

**Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis**

**(hafidhahullāh)**

# **THE HŪTHĪS: BETWEEN IRĀN AND AL-QĀ'IDAH<sup>1</sup>**

---

As-salāmu 'alaykum wa Rahmatullah wa Barakātuhu

To proceed:

Currently we are witnessing warfare between the lions of the Sunnah, the Saudi army, and the Hūthī Rāfidah on account of Hūthī aggression against the land of tawheed and the sunnah, Saudi, may Allāh protect it. Those Hūthīs are from the Jārūdiyyah sect of Zaydi Shi'a who themselves are against the Twelver Rāfidah as the Rāfidah (Rejecters) are only named as such due to their rejection ('Rafd') of Zayd bin 'Ali, who the Zaydiyyah ascribe themselves to. The Jārūdiyyah however are the closest branch of Zaydiyyah to the Twelver Rāfidah even though they are distant from them.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Written on the 27/11/1430 AH and it can be accessed here: [http://islamancient.com/mod\\_stand.item.42.html](http://islamancient.com/mod_stand.item.42.html)

This translation is abridged from that article.

<sup>2</sup> **Translator's note ('AbdulHaq al-Ashantī):** They are ascribed to Abu'l-Jārūd Ziyād bin al-Mundhir al-Kūfī al-Hamadhānī, and his name and *nisba* has also been said to be "ath-Thaqafi" or "al-Hindī" or "Ziyād bin Munqidh al-'Abbādī" or "Ziyād bin Abī Ziyād". Ibn an-Nadeem described him as being "from the 'Ulama of the Zaydiyyah is Abu'l-Jārood and he also has the kunyah Abu'n-Najm Ziyād bin al-Mundhir al-'Abbādī. It was said that Ja'far bin Muhammad bin 'Ali was asked about him and said: "may Allāh curse him, he was blinded in heart and insight." He died in 150 AH and some said 160 AH." See Ibn an-Nadeem, *al-Fihrist*, pp.226-227 and ash-Sharastānī, *al-Milal wa'n-Nihal*, vol.1, pp.159, 162.

The Jārūdiyyah claim that the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) gave 'Ali ibn Abī Tālib (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) leadership by description and not by name. Hence, according to the Jārūdiyyah the Companions after were deficient and negligent in not recognising this description or seeking to trace the description and as a result selected Abū Bakr hereby becoming kuffār as a result. See al-Mufeed, *Awā'il ul-Maqālāt*, p.84; al-'Ash'arī, *Maqālāt ul-Islāmiyyeen*, p.66; ash-Sharastānī, *al-Milal wa'n-Nihal*, vol.1, pp.157, 159; Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddimah*, vol.2, p.534; al-Maqrīzī, *Khutat*, vol.2, p.352.

At the hands of Badruddeen al-Hūthī, the Hūthūs embraced Twelver Shi'ism and when the Zaydī 'Ulama in Yemen pressured him after he authored the book *aṣ-Zaydiyyah fi'l-Yemen* [The Zaydīs in Yemen], wherein he affirmed the similarities between the Zaydiyyah and the Twelver Shi'a, he migrated to Tehrān the capital of the Rāfidī state of Irān and stayed there for a number of years. Then later some representatives of the President of Yemen mediated with him until they allowed him to return to Yemen and he agreed with this. He increased his activities in trying to

---

So even al-Mufeed considered them as Extremist Shia. AbdulQāhir al-Baghdādī stated in his book *al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq*:

**And the Jārūdiyyah have split into two groups concerning this order: The first group says: 'Ali (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) gave the imāmah to his son Hasan (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*), then Hasan (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) gave the imāmah to his brother Husayn (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) after him, then the imāmah was done through consultation between the sons of Hasan and Husayn (*radi Allāhu 'anhumā*), so whoever amongst them came out with his sword unsheathed and calling to his religion – and was an 'Ālim and an 'Ārif – then he was the imām.**

**And the second group claims: That the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) was the one who gave the imāmah to Hasan (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) after 'Ali (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*), and gave the imāmah to Husain (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) after Hasan (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*). Then the Jārūdiyyah split up into many groups concerning the Imām al-Muntadhar (the awaited Imām i.e. Imām Mahdi).**

**The first group: They are not waiting for a certain person, they say: Anyone from the offspring of Hasan and Husayn (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) that unsheathes his sword and calls towards his religion, then he is the imām. The second group: They're waiting for Muhammad bin 'Abdullah bin Hasan bin Hasan bin 'Ali bin Abī Tālib, they do not believe he was killed or died, and they claim that he is the guided and awaited one who will emerge and rule the world. And the view of this group is like the Muhammadiyyah of the Imāmiyyah, they too are awaiting Muhammad bin 'Abdullah bin Hasan bin Hasan bin Ali.**

**The third group: They're awaiting Muhammad bin Qāsim bin 'Ali bin 'Umar al-Husayn al-Alawi at-Tālibī, from the town of Tāliqān (a place in Khurasān), and they believe he did not die. The fourth group: They're awaiting Yahya bin 'Umar bin Yahya bin Husayn bin Zayd bin 'Ali, the one from Kūfā, and they do not believe he died or was killed. These are the views of the Jārūdiyyah, and to make takfeer of them is wājib, because of their takfeer of the companions of Rasoolullah (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*).**

convert the Zaydiyyah to Twelver Shi'ism and in the year 2002 CE his son Husayn announced his opposition to the (Yemenī) State. In 2004 CE he staged an armed protest against the American occupation of 'Irāq. They had a strong military force to the extent that the Yemenī government had to face them with thirty-thousand troops and Husayn ibn Badruddeen al-Hūthī was killed. Then his father assumed the reigns of command and then he too was killed so his other son 'AbdulMālik assumed control of the Hūthīs and fierce fighting between the Hūthīs and the Yemenī government began under his instructions, as well as engaging the Saudi army which was from his orders. This is a brief summary of what I have come across that has been written about the Hūthīs from their own books and articles. What concerns me in this article are the following issues:

### **ONE**

The fighting between the Saudi government and the Hūthīs is a religious battle and not a worldly battle. This is because they have transgressed against the sanctity of the Saudi State even though they are weaker in number in comparison to the lions of the Sunnah the Saudi security forces. So what has led them (Hūthīs) to do this especially during a time when it is near to Hajj? If it is said: **“that which has led the Hūthīs to attack Saudi is that Saudi is supporting the Yemenī government in shelling and fighting against them.”** Then it is to be said to this: “If the opposition of the Saudi State to them was hidden and in secret, but the confrontation is open. Therefore, this excuse is to be rejected and it affirms that behind this is a religious battle orchestrated by Irān, and the enmity between the Rāfidah State of Irān, may Allāh break it, and the State of Sunnah, Saudi, may Allāh strengthen it.”

So if it is said: **“What is verified that Irān is supporting them?”** It should be said in response to this: There are many evidence, such as:

- The fact that the Yemeni government declared that Iranian weapons were in Hūthī possession.
- Al-'Awfī admitted that the Hūthīs offered financial support to al-Qā'idah, via Irān.<sup>3</sup> In an interview on Channel 1 (Saudi TV) on Friday evening on 27 March 2009 CE entitled 'Hūthī Attempts to Co-Ordinate with al-Qā'idah' it was stated: “you have the Hūthīs who came and spoke personally with us saying: ‘Do you want a million? We can get you this from Irān.’ On that day I realised that this is not being ordered by the youth but rather it is being orchestrated from above, however the apