood for whoever requires Tas-heeh of īmān and Ikhlās from the plot of Shaytān, and safety from the Nirān [the fire], and entry into Dār ul-Janān [the abode of paradise].⁹²

While Majlis no.17 of the work is dedicated to the topic of Shirk and bida at the graves. This work was praised by Shāh 'Abdul'Azeez ad-Dehlawī in his *Fatāwā 'Aẓẓī* (Delhi: Mujtabā'ī Press, 1341 AH/CE), vol.2, p.115; as does al-'Allāmah 'AbdulHayy al-Luknowī (d. 1AH/1886 CE) in

⁹² Ahmad bin Muhammad al-Aqhisārī al-Hanafī, *Majālis ul-Abrār wa Masālik ul-Akhyār Mahā'iq al-Bida' wa Maqāmi' al-Ashrār* [Gatherings of the Righteous and Paths of the Good in Destroying Innovation and Suppressing Evils]. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Islamic University of Madeenah, KSA, ed. 'Ali Misrī Surayjān Fawrā, 1428 AH/2008 CE, pp.2-3 (of the main edited text of the work). It can be downloaded here:

<https://barelwism.files.wordpress.com/2020/05/majalis-al-abrar-rumi-best-print-muhaqqaq.pdf>

And here:

<https://waqfeya.com/book.php?bid=8919>

Iqāmat ul-Hujjah, p.19 as edited by Abū Ghuddah. In 2007 in London, Dr Yahya Michot informed me about al-Aqhisārī's work and how in his writings he emphasised Tawheed and opposed Shirk and bida' from within the Ottoman Empire and quoted from the works of Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn ul-Qayyim. For instance, al-Aqhisārī extensively references Ibn ul-Qayyim's *Ighāthat ul-Lahfān min Masa'id ish-Shaytān* [Relieving the Distressed from the Traps of the Devil]. Dr Yahya Michot has also translated and published a book by al-Aqhisārī on the prohibition of smoking tobacco, which he translated as *Against Smoking: An Ottoman Manifesto*.⁹³ While Dr Mustapha Sheikh, now at the University of Leeds and whose PhD thesis was initially supervised by Dr Yahya Michot, has conducted research into the works of al-Aqhisārī. Mustapha Sheikh's book is entitled *Ottoman Puritanism and its Discontents: Ahmad al-Rumi al-Aqhisari and the Qadizadelis*.⁹⁴

Then there were the students of Kadizade Mehmed Efendi (*rahimahullāh*) in the mid-17th century, although this was very small.⁹⁵ They were more focused on knowledge and opposed the graves, dancing, dhikr, bida' of the general shirk of the Sufis and public sin in the Ottoman Empire, yet had some slight Tasawwuf with them, yet not to the level of shirk which was found elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire. They are sometimes pejoratively referred to as the "Kadizadeli", which is a similar nickname to "Wahhābī". Lapidus (2014: 370) notes in regards to Kadizāde Mehmed that they:

...insisted on clarifying boundaries between Muslims and non-Muslims and especially on the separation of Muslim women from non-Muslim men.⁹⁶

Kadizade Mehmed (*rahimahullāh*) was active in translating the works of Ibn Taymiyyah into Turkish, in the 17th century and almost hundred years before the time of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb. He authored *Ziyārat ul-Qubūr* in which he stated that it was an issue in which war could be waged, property taken and bloodshed, he argued this *within* the Ottoman empire almost hundred years before the time of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb.

One of the teachers in hadeeth of Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb was Muhammad Hayāt as-Sindī (d. 1163 AH/1750 CE), who himself was a student of Abū Tāhir al-Kurānī and his

⁹³ Ahmad al-Rumi al-Ahisari, *Against Smoking: An Ottoman Manifesto*. Markfield, Leicestershire and Oxford: Kube Publishing and Interface Publications, 2010. Ed. Yahya Michot.

⁹⁴ Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. Dr Yahya Michot informed me of this research in 2007.

⁹⁵ For more on the Kadizadeli Movement see James Muhammad Dawud Currie (2015), "Kadizadeli Ottoman Scholarship, Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab and the Rise of the Saudi State." *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 26(3), pp.265-288.

⁹⁶ Lapidus, I.M. (2014). *A History of Islamic Societies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

teachers included the Shaykh Muhammad ibn Sulaymān al-Maghribī. Abu'l-Mawāhib was a Hanbali Shaykh based from Damascus, he had a Sūfī inclination but admired Ibn Taymiyyah, and one of his students was 'Abdullāh bin Ibrāhīm an-Najdī, a Shaykh of Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb in fiqh and hadeeth who had travelled to Damascus to study. May Allāh have mercy on them all. While one of the teachers of Abu'l-Mawāhib, was Muhammad bin Ahmad al-Ustuwānī (1608-1661 CE), *rahimahullāh*, one of the Syrian Shaykhs who had influenced the Turkish Fuqahā Sunni Shaykhs.

Al-Ustuwānī had taught in Istanbul in various Masājid and became the preacher of the elite guards at the Sultān's palace, Mehmed IV. He was known as 'Padişeh Şeyh' ['Shaykh of the Sultān'] and encouraged commanding the good and forbidding the evil openly in Istanbul. In his *Risālah*, which was translated into Turkish, he discussed the categories of shirk and kufr and advised that the state intervene by force to quash such actions. He argued this *within* the Ottoman empire almost hundred years before the time of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb.

In 1651 they advised the Grand Vizier to destroy two Khalwati Sūfī lodges, and also complained to the Sultān to prevent Sūfī criticisms of the works of al-Birgīvī book *at-Tareeqah al-Muhammadiyyah*. Al-Ustuwānī was eventually exiled back to Damascus in 1656 CE as his students were viewed as too radical. He taught at the Umayyad Mosque and then the Saleemiyyah School, his son Mustafa later followed in his tradition. Vani Mehmed (d. 1685 CE) in 1661 also gained the respect of Mehmed IV and became 'Padişeh Şeyh' ['Shaykh of the Sultān'] and managed to persuade the Sultān to ban Sūfī dancing and grave visits.⁹⁷

Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb's scholars *ijāzāt* trace back to Hanbalī scholars who were in Damascus when the Turkish Fuqahā Sunni Shaykhs were there, like Abu'l-Mawāhib and al-Ustuwānī – who were all against Shirk and bida'. Under the leadership of al-Ustuwānī and gaining the support of the Sultan and Grand Vizier Köprülü Mehmed, they also used military force and armed enforcement against their opponents, as occurred in 1066 AH/1656 CE.⁹⁸

Due to their da'wah, those preachers of Shirk were executed and Sufi centres opposed. They were eventually suppressed by the Ottomans, and their case does show that at an early period there were Turkish Ottoman Shaykhs who were opposed to the Shirk and bida' that consumed the Ottoman State. The movement came to an end, incidentally and somewhat ironically, around 1683 CE when the Ottomans were in rapid decline during the aftermath of the Vienna defeat.

⁹⁷ For more on this Necati Ozturk, *Islamic Orthodoxy Among the Ottomans in the Seventeenth Century with Special Reference to the Qadi-Zada Movement*. University of Edinburgh. PhD Thesis. 1981.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p.268

Hence, within Ottoman society itself in the mid-17th century, debates were raging about Shirk and bida' and the excessive Sūfī practices, way before Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and the conflicts that the First Saudi State had with the Ottomans and their vassals such as Muhammad 'Ali Pasha.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF 'UTHMĀN IBN FŪDĪ [DAN FODIO] AND THE SOKOTO CALIPHATE IN ALL THIS

There is also the case and situation of Shaykh 'Uthmān Ibn Fūdī (aka 'Dan Fodio'), known for his *tajdeed* efforts and his stance against shirk and innovations in Northern Nigeria in the 18th century CE.⁹⁹ Firstly, not only did he have his own state which was also not under Ottoman control, but he also fought, verbally and physically, against those who claimed Islam yet opposed Tawheed. Let us start with his book *Hisn ul-Afham min Juyush il-Anham* [The Fortification of Understanding Against the Armies of Delusion], which was translated into English as *Islam Against Illusions* (Kano: Quality Press, 1989) by Fazlur Rahman Siddiqi. Imām 'Uthmān ibn Fūdī says under delusion no. 35:

There are people in this country who venerate stones and trees...they sacrifice animals for them symbolizing that the stones and trees are great, and they even pour flour-paste on them.

⁹⁹ He is Abū Muhammad 'Uthmān ibn Muhammad ibn Fūdī, born in Marratta in northern Nigeria in 1168 AH/ 1754 CE. The name 'Dan Fodio' is the Hausa rendition of Ibn Fūdī. He was from a family of scholars that migrated to Hausaland from Futa Toro before the 15th century CE, bringing with it the Islamic tradition of Timbuktu. He waged a *jihād* in 1217 AH/1802 CE against clans that had violently opposed Islām and strongly repressed the Muslims. He established the Sokoto Islamic state which ruled by *Sharee'ah* in West Africa.

Note: these were done by people claiming to be Muslim and did not want to leave the practices even after the proofs were established. Dan Fodio further stated: **“The one who indulges in such activities is considered a kāfir according to consensus.”** Dr Siddiqi stated:

Since innovations and superstitions prevailed in all parts of the country, the common people as well as the Muslim scholars of that time were involved in un-Islamic practices and the whole society changed into a corrupt and demoralized society.¹⁰⁰

Hence, there was a situation which was exactly what was prevalent during the epoch of Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhab, Dr Siddiqi continues:

At that time, Muslims were called Muslims only because they were born in the so-called “Muslim families” while their characters and practices were against Islam and its education. Their belief was that some trees and stones deserved respect and worship and that these could provide them with the means of subsistence or bless them with a child...Muslims of that time had totally lost their Islamic identifications because of their pagan practices. Even for a Muslim, it was difficult to recognize his Muslim brother. Even the Ulama accused the Shaykh, but they were not sincere in their remarks against him. Their attitude to the Shaykh was not based on their sincerity, but it was the result of a conspiracy against the Shaykh by the Sultān.

So there was a conspiracy to establish Shirk al-Akbar and its people in Northern Nigeria, in direct opposition to the Qur'ān. These were the individuals whom Dan Fodio gave da'wah to, established the proofs on and then fought against when they rejected. This was akin to the situation in Najd in the years of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb. Dr Siddiqi also states on page 175 of *Islam Against Illusions*:

According to Muhammad Bello...the main purpose of his (Imām 'Uthmān's) sermons was to teach the people the fundamentals of Islam; preferably, the principles of tawheed, the other articles of faith and the essential duties of a Muslim towards Islam.

Muhammad Bello was the son of Imām 'Uthmān. Therefore, here alone we can see a radical departure in the emphasis of Imām 'Uthmān and the *Sufis* of the era who refrain from calling to Tawheed based on their claim that it causes division. Not to mention the fact that they are largely

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. pp.34-36.

ignorant of it. 'Uthmān ibn Fūdī also made similar statements in his books *Irsbād al-Ummah ilā Tayseer il-Milla* and *Tanqeef ul-Muslimeen*.¹⁰¹

One of 'Uthmān Dan Fodio's teachers was Jibreel ibn 'Umar al-Aqdasī of the Tuareg tribe who had made Hajj and thus lived in Makkah for a while. In Madeenah, Jibreel Ibn 'Umar studied with Muhammad Murtada az-Zabīdī (1145-1205 AH/ 1732-1791 CE) who was originally from India but had travelled to az-Zabeed in Yemen where he lived for a while and studied before going on to teach in Madeenah himself. One of az-Zabeedī's teachers was Shāh Waliullāh ad-Dehlawī (1702–1762 CE) of Delhi in India. Dan Fodio's uncle who taught him hadeeth was Muhammad bin Rāj who had studied under Abu'l-Hasan as-Sindī also from India and a teacher of hadeeth in Madeenah. Abu'l-Hasan as-Sindī was a student of Muhammad Hayāt as-Sindī another great *hadeeth* scholar of India who was also teaching in Madeenah. One of Muhammad Hayāt as-Sindī's other students was Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb. Also see a recent study conducted in Nigeria and written in Arabic entitled *Asānid al-Faqeer ad-Da'if al-Mutashāfi bi'l-Mushaffa' Ahmad as-Shareef*,¹⁰² also see the research of Stefan Reichmuth.¹⁰³

SHAYKH SĀLIH AS-SINDĪ'S REPLY TO HĀTIM AL-'AWNĪ'S CLAIM THAT ISIS IS INTERLINKED TO THE DA'WAH OF IMĀM MUHAMMAD BIN 'ABDULWAHHĀB¹⁰⁴

Does the methodology of the Khawārij such as ISIS/ISIL have any connection to the da'wah of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and the Salafi da'wah?

Answer:

¹⁰¹ See Ahmad Mohammad Khani, *The Intellectual Origin of the Sokoto Jihad*, (Ibadan, Nigeria: Iman Publications, Muharram 1405 AH/1985 CE), pp.85-90.

¹⁰² Ms. University of Ibadan Library 82/137, Ibadan. Centre of Islamic Documentation [CAD].

¹⁰³ Stefan Reichmuth, "Murtada al-Zabidi (d. 1791) in Biographical and Autobiographical Accounts: Glimpses of Islamic Scholarship in the 18th Century CE." *Die Welt Des Islams: International Journal for the Study of Modern Islam* (Leiden, Boston and Koln: Brill, Vol. 39, No. 1, March 1999) p.70.

¹⁰⁴ Summarised translation from an article by the Shaykh dated 21st September 2014:

<http://islamancient.com/play.php?catsmktba=214649>

Dr Shareef Hātim al-'Awnī was heavily repudiated for his assertions by a number of prominent Salafi Shaykhs including: Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Rājiḥī, Shaykh 'AbdurRahmān as-Sudays, Shaykh Sulaymān al-Kharāshī, Shaykh Badr al-'Utaybī and others.

The words of Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Rājiḥī in regards to Hātim Shareef al-'Awnī can be heard here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JFsSxNkxnfU>

Dr Hātim Shareef al-'Awnī's original article in the Saudi newspaper *al-Madina* can be found Online.

What follows is an explanation of the lie of this claim. Hâtîm ash-Shareef in his article convulses against the book *ad-Durar as-Saniyyah* which is a compilation of treatises by Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhâb and his students regarding tawheed which the messengers came with. Hâtîm ash-Shareef claimed that it is responsible for the spread of extremism, takfeer and the manhaj of ISIS!?

Let us contemplate on this book with justice and calmness so that we can see if Shareef's claim is truthful, and if it is true that the book incites to extremism in takfeer or if rather it exhort to moderation. Has ISIS relayed unto us the statement of Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhâb that:

“Takfeer is not to be made of the specific person except if the proof is established...if the Words of Allāh and of His Messenger reach him and he is free of that which can excuse him – then he is a disbeliever.”¹⁰⁵

Or this statement:

We only make takfeer of the one who associates partners with Allāh in His Divinity after we have clarified to him the proofs for the invalidity of shirk.¹⁰⁶

Or this statement:

We make takfeer of the one who acknowledges the deen of Allāh and His Messenger and then shows enmity to it and blocks the people from it, and likewise [we make takfeer of] the one who worships idols after knowing that it is the deen of the Mushrikeen and adorns it to people – this is the one whom I make takfeer of, and every scholar on the face of the earth makes takfeer of such people except a stubborn or ignorant person.¹⁰⁷

Or this statement:

If he performs kufr and Shirk due to his ignorance, or due to the absence of one who will remind him, then we do not judge him to have kufr until the proof is established.¹⁰⁸

Or this statement:

¹⁰⁵ *Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, vol.10, p.69

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, vol.10, p.128

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, vol.10, 131

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, vol.10, 136

If a person, who believes in Allāh and His Messenger, does that which is kufr or has a belief which is kufr, out of ignorance of what Allāh sent His Messenger with (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) – then such a person is not deemed as a disbeliever according to us. We do not judge him with kufr until the proof from the message is established, which if opposed a person is deemed as having disbelieved.¹⁰⁹

Or this statement:

All to whom the Qur'ān has reached then the proof in the Messenger (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) has been established on him. However, the ignorant person needs one of the people of knowledge to inform him of that.¹¹⁰

Or perhaps this statement:

Takfeer of a specific person from those ignorant people and their likes, wherein one of them is judged to be with the kuffār, is not allowed to be resorted to except after the proof of the message is established on them.¹¹¹

It should also be brought to attention that some of the statements are from Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb and some are from others. Perhaps the following statement escaped ISIS:

During times when ignorance is dominant a specific person is not be made takfeer of until the proof is established on him and is made clear to him.¹¹²

Or this statement:

We do not make takfeer except of the one whom Allāh and His Messenger have made takfeer of and after the proof has been established on him.

Or this one:

We do not make takfeer except based on what all of the scholars have agreed upon and the Two Shahādahs.¹¹³

And also:

We make takfeer after knowing, if he knows and rejects.¹¹⁴

Or this:

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., vol.10, 239

¹¹⁰ Ibid., vol.10, 240

¹¹¹ Ibid., vol.10, 248

¹¹² Ibid., vol.10, 274

¹¹³ Ibid., vol.10, 471

¹¹⁴ Ibid., vol.1, 102

We do not make takfeer except of the one who knew tawheed and then cursed it referring to it as the religion of the Khawārij; and knew shirk and then loved it and its people, calling to it and exhorting people to it after the proof had been established on him, even if he does not commit shirk. Or he commits shirk and names it as “Tawassul via the righteous” after knowing that Allāh has prohibited it.¹¹⁵

Or this:

The genus of those Mushrikeen and their likes who worship the prophets and the righteous, we judge them to be Mushrikeen and we view them to have kufr – when the proof is established on them.¹¹⁶

The intent [of this] is to show Hātim Shareef's transgression against the book *ad-Durar as-Saniyyah* and the Imāms of the da'wah [Najdiyyah]. These acknowledgements from the Imāms of the da'wah [Najdiyyah], from Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb, his sons, grandsons, students and their students in regards to the issue of takfeer, so how could this have created a climate for ISIS?! As for the one who is alien to this pure Salafi school he will, due to his ignorance, confuse their words regarding specific circumstances which have their own context which are based on their ijtihād in *Tabqeeq ul-Manāt* [Extraction of the Grounds and Defining Factors for a Divinely Legislated Ruling]. Turning away from this clear foundation is not the way of the one who strives to seek the truth. Thus, this miskeen should be kind to himself and remember the hadeeth: “*Whoever shows enmity to a Wali of mine I have prepared to wage war against.*”

¹¹⁵ Ibid., vol.1, 264

¹¹⁶ Ibid., vol.1, p.522

REVOLTING AGAINST THE LEADERS, THE STANCES OF THE SALAF AND THE ESTABLISHED CONSENSUS AMONG AHL US-SUNNAH

Among many of the Youtube preachers is a lot of ignorance in the matter, merely in order to support their own egos in front of their viewers. So just as 'Bro Hajji's' comments about khurūj are incorrect and not the full detail on the matter, so are comments such as **“the Sahābah did not have the hadeeth about Khurūj” (!!?)** uttered by people who ascribe to the Sunnah and Salafiyyah. So what is the ruling on rebelling and revolting against the unjust leaders, according to the classical scholars? The classical scholars out of consideration that 'Bro Hajji' deems the contemporary scholars of Sunnah as all being **“boot-lickers”**, as he stated in his video about Dr Khalid Green. Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī (*rahimahullāh*) in *Tahdhib ut-Tahdhib* mentioned whilst highlighting the biography of al-Hasan ibn Sālih ibn Hayy:

وقولهم كان يرى السيف يعني كان يرى الخروج بالسيف على أئمة الجور
وهذا مذهب للسلف قد يم لكن استقر الأمر على ترك ذلك لما رأوه
قد افضى إلى أشد منه في وقعة الحرّة ووقعة ابن الأشعث وغيرها عظيمة لمن
تدبرو بمثل هذا الرأي لا يقدح في رجل قد ثبتت عدالته واشتهر بالحفظ

Their statement 'he used to view the sword [be used]' means: 'he used to hold the view of using the sword to rebel against the tyrannical transgressive leaders'. This was an old Madhhab of the Salaf, however the issue became settled to not do that [i.e. rebel against the leaders] due to what they saw it leading to in terms of a worse situation, as occurred at al-Harrah and also with the situation of Ibn Ash'ath and others. A lesson for those who reflect. This view does not denigrate a narrator so long as his credibility is affirmed and his memorisation famed...¹¹⁷

Not relayed, or not known (!), by 'Bro Hajji'.

Hence, this is the reality of the matter. Although some of the Salaf rebelled against Hajjāj, and also other instances, a consensus was reached that rebellion and revolt against the tyrannical leaders should not be done, and this is all the more the case when the Muslims do not have the ability to remove them – as history has testified. Imām Abū Ja'far at-Tahāwī, author of '*Aqeedah Tahāwīyyah*', which was explained by Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafī, states:

"ولا نرى الخروج على أئمتنا وولاة أمورنا وإن جاروا ولا ندعوا عليهم، ولا نتزع يداً من طاعة، ونرى طاعتهم في طاعة الله عز وجل فريضة ما لم يأمرنا بمعصية، وندعو لهم بالصلاح والمعافاة"¹¹⁸ 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'ā against them¹¹⁸ and we do not take back the covenant of

¹¹⁷ Ibn Hajar, *Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb* (Hyderabad, India: Dār ul-Mā'rif an-Nidhāmiyyah, 1325 AH/1968 CE), vol.2, p.288.

¹¹⁸ Shaykh 'Ali stated: Some people make du'ā against the Muslim leaders or curse and slander them and this is not from the characteristics of the people of truth.

obedience from them¹¹⁹ and we view that obedience to them is from obedience to Allāh and obligatory¹²⁰ as long as they do not command to disobedience and we make du'ā to Allāh for them to have correctness and good health.¹²¹

Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafī in *Sharh ut-Tabāwīyyah*, 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. فعلى 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. Allāh 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 Allāh 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.**

As for the consensus which indicates this clearly is that which was stated by Imām an-Nawawī (*rahimahullāh*) in his explanation of *Sabeeh 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 harām (impermissible) according to the consensus of the Muslims even if they are sinful transgressors.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Shaykh 'Ali stated: This obviously means by extension removing themselves from the obedience of Allāh as the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) said "There is no obedience to the creation in disobedience to the Creator" and he (*sallallāhu '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 Allāh and His Messenger, then obedience in this regard is not permissible.

¹²⁰ Meaning: responding in obedience to the leader is as if you have responded in obedience to Allāh, it is obligatory.

¹²¹ Instead of making *du'ā* against them we make *du'ā* for them as Imām Ahmad (*rahimahullāh*) mentioned.

¹²² Meaning: even if those Muslim rulers are sinners and transgressors.

Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī transmitted **an Ijmā'** on not rebelling against the tyrannical and oppressive leaders in his book *Fath al-Bārī* vol.13, p.7 from Imām Ibn Battāl, who has an explanation of Saheeh Bukhārī. This will be relayed later. Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

The Sahābah (*ridwānullāhi 'alayhim*) used to pray behind those whose sin they knew about. 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd and others prayed behind al-Waleed bin 'Uqbah bin Abī Mu'eet and he used to drink alcohol. He prayed *Subh* with four *Rakāts* and 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān whipped him for that. 'Abdullāh bin 'Umar and other Sahābah used to pray behind al-Hajjāj bin Yūsuf and the Companions and Successors used to pray behind Ibn Abī 'Ubayd who was accused of *Ilhād* and calling to misguidance.¹²³

Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimabullāh*) mentioned:

ولهذا استقر أمر أهل السنة على ترك القتال في الفتنة للأحاديث الصحيحة الثابتة على النبي صلى على جور الأئمة وترك قتالهم الله عليه وسلم، وصاروا يذكرون هذا في عقائدهم، ويأمرون بالصبر

For this reason, it became established with Ahl us-Sunnah to avoid fighting during times of fitna due to the verified authentic ahādeeth from the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam). Ahl us-Sunnah began to mention this within their books of 'aqeedah and they exhorted to have patience with the oppression of the leaders and to avoid fighting against them.¹²⁴

Ibn Taymiyyah continued:

Generally, Ahl us-Sunnah strive to obey Allāh and His Messenger according to their capability. They know that Allāh sent Muhammad (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) to benefit the living and provision of the servants (of Allāh), for he instructed to rectification and forbade causing corruption. So if an action has within it benefit and harm, the most appropriate of the two are chosen. If there are more benefits in an action then it is better to do the action but if there is more harm within any given action then it is better and more correct to leave the action.

Ibn Taymiyyah continues:

¹²³ *Majmū' ar-Rasā'il wa'l-Masā'il*, vol.5, p.199

¹²⁴ It is relevant to transmit all of Ibn Taymiyyah's words regarding this topic due to the immense benefits that are contained therein.

«فإن الله تعالى بعث رسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم بتحصيل المصالح وتكميلها، وتعطيل المفاسد وتقليلها، فإذا تولى خليفة من الخلفاء كيزيد وعبد الملك والمنصور وغيرهم، فإما أن يقال: يجب منعه من الولاية وقتاله حتى يولى غيره كما يفعله من يرى السيف، فهذا رأي فاسد؛ فإن مفسدة هذا أعظم من مصلحته، وقلّ من خرج على إمام ذي سلطان إلا كان ما تولد عن فعله من الشر أعظم مما تولد من الخير، وغاية هؤلاء إما أن يُغلبوا وإما أن يُغلبوا، ثم يزول ملكهم فلا يكون لهم عاقبة، وأما أهل الحرّة وابن الأشعث وابن المهلب وغيرهم فهزموا وهزم أصحابهم، فلا أقاموا ديناً ولا أبقوا ديناً، والله تعالى لا يأمر بأمر لا يحصل به صلاح الدين ولا صلاح الدنيا، وإن كان فاعل ذلك من أولياء الله المتقين ومن أهل الجنة، فليسوا أفضل من علي وعائشة وطلحة والزبير وغيرهم رضي الله عنهم، ومع هذا لم يحمّدوا ما فعلوه من القتال، وهم أعظم قدراً عند الله وأحسن نية من غيرهم، وكذلك أهل الحرّة كان فيهم من أهل العلم والدين خلق، وكذلك أصحاب ابن الأشعث كان فيهم خلق من أهل العلم والدين، والله يغفر لهم كلهم»⁽¹²⁵⁾.

Allāh sent the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) to achieve and perfect benefit and to avoid causing harm and lessen it. So when the Khaleefah is assumed by Khulafā' like of Yazeed, 'AbdulMalik, Mansūr and others it was said (by some) "they have to be removed from power and fought against so that others are in charge" as was stated by those who wanted to use the sword to remove him from power, and this is a harmful view as the harms involved in this are more than any benefits which can be achieved. It is very rare that anyone who revolted against the ruler who has power except that the evil consequences were greater than any good which was brought about. Such as those who revolted against Yazeed in Madeenah¹²⁶ and Ibn 'Ash'ath who revolted against 'AbdulMālik in 'Irāq¹²⁷ and like ibn Muhallab¹²⁸ who revolted against his son in Khurasān and like

(125) منهاج السنة النبوية - ابن تيمية - تحقيق: محمد رشاد سالم - مؤسسة قرطبة للطباعة والنشر - الطبعة الأولى (1406) - (527/4).

¹²⁶ Yazeed ibn Abī Sufyān.

¹²⁷ 'AbdulMālik bin Marwān.

¹²⁸ This is referring to Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab who revolted against Yazeed bin 'AbdulMalik in Irāq in the year 101 AH (719-720 CE), he was a provincial governor in the time of the Umayyad Dynasty. In 78

Abū Muslim who called other to revolt in Khurasān¹²⁹ and like those who revolted against al-Mansūr in Madeenah and Basra and the likes of those. All of these examples in history led to corruption and evil and did not bring about any good. The aim of those people (who revolted) was that either they were overpowered or they were victorious for a while and then their rule ended and there was no longevity or effect. As 'Abdullāh bin 'Ali and Abū Muslim were the two who killed many people and they were both killed by Abū Ja'far al-Mansūr.¹³⁰ As for the people of Harrah, and Ibn ul-'Ash'ath and ibn ul-Muhallab, who also revolted, then they were defeated along with their companions and they did not establish anything in the

AH (697-98 CE) al-Hajjāj bin Yūsuf appointed al-Muhallab governor of Khurasān. In 82 AH (701-702 CE) al-Muhallab's son Mughirah died al-Muhallab sent Yazeed to replace him. Shortly afterwards, al-Muhallab died and al-Hajjaj appointed al-Muhallab's son Yazeed governor. There Yazeed confronted external and internal enemies, including some rebels entering his province who were supporters of 'AbdurRahmān ibn Muhammad ibn al-Ash'ath but Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab put down their insurrections. In A.H. 85 (704-705) al-Hajjaj replaced Yazeed bin al-Muhallab naming al-Mufaddal governor of Khurasan. Various reasons are suggested, including that al-Hajjaj encountered a prophecy that his successor would be named "Yazeed" and al-Hajjaj thought that Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab was his only threat. Al-Hajjāj imprisoned and tortured Yazeed bin al-Muhallab. In 90 AH (708-709), Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab escaped and made his way to Palestine where he was granted refuge by Sulaymān bin 'AbdulMalik. When Sulaymān bin 'AbdulMalik became king in 96 AH (715) he appointed Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab as governor of 'Irāq. The next year Sulaymān appointed Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab governor of Khurasan. Yazeed fought in Jurjan and Tabaristan, where he personally engaged in combat. In 99 AH (717-718) the new caliph 'Umar bin 'Abdul'Azeez (*rahimahullāh*) dismissed Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab due to his tortures against people of conquered territories, especially Turks and Sogds. Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab was captured on his way to Basra and brought before 'Umar ibn 'Abdul'Azeez who imprisoned him. In 101 AH (719-720) when 'Umar fell ill, Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab escaped to 'Irāq where he had support and many followers and then ibn al-Muhallab refused to acknowledge Yazeed ibn 'AbdulMalik as caliph and led a very serious uprising against Yazeed ibn 'AbdulMalik. Initially successful, Yazeed ibn al-Muhallab was defeated and killed by the forces of al-'Abbās ibn al-Waleed and Maslamah ibn 'AbdulMalik.

See Muhammad ibn Jareer at-Tabarī, *Tareekh: The Zenith of the Marwanid House*, transl. Martin Hinds (Albany: SUNY, 1990), vol.23; also vol.23, *The Empire in Transition*, transl. David Stephen Powers, (Albany: SUNY, 1989).

¹²⁹ He is Abū Muslim al-Khurasānī.

¹³⁰ **Translator's Note:** Meaning; they killed and they were thus themselves killed. (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, lesson at Markaz al-Albani, Ammān with some brothers from London, March 2006 CE)

deen and nothing remained for them in the dunya.¹³¹ By Allāh they did not instruct to anything which rectified the deen or the dunya¹³² even if the one who done that (revolt against the leader) is from the people who Allāh protects or from those who have been promised Paradise, they are not better than 'Ali, Ā'ishah, Talhah or Zubayr and others (radi Allāhu 'anhum). For this reason, even though they were companions they were not praised for what they done of fighting,¹³³ and they were of a high position in the sight of Allāh and were of the best of intentions from among the people. Likewise, the people of Harrah had among them people of knowledge, deen and manners, likewise the companions of Ibn 'Ash'ath had among them people of knowledge and deen, and Allāh will forgive all of them.

Ibn Taymiyyah continues:

Al-Hasan al-Basrī used to say: 'Hajjāj is a punishment from Allāh, and the punishment of Allāh cannot be averted by your hands rather you have to have submission and humility to Allāh, for Allāh says, "And We had gripped them with suffering [as a warning], but they did not yield to their Lord, nor did they humbly supplicate, [and will continue thus]..." {al-Mumineen (23): 76}'

The virtuous Muslims forbade revolting and fighting during times of tribulation, as 'Abdullāh ibn 'Umar, Sa'eed ibn Musayyib, 'Ali ibn Husayn and others forbade the people during the year of al-Harrah against revolting against Yazeed, as Hasan al-Basrī, Mujāhid and others forbade revolt during the fitnah of ibn 'Ash'ath. For this reason, it became an established rule with Ahl us-Sunnah to abandon fighting during times of fitnah due to the verified authentic ahādeeth from the Prophet (sallallāhu

¹³¹ If they wanted the *deen*, then they did not establish it and if they wanted the worldly life then they also did not achieve it. (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, lesson at Markaz al-Albānī, Ammān with some brothers from London, March 2006 CE) – [TN]

¹³² Which indicates that the Divine Legislation (*Sharee'ah*) is established upon *islāh* (rectification), either something is for the rectification of the *deen* or for the rectification of the *dunya*. (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, lesson at Markaz al-Albānī, Ammān with some brothers from London, March 2006 CE) – [TN]

¹³³ Meaning: their fighting was an error as it was a *fitnah*, *khurūj* and its likes. (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, lesson at Markaz al-Albānī, Ammān with some brothers from London, March 2006 CE) – [TN]

'alayhi wassallam). Ahl us-Sunnah began to mention this within their books of 'aqeedah and they exhorted to have patience with the oppression of the leaders and to avoid fighting against them, even though many of the people of knowledge and deen fought during those early tribulations. The issue of fighting the people of transgression along with commanding the good and forbidding the evil is an issue which is like fighting during times of fitna. Whoever contemplates on the verified authentic hadeeth from the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) regarding this issue and also reflects on the considerations of the people of insight will know that the Prophetic texts come with the best view. For this reason, when Husayn wanted to leave to go to the people of al-'Irāq after they had written many letters to him, the notables of the people of knowledge and deen such as Ibn 'Umar, Ibn 'Abbās and Abī Bakr ibn 'AbdirRahmān ibn il-Hārith ibn il-Hishām advised him not to go as they thought that he would be killed.¹³⁴ To the extent that some of them said “may you place your trust in Allāh from being killed.”¹³⁵ Allāh and His Messenger command for benefit and not harm, however views can be correct at times and mistaken at other times. It would emerge that the affair was as they (the companions) had said and there was not in his (Husayn's) insurrection any benefit for the deen and no benefit for the dunya¹³⁶, rather those oppressors and transgressors were established the earth and Husayn was killed unjustly and was martyred. Within his insurrection and his being killed was 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.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ When Husayn (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) said that he wanted to go they told him not to go. [TN]

¹³⁵ Meaning: before he went out they said “you will be killed.” [TN]

¹³⁶ Also, we do not throw doubts on the intentions of Husayn and we do not 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 Allāh 'anhu*) will not be mistaken? What happened transpired which indicated that he (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) was not correct in that matter. (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, lesson at Markaz al-Albānī, Ammān with some brothers from London, March 2006 CE) – [TN]

¹³⁷ Therefore, his intention in revolting was what? To establish good and ward off evil. (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, lesson at Markaz al-Albānī, Ammān with some brothers from London, March 2006 CE) – [TN]

Rather, evil increased in his revolt and due to his death and the good was diminished with that and that (his revolt) became a reason for great evil, as the killing of Husayn caused tribulation just as the killing of 'Uthmān caused tribulation. So all of this makes clear that what the Prophet (sallallāhu '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 Allāh) in the dunya and the Hereafter and whoever opposed this intentionally¹³⁸ or mistakenly¹³⁹, no rectification was realised with his action rather corruption.¹⁴⁰

Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī mentions:

ونقل ابن التين عن الداودي قال: الذي عليه العلماء في أمراء الجور أنه إن قدر على خلعه بغير فتنة ولا ظلم وجب، وإلا فالواجب الصبر، وعن بعضهم لا يجوز عقد الولاية لفاسق ابتداءً، فإن أحدث جوراً بعد أن كان عدلاً فاختلّفوا في جواز الخروج عليه، والصحيح المنع إلا أن يكفر فيجب الخروج عليه"

Ibn ut-Teen transmitted from ad-Dāwūdī that: 'What the 'Ulama are upon in regards to the tyrannical rulers is that if it is able to remove them without causing fitna and oppression then such a removal is obligatory. If not, then it is wājib to be patient.' Some of them said that it is not permissible to have a sinful leader in place from the outset, but if tyranny happens after he was just then the scholars differ over whether such a leader should be revolted against. What is more correct is that he is not to be removed unless he disbelieves, at which point it is obligatory to remove him from power.¹⁴¹

Shaykh 'AbdulLateef bin 'AbdurRahmān bin Hasan Āl ush-Shaykh stated in *ad-Durur as-Sunniyyah fī Ajwibat-Najdiyyah*,¹⁴² vol.7, pp.177-78:

وأضرب لك مثلاً بالحجاج بن يوسف الثقفي، وقد اشتهر أمره في الأمة بالظلم والغشم والإسراف في سفك الدماء وانتهاك حرمة الله، وقتل من قتل من سادات الأمة: كـ"سعيد بن جبير" وحاصر ابن

¹³⁸ Meaning: to intend corruption. [TN]

¹³⁹ Such as one who wants rectification yet does not realise it. [TN]

¹⁴⁰ *Minhāj us-Sunnah*, vol.4, pp.528-532

¹⁴¹ Ibn Hajar, *Fath ul-Bārī*, vol.13, p.8.

¹⁴² This was compiled by 'AbdurRahmān bin Qāsim and was printed by Dār ul-Iftā', 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.

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 والالتقياد 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، كز ابن المسيب، والحسن البصري، وابن سيرين، وإبراهيم التيمي، وأشباههم ونظرائهم من سادات الأمة.

واستمر العمل على هذا بين علماء الأمة من سادات الأمة وأئمتها، يأمرهم بطاعة الله ورسوله، والجهاد في سبيله مع كل إمام بر أو فاجر، كما هو معروف في كتب أصول الدين والعقائد وكذلك بنو العباس: استولوا على بلاد المسلمين قهراً بالسيف، لم يساعدهم أحد من أهل العلم والدين، وقتلوا خلقاً كثيراً، وجباً غفيراً من بني أمية وأمراءهم ونوابهم، وقتلوا ابن هبيرة أمير العراق، وقتلوا الخليفة مروان، حتى ثقل أن السفاح قتل في يوم واحد نحو الثمانين من بني أمية، ووضع الفرش على جثثهم، وجلس عليها، ودعا بالمطاعم والمشارب!!! ومع ذلك فسيرة الأئمة كالأوزاعي، ومالك، والزهري، والليث بن سعد، وعطاء بن أبي رباح مع هؤلاء الملوك لا تخفى على من له مشاركة في العلم وإطلاع.

والطبقة الثانية من أهل العلم، كز 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، وامتنحوا فيه، وقتل من قتل، كز 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-Hajjāj bin Yūsuf ath-Thaqafī and he became famous in the Ummah for his oppression, suppression, excess in bloodshed and dishonouring the sanctities of Allāh 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, Hajjāj 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-'Irāq. Hajjāj was the deputy of Marwān, but neither did any of the Khulafā' nor any of the influential people in authority pledge allegiance to Marwān. 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 Islām and its obligations. Ibn 'Umar (*radi Allāhu 'anhumā*) and whoever was present from the Companions of the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) at the time did not challenge him or prevent anyone from obeying him in those things which Islām instructs and perfect īmān. It was likewise during the time of Hajjāj for the Successors (Tābi'een) like: Ibn ul-Musayyib, al-Hasan al-Basrī, Ibn Seereen, Ibrāheem at-Taymī and their likes from the illustrious people of the Ummah. This way continued among the leading scholars of the Ummah who instructed obedience to Allāh and His Messenger, and jihād in the way of Allāh with every leader whether righteous or sinful as is well-known in the books of Usūl ud-Deen (Religious Principles) and 'Aqā'id (Creed). And likewise during the epoch of Banu 'Abbās (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 (Umayyids) and their leaders and deputies. They killed Ibn Hubayrah, the leader of 'Irāq and they killed the Khaleefah Marwān, 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 Imāms of the time such as: al-Awzā'ī, Mālik, az-Zuhrī, al-Layth ibn Sa'd, 'Atā' bin Abī Rabāh 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 Ismā'īl, Muhammad bin Idrees, Ahmad bin Nūh, Ishāq bin Rāhawayh and their brothers, and during their time were kings with major innovations, such as denying the Attributes of Allāh 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 khurūj (rebellion) should be made against those leaders.

Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimahullāh*) stated in the fifth volume of *Minhāj us-Sunnah* on page 112:

And likewise an-Najāshi who was a Christian king of his country would not have been obeyed by the people whom he ruled over in accepting Islām and only a few people accepted Islām with him. If he embraced Islām 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 (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) in Madeenah prayed over Najāshi, the people went out to a musalla and arranged rows in order to pray the janazah for an-Najāshi and the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) prayed over him.¹⁴³ He then informed them that an-Najāshi had died saying "Indeed, your righteous brother from the people of Habasha (Ethiopia) died today." Many of the symbols and institutions of Islām, or most of them, were not established in Habasha due to his (an-Najāshi's) inability to implement them there.

Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī stated about this:

This is a very precise point as an-Najāshi therefore was aware of many of the symbols and institutions of Islām 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-Najāshi wherein it is stated that an-Najāshi 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-Islām who stated: **'Many of the symbols of Islām, or most of them, were not established in Habasha due to his (an-Najāshi's) inability to implement them there.'** He did not make *hijra*, he did not make *jibād*, 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

¹⁴³ Shaykh 'Ali stated: This indicates that *Salāt ul-Janāzah* (the funeral prayer) is to be prayed in a *musalla* and not in a *Masjid*. It is permissible to pray *Salāt ul-Janāzah* 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).

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.¹⁴⁴

Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah continues:

We know absolutely that it was not possible for him to rule amongst his people with the Qur'ān¹⁴⁵ and Allāh obligated His Messenger in Madeenah that if the People of the Book come to him he should not judge between them except with what Allāh had revealed and warned him from the fact that the People of the Book swerve him away from some of what Allāh has revealed. For example, the punishment and ruling upon zinā, blood-money, the recompense for killing another soul, an eye for an eye etc. So an-Najāshi was not able to rule with the rule of the Qur'ān 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, 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 Islām and they do not reject the rule of Islām rather, they rule according to some of the regulations of Islām and all praise is due to Allāh as *masājīd* are widespread, the institution of the month of Ramadān 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 Ramadān, therefore the main symbols and institutions of Islām 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 Islām are apparent and are

¹⁴⁴ In a class given at the Imām al-Albānī Centre 'Ammān, Jordan on Thursday 16th March 2006 CE

¹⁴⁵ Meaning: to rule with what Allāh has revealed.

present along with importance attached to Islām, but to they apply all of Islām? So they fall into the same as that an-Najāshi did before them.

They (leaders) are not able to rule totally according to what Allāh 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 Allāh 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 Allāh knows best.

So if all of these regulations have been verified in theory and practice and the narrations regarding an-Najāshi (*radi Allāhu '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 *imān* 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 Islām as they have not expelled themselves from the religion and they have not become *kuffār* 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.

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

"وفي الحديث حجة على ترك الخروج على السلطان ولو جار، وقد أجمع الفقهاء على وجوب طاعة السلطان المتغلب والجهاد معه، وأن طاعته خير من الخروج عليه لما في ذلك من حقن الدماء وتسكين الدهماء" فتح الباري (7/13)

In the hadeeth is proof for avoiding revolting against the leader even if he transgresses. The fuqahā (Islamic jurists) have reached consensus that obedience must be made to the leader who becomes dominant (mutaghallib)¹⁴⁶ and making jihād with him and that obeying him is better than revolting against him due to the blood which would be spilt in that and this would not be permissible unless there was clear kufr from the leader.¹⁴⁷

Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī notes:

¹⁴⁶ 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 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.

¹⁴⁷ 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 (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) said: "Until you see clear (*buwāhan*) *kufr*, for which you have with you evidence from Allāh." Pay attention here: "you have with you (*indakum*)" meaning that this evidence is firmly settled in your hearts and is clear in front of your eyes, not any type of *kufr* rather it must be clear, explicit and apparent!

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 'Allāh 'anhum*). They thus use as a proof against the consensus the examples of al-Husayn, 'Abdullāh ibn Zubayr, and those who were with them from the people of Madeenah in revolting against Banī '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 Allāhu 'anhum*) about the Messenger of Allāh 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 Imām an-Nawawī wherein he stated: **'This difference was in the beginning and then the consensus developed that prevented revolting against the Muslim leaders.'**¹⁴⁸ There are other statements such as that in *at-Tabdheeb wa't-Tabdheeb* of al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī who mentioned in whilst highlighting the biography of al-Hasan ibn Sālih ibn Hayy. He noted: **'This was in the affair in the past at the beginning of Islām and then the ummah agreed upon the opposite.'**¹⁴⁹

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-Nawawī, Ibn Battāl, al-Hāfidh 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 'Ubādah ibn Sāmit which is in Saheeh Muslim wherein the Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) stated:

¹⁴⁸ See *Sharh Saheeh Muslim*, vol.12, p.229

¹⁴⁹ Ibn Hajar, *Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb* (Hyderabad, India: Dār ul-Ma'ārif an-Nidhāmiyyah, 1325 AH/1968 CE), vol.2, p.288.

“We pledged allegiance¹⁵⁰ to the Messenger of Allāh 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 Allāh (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) stated, clear explicit (*bunwāhan*) *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 (bunwāhan) kufr, for which you have with you evidence from Allāh.*” Shaykhul-Islām ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimahullāh*) appended to this *hadeeth* in his book *Minhāj us-Sunnah* saying: **‘This issue is a clear obligation from the Prophet (sallallāhu '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 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, Allāh has commanded us to obey them and they the power and they utilise it to fulfil what they do.’**¹⁵¹ Imām al-Kirmānī, who has an explanation of Saheeh Bukhārī

¹⁵⁰ Shaykh 'Ali stated: “*Bayah'nā Rasullullāh...*” means: that we are the ones who pledge allegiance to the Messenger, we are the doers and the messenger of Allāh is the *maful bihi*. But if we say “*Bayyah'nā Rasullullāh*” [which a *shadda* on the *yā*] means that we are the *maful-bihi* and the Messenger of Allāh is the one who made bay'ah to us.

¹⁵¹ 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.

before al-Hāfidh 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 Allāhu ‘anha*) wherein she said: “The Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu ‘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.”¹⁵² 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 (*sallallāhu ‘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 Islām so as long as the prayer is established and permitted then this is the greatest sign of Islām after the two testimonies of faith. Ibn Taymiyyah stated in *Minhaj us-Sunnah*:

The Messenger of Allāh 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 khawārij, zaydiyyah and mu’tazilah view as permissible.

Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah stated about the revolt of Husayn (*radi Allāhu ‘anhu*) in *Minhaj us-Sunnah*:

For this reason, when Husayn (*radi Allāhu ‘anhu*) wanted to go out to the people of ‘Irāq after they had written many letters to him. The notables of the people of knowledge and deen such as Ibn ‘Umar, Ibn ‘Abbās and Abī Bakr ibn ‘AbdirRahmān ibn il-Hārith ibn il-Hishām advised him not to go as they thought that he would be killed.¹⁵³ To the extent that some of them

¹⁵² 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 Imām al-Albānī, *rahimahullāh*, and states that advice to the ruler differs from advice to the common people, wherein the Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam*) said “Whoever has advice for the Muslim ruler then he should not be given openly, rather it should be done privately.”

¹⁵³ When Husayn (*radi Allāhu ‘anhu*) said that he wanted to go they told him not to go.

said “may you place your trust in Allāh from being killed.”¹⁵⁴ 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 dunya¹⁵⁵, 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.¹⁵⁶ 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 'Uthmān caused tribulation. So all of this makes clear that what the Prophet (sallallāhu '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 Allāh) in the dunya and the Hereafter and whoever opposed this intentionally¹⁵⁷ or mistakenly¹⁵⁸, no rectification was realised with his action rather corruption. For this reason, the Prophet (sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam) praised his Hasan¹⁵⁹ by saying “my son here is a sayyid and through him Allāh will resolve a matter between two great groups of the Muslims.¹⁶⁰” The Prophet (sallallāhu '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 jamā'ah (the congregation of Muslims).

¹⁵⁴ Meaning: before he went out they said “you will be killed.”

¹⁵⁵ 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 Allāh 'anhū*) will not be mistaken? What happened, happened, which indicated that he (*radi Allāh 'anhū*) was not correct in that matter.

¹⁵⁶ Therefore, his intention in revolting was what? To establish good and ward off evil.

¹⁵⁷ Meaning: to intend corruption.

¹⁵⁸ He wants rectification yet does not realise it.

¹⁵⁹ Hasan, the brother of Husayn, Husayn revolted so Hasan was better.

¹⁶⁰ The *hadeeth* is in Bukhārī.

'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal (d.241 AH/855 CE)

Imām Ahmad mentions in his *Usul us-Sunnah* that revolt against a Muslim leader is not to be made. He states under point 53:

"لا يجوز قتال السلطان ولا الخروج عليه، ومن خرج على إمام من أئمة المسلمين، وقد كان الناس قد اجتمعوا عليه، وأقروا له بالخلافة بأي وجه كان، بالرضا أو بالغلبة فقد شق هذا الخارج عصا المسلمين، وخالف الآثار عن رسول الله، وإن مات الخارج مات ميتة جاهلية".

It is not permissible to fight against the leader or rebel against him. 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 khilāfah for him, in whatever way this khilāfah may have been, by their pleasure and acceptance or by (his) force and domination (over them), **then this rebel has disobeyed the Muslims, and has contradicted the narrations of the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu '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.**¹⁶¹

'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Abū Ibrāheem Ismā'īl bin Yahyā al-Muzanī (d. 264 AH/877 CE)¹⁶²

He was the author of *Sharh us-Sunnah* and was an Imām of the Muslims, the 'Ulama testified to his knowledge, virtue, *zuhd* (asceticism) and *wara'* (abstemiousness). He is Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā'īl bin Yahyā al-Muzanī, the companion of ash-Shāfi'ī, he died in 264 AH. This Imām lived through the reign of eleven different *khulafā'* from the Abbasid Empire:

¹⁶¹ For both Arabic and English texts see *Foundations of the Sunnah by Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal* (Birmingham: Salafi Publications, 1417 AH/1997 CE), pp.37-38.

¹⁶² See Ismā'īl bin Yahyā al-Muzanī, Jamāl 'Azūn (ed.), *Kitāb Sharh us-Sunnah* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ibn Hazm, 1420 AH/2000 CE), p.85.

- Hārūn ar-Rasheed (d.193 AH/809 CE)
- Muhammad al-Ameen (d.198 AH/814 CE)
- Al-Ma'mūn (d.218 AH/833 CE)¹⁶³
- Al-Mu'tasim (d. 227 AH/842 CE)¹⁶⁴
- Al-Wāthiq (d. 232 AH/847 CE)¹⁶⁵
- Al-Mutawakkil (d. 247AH/861 CE)¹⁶⁶
- Al-Muntasir (d. 248 AH/862 CE)
- Al-Musta'een (d. 252 AH/866 CE)
- Al-Mu'tazz (d. 255 AH/869 CE)
- Al-Muhtadī (d. 256 AH/870 CE)
- Al-Mu'tamid (d. 279 AH/892 CE)

This Imām lived in Egypt among a large portion of *Huffādh*, *Muhadditheen*, *Fuqahā*, *Qurā'*, *Zuhhād* and others. Such as the likes of:

- the 'Ālim of Egypt Abū Muhammad 'Abdullāh Ibn Wahb al-Fihri (d. 197 AH);
- Imām Abū 'Abdillāh ibn Idrees ash-Shāfi'ī (d. 204 AH), who was with al-Muzanī a lot and affected him greatly.
- The *Muhaddith* of Egypt Sa'īd Abū Maryam al-Hāfidh (d. 224 AH)
- The Shaykh of Egypt Harmalah bin Yahyā at-Tujaybī al-Hāfidh al-Faqeeh, the compiler of *al-Mukhtasar* and *al-Mabsūt*, he died in 223 AH
- Hāfidh ul-Misr Ahmad ibn Sālih al-Misri, one of the notable who died in 248 AH

Outside of Egypt during the time of al-Muzanī were:

- Sufyān bin 'Uyaynah, the Shaykh of the Hijāz who died in 197 AH
- The *Hafidh* of the era Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān bin Dāwūd at-Tayālī (d.204 AH)

¹⁶³ He was the one who tested all of the scholars of his time with saying if that the Qur'ān 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 Nūh, they were both chained and sent to be tried by al-Ma'mūn who was in Tarsūs (currently in Turkey), but al-Ma'mūn died before their arrival. Adh-Dhahabī, *Duwal al-Islām*, p.132

¹⁶⁴ He also tested the people with the creed of the Qur'ān being created and wrote to the different lands saying that this should be the creed. See *Siyar 'A'lam un-Nubalā*, vol.10, p.291

¹⁶⁵ He tested the people with the creed of the Qur'ān being created also during 231 AH, during this time Ahmad ibn Nasr al-Khazā'ī was executed for refusing to give into the heretical creed. See adh-Dhahabī, *Duwal al-Islām*, p.139

¹⁶⁶ He revived the *Sunnah* and killed the innovation of the creed of the Qur'ān being created. See *ibid.*, p.149

- Shaykh ul-Ummah Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 241 AH)
- Shaykh ul-Islām, the *Hāfidh* of the era Muhammad bin Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī (d. 256 AH)
- The *Hāfidh* of Khurasān,¹⁶⁷ Muslim bin al-Hajjāj al-Qushayrī (d. 261 AH)

And there were others whom al-Muzanī 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-Muzanī was influential during that time. He was born in the year when al-Layth bin Sa'd died 175 AH¹⁶⁸ 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-Muzanī mentioned that she used to attend the gatherings of knowledge given by Imām ash-Shāfi'ī and ar-Rāfi'ī used to transmit narrations from her in his Book of *Zakat*.¹⁶⁹ Ibn us-Subkī mentioned her as did al-Isnawī in *at-Tabaqāt*.¹⁷⁰ His biographers do not go in depth in mentioning his teachers rather they restrict them to the following:

1. Muhammad ibn Idrees ash-Shāfi'ī¹⁷¹
2. 'Ali bin Ma'bad bin Shaddād al-Basrī¹⁷²
3. Nu'aym bin Hammād¹⁷³

¹⁶⁷ The descriptions of these notable are taken from the book *Duwal ul-Islām* by adh-Dhahabī

¹⁶⁸ Adh-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol.12, p.492

¹⁶⁹ From his book *al-'Azeez* which was his commentary of *al-Wajeez* of al-Ghazālī, it is also known as *as-Sharh ul-Kabeer*. [TN]

¹⁷⁰ As-Suyūṭī, *Hasanul-Muhādhirah*, vol.1, p.399. Al-Isnawī in vol.1, p.44 said "I do not know the date of her death". It is worth bringing to attention here two relatives of al-Muzanī:

First: ar-Rabī' bin Sulaymān al-Murādī, the brother of al-Muzanī via suckling (having suckled from the same woman as babies). Adh-Dhahabī reports in *Siyar*, vol.12, p.392 with a chain of transmission to Abi'l-Fawāris as-Sindī saying "**al-Muzanī died in 264 AH and ar-Rabī' died in 270 AH**", adh-Dhahabī said "**Between their suckling at birth was six months**".

Second: His nephew, at-Tahāwī, the famous Imām and author of *al-'Aqeedah Tahāwīyyah*.

¹⁷¹ Soon will come some speech regarding the influence of Imām Shāfi'ī on al-Muzanī.

¹⁷² A resident of Egypt and one of its senior Imāms, he narrated from Muhammad bin al-Hasan *al-Jāmi' al-Kabeer* and *al-Jāmi' as-Sagheer*. He died in 218 AH, see *Siyar 'Alam un-Nubalā'*, vol.10, p.631

¹⁷³ Ibn Mu'awiyah al-Khazā'ī, the Imām, *Allāmah*, *Hāfidh*, he arrived in Egypt and did not leave it until al-Mu'tasim presided over it and thus he was asked about the Qur'ān being created and he refused to answer with what al-Mu'tasim wanted. He was imprisoned in Sāmārā' where he remained until death in 228 AH. See *Siyar*, vol.10, p.595. Al-Muzanī was asked about his beliefs about the Qur'ān and narrations, as will be mentioned shortly.

4. Asbagh bin Nāfi'¹⁷⁴

Ibn Yūnus stated in his *Tārīkh*¹⁷⁵: “The companion of ash-Shāfi’ī, 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 Allāh’s creation, his qualities are many.”¹⁷⁶

Abū Ishāq ash-Shīrāzī stated: “He was an abstinent scholar, a debater, a proof, emerged in the detailed meanings.”¹⁷⁷ ‘Amru bin ‘Uthmān al-Makkī 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 Shām and Alexandria and its surrounding areas and fortified areas with as such efforts as al-Muzanī. 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-Muzanī, 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-Shāfi’ī (*rahimabullāh*).”¹⁷⁸

Abū Sa’eed bin as-Sakkārī stated: “When I saw al-Muzanī I realised that I had not seen one who worships Allāh more than him or understands the details of *fiqh* more than him.”¹⁷⁹ Al-‘Abbādī said “He was an ascetic and abstinent scholar he had nice statements when debating...”¹⁸⁰ 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 Madhhab of Shāfi’ī and his statements memorising its principles with precision. He has many books in the Shāfi’ī Madhhab that no one else ever equalled. The people tired after him, he was the most knowledgeable from the companions of Shāfi’ee in

¹⁷⁴ Ibn Sa’eed bin Nāfi’ Abū ‘Abdullāh al-Umawī al-Misrī al-Mālikī, he died in 225 AH. See *Siyar*, vol.10, pp.656-58

¹⁷⁵ His history has not lost its precious heritage and nothing of it exists except for transmissions of praise in biographies. See the book Dr. Bashhār ‘Awwād adh-Dhahabī and his methodology in the book *Tārīkh ul-Islām*, p.234 wherein he mentions among the publications his abridgement of Ibn Yūnus’ *Tārīkh*.

¹⁷⁶ *Wafayāt ul-‘A’yān*, vol.1, p.218

¹⁷⁷ *Siyar*, vol.12, p.493 with a chain of transmission back to him and that which is in *Tabaqāt ul-Fuqahā*, p.89 of ash-Shīrāzī: “A proof of the detailed meanings...”

¹⁷⁸ Al-Bayhaqī, *Manāqib ush-Shāfi’ī*, vol.2, p.351, with an *isnād* back to him.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, vol.2, p.351

¹⁸⁰ *Tabaqāt ul-Fuqahā ush-Shāfi’iyyah*, p.9

debating, he had detailed knowledge and his books and abridgements circulated throughout the different regions of the earth, east and west. He was pious, abstinent, religious and patient with little and simple-living.¹⁸¹

Ibn ul-Jawzī said:

The companion of Shāfi'ī (*rahimabullāh*) he was a deft *Faqeeh*, trustworthy in *hadeeth* and was of abundant worship and virtue he was from the best and gracious of Allāh's creation and adhered to the fortified frontline areas (*Ribāt*).¹⁸²

Ibn Khallikān said "The Imām of the Shāfi'īs and the most knowledgeable of them of his way (i.e. the way of Shāfi'ī), his *fatāwā* and whatever had been transmitted from him."¹⁸³ Adh-Dhahabī said "The Imām, *Allamah*, *Faqeeh* of the religion, the knowledgeable *Zāhid*."¹⁸⁴ As-Subkī stated "The great Imām, the supporter of the *madhhab*, a mountain of knowledge, the decisive debater, the *Zāhid*, the abstemious, the one detached from the *Dunya*."¹⁸⁵ Al-Isnawī (772 AH/1371 CE) stated "He was an ascetic Imām and *Zāhid*, detached from the *dunya*, exalted among the companions of Shāfi'ī."¹⁸⁶ In *Sharh us-Sunnah*, points 14 and 15, he states:

14 - Obedience to the People in Authority in that which pleases Allāh and staying away from whatever angers Allāh.¹⁸⁷

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

¹⁸¹ *Al-Intiqā' fī Fadā'il ath-Thalāthatil-A'imma il-Fuqahā*, p.110

¹⁸² *Al-Muntadham*, vol.12, p.192

¹⁸³ *Wafayāt ul-'A'yān*, vol.1, p.218

¹⁸⁴ *Siyar*, vol.12, p.492

¹⁸⁵ *Tabaqāt ush-Shāfi'iyyah al-Kubrā*, vol.1, p.238

¹⁸⁶ *Tabaqāt ush-Shāfi'iyyah*, vol.1, p.34

¹⁸⁷ Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafī in *Sharh ut-Tahāwīyyah*, 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. Allāh 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 Allāh 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.**"

Allāh by freeing oneself from him, abandoning him, hating him and staying away from what he has innovated.

'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Abū Bakr al-Isma'īlī (d. 371 AH/981 CE)

Before we come to the relevant text from Abū Bakr al-Isma'īlī's *T'itiqād Abl us-Sunnah* we will look at his biography. Al-Hasan bin 'Alī al-Hāfidh stated in *Tārīkh Jurjān*¹⁸⁸:

Shaykh Abū Bakr should have classified his own *Sunan* as he was able to write much due to his knowledge, understanding and honour.

Abū 'Abdullāh al-Hākim stated, as reported in *Siyar 'A'lām un-Nubalā*, vol.16, p.294:

Al-Isma'īlī was one of his time, a Shaykh of the *Muhadditheen* and *Fuqubā* and most noble of them in leadership...there is no difference among the scholars of the two sciences and their intelligentsia about Abū Bakr.

Adh-Dhahabī stated in *Siyar*, vol.16, p.292: **“the Imām, Hāfidh, Hujjah, Faqeeh, Shaykh ul-Islām.”** As-Subkī stated in *Tabaqāt ash-Shāfi'īyyah al-Kubrā*, vol.3, p.7: **“The Imām of the people of Jurjān,¹⁸⁹ the reference point in Fiqh and Hadeeth, the author of classifications.”**

His Birth, Life and Death:

He is the Imām, Hāfidh, Hujjah, Faqeeh, Shaykh ul-Islām Abū Bakr ibn Ibrāheem bin Isma'īl bin al-'Abbās al-Jurjānī al-Isma'īlī ash-Shāfi'ī the author of *as-Sabeeh* and the Shaykh of the Shāfi'īyyah, he was born in 277 AH/890 CE. 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 **“Abū Bakr died in Ghazzah in Rajab 371 AH/June 902 CE aged 94 years of age.”**

His Works:

Dr. Ziyad Muhammad Mansūr mentioned in *Kitāb ul-Mu'jam fī Asāmī Shuyūkh Abī Bakr al-Isma'īlī* (al-Madeenah al-Munawwarah: Maktabah al-'Ulūm wa'l-Hikam, 1410 AH/1990 CE, First Edn.)¹⁹⁰ 17 works:

1. *al-Mu'jam fī Asāmī Shuyūkhibihi*
2. *al-Mustakbraj 'alā Sabeeh il-Bukhārī*

¹⁸⁸ Hamza as-Sahmī, *Tārīkh Jurjān*, p.70.

¹⁸⁹ 'Jurjān' is the Arabic name for 'Gorgan' which is the capital city of the Golestan Province in Northern Irān and is south-east of the Caspian Sea.

¹⁹⁰ See vol.1, pp.166-68 with some slight additions to it.

3. *al-Madkhal ilā Saheeh il-Bukhārī*, with objections and answers to them.¹⁹¹
4. *al-Musnad al-Kabeer*
5. *Musnad 'Umar*
6. *Musnad 'Ali*
7. *Musnad Yahyā al-Ansārī*
8. *Hadeeth Yahyā bin Abi Bakr*.
9. *al-Fawā'id*
10. *al-'Awālī*
11. *Kitāb Abādeeth il-'A'mash*
12. *Hadeeth*, which has the *abādeeth* of other *hadeeth* scholars, *al-Majmū'* 31.
13. *Su'alāt us-Sahmī*
14. *Mu'jam us-Sahābah*
15. *Su'alāt ul-Barqānī*
16. *Risālah fi'l'Aqeedah*, this was mentioned by as-Sābūnī¹⁹² and Ibn Taymiyyah.¹⁹³
17. *Kitāb fi'l-Fiqh*
18. *Kitāb 'T'tiqād Abl us-Sunnah*
19. *Jamū' Hadeeth Mis'ar*,¹⁹⁴ this was mentioned by Ibn Rajab al-Hanbalī.¹⁹⁵

His 'Aqīdah:

Al-Hāfidh Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī had Salafī 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."¹⁹⁶

This makes clear three matters:

- ❖ That he has a book entitled *'T'tiqād Abl us-Sunnah*

¹⁹¹ Ar-Rawdānī, *Sillatul-Khalaf bi-Mawsūl as-Salaf*, p.407, this text was overlooked by the editor of *al-Mu'jam*.

¹⁹² *Sharh Hadeeth in-Nuzūl*, pp.51-2

¹⁹³ Ibid. and pp.9-10

¹⁹⁴ This book was overlooked by the editor Dr Ziyad Muhammad Mansūr in *al-Mu'jam*.

¹⁹⁵ *Fath ul-Bārī*, vol.1, p.292, vol.7, p.445, vol.8, p.218

¹⁹⁶ *Al-Bidāyah wa'n-Nihāyah*, vol.11, p.298

❖ His statements regarding *'aqeedah* which have been transmitted by many Imāms of this issue.

❖ His treatise on *'aqeedah* which was sent to the people of Jeelān.
Al-Hāfidh Abū 'Uthmān Ismā'īl bin 'AbdurRahmān as-Sābūnī stated in *'Aqeedah Salaf wa Ashāb ul-Hadeeth*, p.27:

I read in the treatise of Shaykh Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī to the people of Jeelān that he said 'Indeed, Allāh descends to the Heavens of the Dunya in accordance with the most correct understanding from the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*)...'”

Abū 'Uthmān as-Sābūnī also transmitted the following from al-Ismā'īlī:

As for the wording and recitation (*Lafdh*) of the Qur'ān then Shaykh Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī (*rahimahullāh*) mentioned in his treatise that he classified to the people of Jeelān. He said in it: 'Whoever claims that his recitation of the Qur'ān is created intending the Qur'ān has spoken with the speech of those who say the Qur'ān is created.'

His Biographical Sources

- ❖ *Tārikh Jurjān* [The History of Gorgan], pp.108-116, no.98
- ❖ *Al-Kāmil fī't-Tārikh*, pp.9, 16
- ❖ *Al-Muktasar fī Akhbār il-Basr*, vol.2, p.122
- ❖ *Tārikh Ibn ul-Wardī*, vol.1, p.305
- ❖ *Al-Muntadham*, vol.7, p.108, no.144
- ❖ *Tadhbhkirat ul-Huffādh*, vol.3, p.947, no.897
- ❖ *Al-Ansāb*, vol.1, 'lām', 36, 'alif'
- ❖ *Al-'Ibar*, vol.2, p.358
- ❖ *Tabaqāt ush-Shāfi'īyyah al-Kubrā*, vol.2, 80
- ❖ *Shadharāt udb-Dhabab*, vol.3, p.75
- ❖ *Al-Bidāyah wa'n-Nihāyah*, vol.11, p.298
- ❖ *Marāt ul-Janān*, vol.2, p.396
- ❖ *Tabaqāt ul-Huffādh*, pp.381-2
- ❖ *Duwal ul-Islām*, vol.1, p.229
- ❖ *Tabaqāt ul-Fuqahā* by Shirāzī, pp.116, 121
- ❖ *Tabaqāt ush-Shāfi'īyyah* by Ibn Hidāyatillāh, p.95
- ❖ *Wafayāt ul-'A'yān*, vol.3, p.168

- ❖ *Al-Wāfi bi'l-Wafayāt*, vol.6, p.213, no.2678
- ❖ *Tabyeen Kadhīb al-Muftarī*, p.192
- ❖ *Mu'jam ul-Buldān*, vol.2, p.122
- ❖ *Tabaqāt ul-'Abbādī*, p.86
- ❖ *Al-Lubāb*, vol.1, p.58
- ❖ *As-Siyar*, vol.16, pp.292-96
- ❖ *Al-T'lān bi't-Tawbikah*, p.141
- ❖ *Kashf udh-Dhunūn*, p.1735
- ❖ *Al-'A'lām*, vol.1, p.83
- ❖ *Hidayat ul-'Arifeen*, vol.1, p.66
- ❖ *Mu'jam ul-Mu'allifeen*, vol.1, p.135
- ❖ *Tārīkh ut-Turāth al-'Arabī* vol.1, p.329

Tracing the Book 'Itiqād Ahl us-Sunnah to Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī:

The creed of al-Ismā'īlī was affirmed by Ibn Qudāmah¹⁹⁷ where he said:

...ash-Shareef Abu'l-'Abbās Mas'ūd bin 'AbdulWāhid bin Matr al-Hāshimī informed us¹⁹⁸ saying: al-Hāfidh Abu'l-'Ulā Sā'id bin Sayyār al-Harawī informed us saying: Abu'l-Hasan 'Alī bin Muhammad al-Jurjānī informed us saying: Abu'l-Qāsim Hamzah bin Yūsuf as-Sahmī informed us saying: Abū Bakr Ahmad bin Ibrāheem al-Ismā'īlī informed us in his book *'Itiqād Ahl us-Sunnah* saying: 'Know, may Allāh have mercy on us and you, that the madhhab of the people of hadeeth, the people of *Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah* is...'

Via Ibn Qudāmah and transmitted by adh-Dhahabī¹⁹⁹ who said: "Ismā'eel ibn 'AbdurRahmān bin al-Farā' informed us: Shaykh Muwaffaquddeen 'Abdullāh..." Al-Albānī²⁰⁰ stated about this *isnād*: "All of the men in the *isnād* are trustworthy and well-known except for Mas'ūd bin 'AbdulWāhid al-Hāshimī, I did not find a biography of him." Adh-Dhahabū mentioned the accuracy of this *isnād* saying in his book *al-Arba'een*: "We heard this creed with an authentic *isnād* from him (meaning: from al-Ismā'īlī)." ²⁰¹ Ibn Taymiyyah stated in *Dar' at-Ta'arud*:

¹⁹⁷ In *Dhamm it-Ta'weel*, p.17

¹⁹⁸ The Arabic used here is 'Abnā' which is an abridgement of 'Akhbaranā' (he informed us...).

¹⁹⁹ *Al-Uluww*, p.167; *Tadhkiratul-Huffādh*, vol.3, p.449 and *Siyar*, vol.16, p.295

²⁰⁰ *Mukhtasar al-'Uluww*, p.49

²⁰¹ *Al-Arba'een fī Sifāt ir-Rabb ul-'Ālameen*, p.118.

The statements which do not have any basis in the Book, *Sunnah* and *Ijmā'* are the negated statements which are stated by the *Jahmiyyah*, *Mu'tazilah* and others. They describe the people who affirm the Attributes mentioned in the confirmed texts who say: 'The Qur'ān is not created or that Allāh will be seen in the Hereafter or that Allāh is Above the Worlds, as being "*Mujassima*" (anthropomorphists) and "*Hashwiyyah*" (worthless ones). Yet these three matters have been agreed upon by the Salaf of the Ummah and its Imāms. The *ijmā'* of *Ahl us-Sunnah* from the statements of the Salaf in these matters has been corroborated by more than one of the Imāms, such as: Ahmad bin Hanbal, 'Alī bin al-Madanī, Ishāq bin Ibrāheem, Dāwūd bin 'Alī...and like **Abī Bakr al-Ismā'īlī**..."²⁰²

Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī stated in *Fath ul-Bārī*, transmitting from al-Ismā'eelee what is connected to the division between *īmān* and Islām: "Al-Ismā'īlī relayed this from the people of *Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah* who said "They are both differ in their evidences when compared..."²⁰³ In his *T'tiqād Ahl us-Sunnah*, Imām Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī states in point no.43:

"...ويرون الصلاة الجمعة وغيرها خلف كل إمام مسلم، برأ كان أو فاجراً، فإن الله عز وجل 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)

They (Ahl us-Sunnah) view that the prayer, whether it is congregational or any other, should be made behind every Muslim Imām, good or sinful, because Allāh made the congregational prayer obligatory specifically and absolutely. This is even though Allāh 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.

Then he states:

²⁰² *Al-Arba'een fī Sifāt ir-Rabb ul-'Ālameen*, p.118.

²⁰³ *Fath ul-Bārī*, vol.1, p.105

44 – They view *jihād* against the *kuffār* with the leaders even if the leaders are sinful and immoral.

45 – They view that du'ā should be made for the leaders so that they be righteous and just.

46 – They do not view that khurūj 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 Imām.

49 – They view that the abodes are places of Islām (Dār ul-Islām) and not Dār 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.²⁰⁴

'Aqīdah on Dealing with the Rulers from Imām Abū 'Uthmān as-Sābūnī (d. 449 AH/1057 CE)

He stated in *'Aqeedat us-Salaf wa As-hāb ul-Hadeeth*:

The People of Hadeeth view that the establishment of the Jumu'ah and the two 'Eids and other than that from all of the prayers that are made behind a Muslim Imām, righteous or sinful, as long as he is not a disbeliever who is outside the fold of the religion.²⁰⁵ They (the People of Hadeeth) make

²⁰⁴ See al-Hāfidh Abū Bakr Ahmad bin Ibrāheem al-Ismā'īlī, Jamāl 'Azūn (ed.), intro. by Shaykh Hammād bin Muhammad al-Ansārī, *Kitāb 'Itiqād Ahl is-Sunnah* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ibn Hazm, 1420 AH/1999 CE), pp.55-56.

²⁰⁵ Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī 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

du'ā for the Muslim rulers for success and righteousness,²⁰⁶ and they²⁰⁷ 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.²⁰⁸

Therefore, we have relayed the words and clear view of the classical Imāms and scholars, such as:

- Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 241AH/855 CE)
- Imām al-Muzanī (d. 264 AH/877 CE)
- Imām at-Tahawī (d. 321 AH/933 CE)
- Imām Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī (d. 371 AH/981 CE)
- Imām as-Sābūnī (d. 449 AH/1057 CE)
- Imām an-Nawawī (d. 676 AH/1277 CE)
- Imām Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī (d. 852 AH/1449 CE)
- Imām Ibn Battāl (d. 387 AH/997 CE)
- Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 AH/1328 CE)

This matter is also relayed in the works of ar-Rāzi'ayn in their creed (Abū Hātim dying in 264 AH/878 CE and Abū Zur'ah in 277 AH/890 CE), Harb bin Ismā'īl al-Handhalī al-Kirmānī (d. 280 AH/893 CE) in his *Masā'il*, 'Abdullāh bin al-Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 290 AH/903 CE) in *Kitāb us-Sunnah*, Abū Bakr al-Khallāl (d. 311 AH/923 CE) in *as-Sunnah*, Ibn Khuzaymah (d. 311 AH/923 CE) in *Kitāb ut-Tawbeed*, Ibn Battah al-'Ukbarī (d. 387 AH/997 CE) in *al-Ibānah*, al-Lālikā'ī (d. 418 AH/1027 CE) in *Sharh I'tiqād Ahl us-Sunnah*, Ibn ul-Banā'a al-Hanbalī (d. 471 AH/CE) in *ar-Radd 'ala'l-Mubtadi'ah* and Imām at-Tahawī in his *'Aqeedah at-Tahaviyyah* – they all mention not fighting against the tyrannical leaders, or other fiqh issues which demarcated Ahl us-Sunnah from the Rāfidah and the Khawārij. Are these classical scholars all “bootlickers” according to Dilly Hussain and ‘Bro Hajji?!

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 *fatāwā* of the scholars.

²⁰⁶ Shaykh 'Ali stated: To the extent that Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal (*rahimahullāh*) would say “**If my du'ā would be accepted, I would make du'ā for the sultān (governor/ruler)**”, as if the ruler is rectified then so would the people under him and also the affairs of the society.

²⁰⁷ i.e., the people of *hadeeth* who are the saved sect and the aided group.

²⁰⁸ See translation: Abū 'Uthmaan Ismaa'eel ibn 'AbdurRahmaan as-Saabooni, *'Aqeedat us- Salaf wa As-hāb 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.

Umm Salamah (*radi Allāhu 'anhā*) that the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) said: “There shall be leaders appointed over you, you will find that some of them do good things that you approve of and that some of them do evil things that you disapprove of. The one who knows their evil (but does not follow it) is free from blame, and the one who rejects their evil is safe. But the one who is pleased with it (such evil) and follows it is destroyed.” The people asked: “Should we not fight against them?” The Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) replied “No, as long as they pray.”²⁰⁹ And in another wording; “as long as they establish the prayer among you.”

There is a claim, which used to be argued by Takfirīs like 'Abdullāh El-Faisal al-Jamaykī and now taken up in a similar manner by Dilly Hussain and Hajji, that the ahādeeth about the rulers and associated explanations by scholars on the matter ‘only refer to a Khaleefah’?! Who preceded them with this understanding? The Prophet (*sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) related the ahādeeth about the future presence of tyrannical leaders and some of them are discussing future prophecies at times when it will be known that there will not be a Khaleefah?! As there has not been a sole Khaleefah for all Muslims for centuries! Since the time of the Salaf. Imām as-San'ānī stated when explaining the hadeeth in Saheeh Muslim of Abū Hurayrah regarding the one who does not obey the ruler dies the death of Jāhiliyyah:

The people did not agree on a Khaleefah in all of the Islamic lands during the period of the Abbasid state, rather every region was independent running their own affairs.²¹⁰

Imām ash-Shawkānī mentioned this similar view:

As for after the spread of Islām and the different sections broadened then it is well known that every country had allegiance to an Imām or Sultān [of their own] and the countries did not rebuke each other. So there is no problem in having multiple leaders and rulers, each have to be obeyed and the bay'ah is made to them from the people being ruled over wherein his orders are to be enacted. If someone rises to remove a leader from a country who has already assumed authority and after the people have pledged allegiance to him, then the dissenter should be executed if he does not repent.²¹¹

Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimahullāh*):

²⁰⁹ Verified by Muslim in *Kitāb ul-Imārah*, hadeeth no.1854

²¹⁰ *Subul us-Salām Sharh Bulūgh il-Marām*, vol.3, p.499

²¹¹ *As-Sayl al-Jarrār al-Mutadaffiq 'alā Hadā'iq il-Azhār*, vol.4, p.512

The Sunnah is that the Muslims have one leader and the rest are his deputies, **but if the Ummah leave off this foundation due to their disobedience or inability resulting in the leaders being numerous, then each leader (within his country) has to establish the hudūd and maintain the rights.**²¹²

So based on this: the 'Ulama confirmed for multiple leaders whatever is confirmed for the main ruler when he is present, they implement the hudūd and the likes and they are to be heard and obeyed and it is not a condition that anyone of these leaders calls to the greater Khilāfah. This was also mentioned by our Shaykh and teacher, Qādī 'AbdusSalām Burjis (*rahimabullāh*) in his book *Mu'āmalat ul-Hukkām* [Dealings with the Leaders].²¹³

Indeed, the Prophet (*sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) said in the hadeeth, narrated by Jābir bin Samurah (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*), in the Saheehayn about the 12 Khulafā' that they will all be from the Quraysh, and this matter will not end until they have arrived, and in a version in Saheeh Muslim "*Islām will continue to prevail through them*" and "*Islām will continue to be prevail and be strong until there have been twelve caliphs.*" Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

فكان الخلفاء: أبو بكر، وعمر، وعثمان، وعلي، ثم تولى من اجتمع الناس عليه وصار له عز ومنعة: معاوية، وابنه يزيد، ثم عبد الملك وأولاده الأربعة، وبينهم عمر بن عبد العزيز. وبعد ذلك حصل في دولة الإسلام من النقص ما هو باق إلى الآن؛ فإن بني أمية تولوا على جميع أرض الإسلام، وكانت الدولة في زمنهم عزيزة، والخليفة يدعى باسمه: عبد الملك، وسليمان...، وكان أحدهم هو الذي يصلي بالناس الصلوات الخمس، وفي المسجد يعقد الرايات ويؤمر الأمراء، وإنما يسكن داره، لا يسكنون الحصون، ولا يحتجبون عن الرعية".

The Caliphs [were]: Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Alī, and then the people united around those who had assumed power and had might and strength [such as]: Mu'āwiyah and his son Yazeed, and then 'AbdulMalik and his four sons and among them 'Umar bin 'Abdul'Azeez. **After that, the Islamic State gave in to deficiency which has remained up until today.** For the Banu Umayyah [Umayyads] assumed control over all the Islamic lands and the state during their time was mighty and the Caliph would be referred to by his actual [first] name, 'AbdulMalik', 'Sulaymān' etc. and he would lead the people for the five daily

²¹² *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.35, pp.175-176

²¹³ Shaykh, Dr 'AbdusSalām Burjis Āl 'AbdulKareem, *Mu'āmalat ul-Hukkām fī Daw' al-Kitāb wa's-Sunnah*, p.28

prayers, and in the Masjid would give out the flags [to the armies], appoint commanders, live in his own house and not in a fortified building and not be secluded away from the people.²¹⁴

While Ibn Hajar stated about this hadeeth:

أرجحها الثالث لتأييده بقوله في بعض طرق الحديث الصحيحة : كلهم يجتمع عليه الناس .
وإيضاح ذلك أن المراد بالإجماع انقيادهم لبيعتهم . والذي وقع أن الناس اجتمعوا على أبي بكر ثم عمر ثم عثمان ثم علي ، الى أن وقع أمر الحكمين في صفين فسمى معاوية يومئذ بالخلافة ، ثم اجتمع الناس على معاوية عند صلح الحسن ، ثم اجتمعوا على ولده يزيد ، ولم ينتظم للحسين أمر بل قتل قبل ذلك ، ثم لما مات يزيد وقع الاختلاف ، الى أن اجتمعوا على عبد الملك بن مروان بعد قتل بن الزبير ، ثم اجتمعوا على أولاده الأربعة : الوليد ثم سليمان ثم يزيد ثم هشام ، وتخلل بين سليمان ويزيد عمر بن عبد العزيز ، فهؤلاء سبعة بعد الخلفاء الراشدين . والثاني عشر هو الوليد بن يزيد بن عبد الملك ، واجتمع الناس عليه لما مات عمه هشام فولي نحو أربع سنين ، ثم قاموا عليه فقتلوه ، وانتشرت الفتن وتغيرت الأحوال من يومئذ ، ولم يتفق أن يجتمع الناس على خليفة بعد ذلك ، لأن يزيد بن الوليد الذي قام على بن عمه الوليد بن يزيد لم تطل مدته ، بل ثار عليه قبل أن يموت ابن عم أبيه مروان بن محمد بن مروان ، ولما مات يزيد ولي أخوه إبراهيم فغلبه مروان ، ثم ثار على مروان بنو العباس ، الى أن قتل . ثم كان أول خلفاء بني العباس أبو العباس السفاح ، ولم تطل مدته ، مع كثرة من ثار عليه ، ثم ولي أخوه المنصور فطالت مدته ، لكن خرج عنهم المغرب الأقصى باستيلاء المروانيين على الأندلس ، واستمرت في أيديهم متغلبين عليها الى أن تسموا بالخلافة بعد ذلك ، وانقرط الأمر في جميع أقطار الأرض ، الى أن لم يبق من الخلافة إلا الاسم في بعض البلاد ، بعد أن كانوا في أيام بني عبد الملك بن مروان يخطب للخليفة في جميع أقطار الأرض شرقاً وغرباً وشمالاً ويميناً مما غلب عليه المسلمون ، ولا يتولى أحد في بلد من البلاد كلها الإمارة على شيء منها إلا بأمر الخليفة . ومن نظر في أخبارهم عرف صحة ذلك .

²¹⁴ Ibn Taymiyyah, *Minhāj us-Sunnah*, vol.8, p.238.

فعلى هذا يكون المراد بقوله : ثم يكون الهرج ، يعني القتل الناشئ عن الفتن وقوعاً فاشياً يفشو ويستمر ويزداد على مدى الأيام ، وكذا كان. والله المستعان.

The third view is the more accurate as it is supported by the Prophet's words in other versions of the saheeh hadeeth that: *"the Ummah will be united behind all of them."* The people united behind Abū Bakr, then 'Umar, then 'Uthmān and then 'Ali, until the events of the arbitrating parties at Siffeen at which point Mu'āwiyah was known as the Caliph. Then the people united around Mu'āwiyah when he made a peace treaty with al-Hasan. Then the people united around Mu'āwiyah's son Yazeed and al-Husayn was unable to assume power and he was killed prior. Then when Yazeed died there was division until the people united around 'AbdulMalik ibn Marwān after the killing of Ibn az-Zubayr. Then the people united around the four sons of 'AbdulMalik: al-Waleed, then Sulaymān, then Yazeed, then Hishām, while 'Umar bin 'Abdul'Azeez came between Sulaymān and Yazeed. These were the seven caliphs after the Rightly Guided Caliphs, and the twelfth was al-Waleed bin Yazeed bin 'AbdulMalik. The people united behind him when his paternal uncle Hishām died and he ruled for around four years. Then they revolted against him and killed him. **[Then] tribulation became widespread and circumstances changed at that point and the people after that did not agree on a Khaleefah.** Because Yazeed ibn al-Waleed, who had rebelled against his cousin al-Waleed bin Yazeed, did not rule for a long period. Rather, the son of his father's cousin Marwān ibn Muhammad bin Marwān, rebelled against him. When Yazeed died he was succeeded by his brother Ibrāheem, but Marwān defeated him. Then the Banu'l-'Abbās [Abbasids] revolted against Marwān and he was killed.²¹⁵ Then the first of the Abbasid Caliphs was Abu'l-'Abbās as-Saffāh [the blood-shedder] but his rule did not last long as so many people rebelled against him. He was succeeded by his brother al-Mansūr who did rule for along time. However, they lost al-Maghrib al-Aqsā [Spain and North Africa] when the Marwanids took control of Andalusia and they remained in control of it and then referred to it as a 'Khilāfah'. **Then things began to deteriorate all over the [Muslim] realm to the extent that there was nothing left of Khilāfah in some countries except in name only.** Before that, during the time of the Banu 'AbdulMalik bin Marwān, the Khateeb gave khutbahs in the

²¹⁵ [TN]: the Abbasid Revolution.

name of the Caliph in all regions, east and west, north and south – this was in all lands under Muslim control. No one could assume any position of authority in any land except by the direct appointment of the caliph. Whoever inspects their reports [i.e. history] will know the accuracy of this. **Based on this, the intent of the Prophet's words (sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam): "Then there will be harj [riotous killing]" refers to the killing which results from widespread tribulation and continues to spread and increase as time goes by. This is exactly what has happened. Allāh Musta'an.**²¹⁶

This shows that the ahādeeth about obeying the unjust tyrannical leaders will not be the Khulafā' whom the Prophet prophesied would come after him *sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam*. It also debunks any suggestion that the Prophetic Khilāfah ended in 1924 until Ataturk came along! As the Ottoman Empire was evidently already in collapse if circumstances could develop wherein a secularist such as he could assume such absolute control!?

CONCLUSION

There are several important key issues with the approach of Dilly Hussain and Hajji. Firstly, with all due respect Dilly Hussain's pillars (!?) of journalism and political commentary do not confer on him the qualification to discuss the history of the da'wah of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb, or to advocate ahistorical pan-Turkic myths to buttress a Neo-Ottomanist Manhaj. He should be humble and admit this fact. Hussain's evident knowledge gaps can even be seen in his own assumed field of specialisation, politics. In a recent interview with Noam Chomsky Dilly Hussain after 38 minutes refers to the French homosexual political philosopher who died of AIDS, Michel Foucault. Dilly Hussain pronounces Foucault's name wrong, without the silent French 'l' and 't', leaving Noam Chomsky totally confused as to who Dilly Hussain is even referring to! Chomsky has to have it clarified by his wife who can be heard in the background! It is odd that a politics graduate does not even know how to pronounce the name of a political philosopher who is oft-repeated within that field, and demonstrates the problem we have here.

Secondly, as for 'Bro Hajji' he adopts a narrative like the Orientalists in that he asserts that Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb began out a certain way and then later became 'Takfirī. This is a bizarre notion to posit to the people. This is what the Orientalists say about Islām, that it started

²¹⁶ Ibn Hajar, 'Kitāb ul-Ahkām', hadeeth nos.7222-7223 *Fath ul-Bārī*, vol.13, p.214

peacefully and then came with the sword. The clear approach and principled method of the Imām in regards to Shirk al-Akbar, Tawheed and Takfeer has been outlined.

Thirdly, Hajji conveniently fails to mention in his selective quoting the Ijmā' of Ahl us-Sunnah on not rebelling which was relayed by Ibn Hajar and Imām an-Nawawī. This shows either deception or ignorance, we will give him the benefit of the doubt and deem this as sheer ignorance. Hajji quoting when it suits and denying when it suits. Al-Hāfidh ibn Hajar stated in *Tahdhib ut-Tahdhib*, vol.2, p.288:

وقولهم (كان يرى السيف) يعني كان يرى الخروج بالسيف على أئمة الجور، وهذا مذهب للسلف
قديم، لكن استقر الأمر على ترك ذلك لما رأوه قد أفضى إلى أشد منه في وقت الحرة، ووقعة ابن
الأشعث وغيرهما، عظة لمن تدبرها.

Their statement 'he used to view the sword [be used]' means: 'he used to hold the view of using the sword to rebel against the tyrannical transgressive leaders'. This was an old Madhhab of the Salaf, however the issue became settled to not do that [i.e. rebel against the leaders] due to what they saw it leading to in terms of a worse situation, as occurred at al-Harrah and also with the situation of Ibn Ash'ath and others. A lesson for those who reflect.

The above clear statement from Ibn Hajar on the issue of rebellion against the leaders has been neatly swept under the carpet by 'Bro Hajji'. Fourthly, the Salafi 'Ulama have been succinct in their explanations of the issue of rebellion. Hajji, due to his poor interactions with a few Salafis, along with Dilly Hussain, both appear to hold that the Salafis have a complete blanket prohibition on the issue of removing the unjust leaders. This therefore requires further elucidation. For example, Imām 'Uthaymeen (*rahimahullah*) stated:

It is not permissible to revolt against the leaders except with some affirmed principles because khurūj against them has principles, these principles are:

1. To know for certain that they have come with something which is kufr.
2. That we have to know that this kufr is clear and needs no interpretation. It must be manifest and apparently clear because clarity, as the hadeeth mentions, is something which is apparently clear. As Allāh says about Pharaoh, **"Pharaoh said: 'O Hammān build for me a tower that I might reach for the ways. The ways into the heavens...'"** {*Ghāfir* (40): 36-7} So it must be clear and as for different possible interpretations and explanations then this does not justify departing from imān.

3. That we have a clear and decisive proof from Allāh that is clear like the sun that indicates that this action is indeed kufr. We have to know for sure that this is *kufr* and we have to know that he has become a disbeliever without any room whatsoever for interpretation, as the Prophet (*sallallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) said: *"Until you see clear kufr which you have a proof from Allāh about."*
4. **Ability to remove such a leader.** As for us knowing that we cannot have the ability to remove him except by fighting him which will involve bloodshed and the sanctities being dishonoured- then this is not permissible for us to speak about doing at all. Rather, we ask Allāh to guide such a ruler or for Allāh to remove him, this is because if we do it (i.e. try to remove the ruler) yet we do not have the ability to do that, will it be possible for the ruler to retract from what he is upon? No! Rather, he will increase in what he is upon and those who support him will increase. Therefore, in this instance our effort in trying to revolt against the leader will cause greater harm and *bātil* will not cease but rather strengthen and the sin will be upon us and it will be us who have laced the swords on our own necks. There is no one wiser than Allāh and He did not obligate the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) and the companions to fight except until when they had an independent state. Before this they were weak in Makkah, some were imprisoned, some killed, some had rocks placed on their chests in the burning sun and Muhammad (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) returned from Makkah bleeding after he has rocks thrown at him by the people of Tā'if. Yet with all of this, the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) was not instructed to fight because Allāh is the Most Wise. Unfortunately, you will not find anyone who disobeyed the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) and revolted against the leader, except that he greatly regretted what he had done and was a cause of harm to his people. He was not successful in removing the Imām from power, and I do not intend here the greater Imām (Khaleefah) as that has not been with us for ages, rather I intend by 'Imām' all of those people who have authority and rulership.²¹⁷

²¹⁷ End of Imām 'Uthaymeen's words from *Sharh uz-Zād ul-Mustaqni'* in explaining the preventions of inheritance.

Hence, there has to be the requisite *ability* to remove an unjust tyrannical oppressive leader and in a way so as *not to bring about a greater harm*. It is not a mere matter of anger and emotion. So we ask Hajji and Dilly: where has khurūj against the leaders worked, especially of late? It is easy to sit, theorise and conduct mere thought experiments about revolution, rebellion and removing leaders, but where has it materialised as a tangible successful project with a positive reality for Muslims? Algeria?! Iraq? Egypt? Somalia? Libya? Syria?! Yemen?

Hajji should relay issues accurately or desist from doing so entirely. This is the deen and not a comedy club. So we advise Dilly Hussain and 'Bro Hajji' to be careful of *'Ujb bi'n-Nafs* and *Ta'ālum* and thinking that they have presented arguments which have never ever been known until gracing the scene with Youtube videos. The same contentions have been made over the last 25 years by Abū Hamza al-Misrī, 'Abdullāh El-Faysal al-Jamaykī, Tāriq 'AbdulHaleem and others. Way before 'Bro Hajji' even graced the scene, while the recent contentions as per what is found in the histories of Ibn Ghannām and Ibn Bishr has recently been argued by Hātim al-'Awnī in Saudi Arabia.

It has been evident that 'Bro Hajji' did not mention the complete stance on the issue rebellion as per the words of the scholars, yet we will give him the benefit of the doubt and assume that he was ignorant of these details. Incidentally, and somewhat ironically, 'Bro Hajji' asserts that Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb was the forefather of ISIS, yet also holds the same stance as ISIS in regards to denigration of the contemporary 'Ulama, open condemnation of leaders and the validity of rebellion against the wicked transgressive rulers without the ability to remove that – now if this is not from the modern Khawārij and ISIS playbook we don't know what is!?

Hajji regards himself as a "Hanafī-Atharī" and disassociates himself from Salafiyyah. So where is this community of non-Salafī Atharīs to which he ascribes and what is the basis of this? Hajji, based on a few interactions with younger inexperienced Salafis, has taken it upon himself to label the entire Salafī Manhaj as a result as being "bootlicking", "not speaking the truth due to money from Saudi", "hiding knowledge", "not distinguishing between baghy and khurūj" and "not knowing khurūj" etc.

تِلْكَ إِذَا قِسْمَةٌ ضِيزَى

"That, then, is an unjust division"

{an-Najm (53): 22}

We could agree that some of the people whom he has interacted with are ignorant, blind followers and inexperienced. But the texts which he has attempted to quote from are open to

everyone and has been our way, so he cannot take his own personal skewed experiences of some who ascribe to Salafiyyah in Hyde Park Speakers Corner and then apply them to the texts to then criminalise Salafis generally. This merely reflects Hajji's own so-called "Atharī community" which he claims to represent. Can all "non-Salafī Hanafī-Atharīs" now be described with the manners and Manhaj that Hajji has? And if the Atharī way is correct as Hajji opines, and not Salafiyyah, who are these "Atharīs" whom he asserts to take from? As Imām Muslim (*rahimahullāh*) also recorded in his the *Muqaddimah* of his *Saheeh* (vol.1, p.15) that Muhammad ibn Sīrīn said:

لم يكونوا يسألون عن الإسناد فلما وقعت الفتنة قالوا سموا لنا رجالكم فينظر إلى أهل السنة فيؤخذ
حديثهم وينظر إلى أهل البدع فلا يؤخذ حديثه

They had not used to ask about the Isnād (chains of narration) but when the Fitnah arose they said, "Name us your men!" So they looked to Ahlus Sunnah and they took their narrations and they looked to the people of innovation and they did not take their narrations.

It is upon Hajji to impart his alternative so-called "Atharī way" and the adherents and Shaykhs of this approach. The Tābi'ī Imām, Muhammad ibn Sīrīn (*rahimahullāh*), which is recorded in the *Muqaddimah* of Saheeh Muslim, vol.1, p.15:

«إن هذا علم الدين، فانظر ممن تأخذون دينكم»

"This is the knowledge of your religion, so look to whom you take your religion from."

And there is no doubt that though there are shortcomings, the blessings of the da'wah to Tawheed emphasised by Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb are evident in the land, and Allāh brought much benefit for the deen and the dunya as a result of the Imām's aiding Allāh's deen. So if the Muslims return to their true deen based upon the Book and the Sunnah with the understanding of the Salaf of the Ummah, Allāh will help them and grant for them honour and empowerment as Allāh says,

﴿وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَلَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِينَهُمُ الَّذِي ارْتَضَى لَهُمْ وَلَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ أَمْنًا يَعْبُدُونَنِي لَا يُشْرِكُونَ بِي شَيْئًا﴾

"Allāh has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession (to authority) upon the earth just as He granted it to those before them and that He will surely establish for them (therein) their religion

which He has preferred for them and that He will surely substitute for the, after their fear, security, (for) they worship Me, not associating anything with Me.”

{an-Nūr (24): 55}

Shaykh 'AbdulMālik ar-Ramadānī al-Jazā'irī states about this noble ayah:

Do the Muslims actually pay any attention to this great condition?

“...(for) they worship Me, not associating anything with Me...”

So does the one who puts his hopes in a stone qualify for help? Does the one who seeks help from the dead qualify for help? Does the one who prostrates by the graves qualify for help? Does the one who makes Tawāf around the shrine or tomb of a pious man qualify for help? Does the one who believes that his hidden and open affairs are in the hand of a Wali [Friend or Close Ally of Allāh], or swears by the Prophet qualify for help?²¹⁸

While Imām 'AbdurRahmān as-Sa'dī (*rahimahullāh*) said:

This is from the truthful promises, He promises whoever establishes imān and righteous actions from this Ummah that He will grant them succession in the earth and be Khulafā' [successors] in the earth. He will establish their religion for them which He has preferred for them, which is Islām, which is above all other religions which He has preferred for this Ummah, due to the Ummah's virtue, nobility and blessing. Those who establish it [the deen] will be firmly established and also due to their open and secret establishing of Allāh's Divine Legislation within their ownelves and within others [from other religions and kuffār who have been overpowered].

Allāh will substitute [a condition] after their fear wherein one could not manifest his deen or fear from the harm of the kuffār against him and the condition of the Muslims is insignificant in comparison to that of the others and the people of earth target them from one bow and wreak havoc against them. Allāh promised them these affairs at the time of the descent of the ayah: succession in the earth and empowerment in the earth, empowerment in the earth to establish the Islamic way of life, complete security wherein they worship Allāh and do not associate anything with Him not fearing anyone except Allāh.

²¹⁸ *As-Sabeel ilā 'Izz wa't-Tamkeen* [The Path to Honour and Establishment]. Riyadh: Dār at-Tayyibah, 1421 AH/2000 CE.

So the core of this Ummah established *īmān* and righteous actions in order to be successful others. Allāh established them with countries and pious servants [of Allāh] from the eastern parts of the earth to the west and complete safety was obtained along with total empowerment. This is from the wondrous and splendid signs of Allāh and the affair will remain in this way until the Last Hour. As long as the people establish *īmān* and righteous actions there is no escape from finding what Allāh promised has them. And if the *kuffār* and *munāfiqeen* (hypocrites) overpower the Muslims at times, this is due to Muslims being devoid of *īmān* and righteous actions.

And Allāh says,

﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ اتَّقَوْا وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ مُحْسِنُونَ﴾

“Indeed, Allāh is with those who fear Him and those who are doers of good.”

{*an-Nahl* (16): 128}

Allāh explained in some verses of the Qur'ān:

﴿وَلَقَدْ أَخَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ بَنِي إِسْرَآئِيلَ وَبَعَثْنَا مِنْهُمُ اثْنَيْ عَشَرَ نَقِيبًا وَقَالَ اللَّهُ إِنِّي مَعَكُمْ لَئِنْ أَقَمْتُمُ الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَيْتُمُ الزَّكَاةَ وَآمَنْتُمْ بِرُسُلِي وَعَزَّرْتُمُوهُمْ وَأَقْرَضْتُمُ اللَّهَ قَرْضًا حَسَنًا لَأُكَفِّرَنَّ عَنْكُمْ سَيِّئَاتِكُمْ وَلَأُدْخِلَنَّكُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ فَمَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ مِنْكُمْ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ سَوَاءَ السَّبِيلِ﴾

“And Allāh had already taken a covenant from the children of Israel, and We delegated from among them twelve leaders. And Allāh said, “I am with you. If you establish prayer and give zakah and believe in My messengers and support them and loan Allāh a goodly loan (spending in Allāh’s way), I will surely remove from you your misdeeds and admit you to gardens beneath which rivers flow. But whoever of you disbelieves after that has certainly strayed from the soundness of the way.”

{*al-Mā'idah* (5): 12}

And Allāh neither gives authority and establishment to a *Khārijī* state for any significant period, nor to a state which buttresses, co-opts, sanctions and promotes *shirk* and *bida'* in the name of His *deen*. When the Mongols invaded *Shām*, the Muslims went out to confront them, yet they had some practices of *shirk* amongst their ranks. Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimahullāh*) emphasised correcting the '*aqeedah* of the Muslims and calling the Muslims to *Tawheed*, as is mentioned in

his refutation of al-Bakri which has been published as *Talkhees Kitāb ul-Istighātha* (vol. 2, pp. 731-732):

Some of the senior scholars from our companions were saying that tawheed is the greatest thing knowing that it is the basis of the deen. Yet on the other hand, others were calling upon the dead and asking them for help, supplicating to them, humbling themselves to them and maybe even what they were doing with the dead was the worst thing, calling upon the dead in times of need. They were therefore calling upon the dead hoping for a response to their request or they make a supplication by the grave of the dead as opposed to worshipping Allāh and calling upon only Him. They call upon the dead most of the time to the extent that when the enemies, who were outside the Divine Legislation of Islām, entered Damascus, some of the people went out to seek help from the dead at the graves which people hoped could remove afflictions. Some of the poets said:

*O those who are scared of the Mongols,
go to the grave of Abū 'Umar*

and:

*seek refuge in the grave of Abū 'Umar,
it will save you from harms and afflictions*

This was during a defensive jihād not an offensive jihād. Then Ibn Taymiyyah said:

I said to them: those who were seeking help and assistance from the dead in the graves that even if they were with you in the battle they would be defeated as the Muslims at Uhud were defeated.²¹⁹ As it was certain that the

²¹⁹ Shaykh 'AbdulMālik ar-Ramadānī al-Jazā'irī states in commenting on these words from Ibn Taymiyyah:

Contemplate on these two matters:

FIRST: The necessity of purifying the beliefs of the those striving in the way of Allāh, even if there are righteous people amongst them this will not benefit them at all so long as innovations and idolatrous practices are rampant within the ranks of the Muslims. How can an army that seeks nearness to Allāh with shirk and is stubborn towards the Muwahhideen be aided?!

SECOND: The sound deduction of Ibn Taymiyyah wherein he deducted the low with the lofty. The Muslims at Uhud did not fall into shirk yet they disobeyed the messenger (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) and were thus defeated. So is it reasonable to think that Muslims will be aided by Allāh if they have innovations, idolatrous practices, Sufism,

army was destroyed due to reasons that necessitated that, Allāh's wisdom is in that.

This explains why some states which were entrenched in shirk, regardless of battles to spread their own borders and influence, gave rise to individuals who later did away with many of the core apparent and public institutions of Islām, and now nothing remains of Islām except tradition along with half of the population being secular! Ibn Taymiyyah continues:

Therefore, the people of knowledge of the deen and those possessing insight did not fight on that occasion alongside the practices of innovations and shirk. This was because the fight was not a Divinely Legislated fight that Allāh and His messenger have commanded, as evil and corruption would have been achieved as opposed to the desired victory from the fight. There would not have been any rewards in this life or in the next for whoever knows this. As for many of those who believed that this was a Divinely Legislated fight then they will be rewarded for their intentions. After that we began to command the people to have sincerity to the deen of Allāh and to seek help from Him and that they should not seek help from anyone other than Allāh, whether it be an angel or prophet, as Allāh said on the Day of Badr:

﴿إِذْ تَسْتَغِيثُونَ رَبَّكُمْ فَاسْتَجَابَ لَكُمْ﴾

“(Remember) when you asked for help from your Lord, and He answered you...”

{*al-Anfal* (8): 9}

It is also narrated from the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said on the day of Badr:

“O Ever-Living, O Self-Sufficient, there is no god worthy of worship except You, with Your

denial of Allāh's Attributes (*tajahhum*), *rafd* (rejection of the rightly guided caliphs) and great tribulations?!

*Mercy I ask You for help.*²²⁰ In another wording: *“Rectify all of my affairs and do not make me occupied with myself, or to anyone from Your creation.”*²²¹

Ibn Battah narrated in his *al-Ibānah* (no. 1848) that 'Umar ibn Abdul- 'Azeez said: *“Do not do battle alongside the Qadariyyah, for they will not be helped.”*

And may peace and blessings be upon Muhammad, his family and all of his companions

Written and compiled by the one in need of Allāh's Aid,

'AbdulHaq ibn Kofi ibn Kwesi al-Ashanti

London

Sunday 18th October 2020 CE/1st Rabī al-Awwal 1442 AH

²²⁰ The verifier mentioned seeking help in this *hadeeth* which was reported by an-Nasā'ī (no. 611); al-Hākim (vol. 1, pp.222) and al-Bayhaqī in his *Dalā'il un-Nubuwwah* (vol. 3, p.49). it is authenticated in the narration of Tirmidhī (*hadeeth* no. 3524) and others, and from Anas (*radi Allāh 'anhu*) with the words: *“The Prophet (sallallāhu alayhi wassallam) whenever he was worried about a matter would say: “O Ever-Living, O Self-Sufficient, with Your Mercy I ask You for help.”*

²²¹ The verifier also mentioned that this is a narration from Ahmad (vol. 5, p. 42); Abū Dāwood (*hadeeth* no. 590) and al-Bukhārī in *al-Adab ul-Mufrad* (*hadeeth* no. 701), and it is saheeh.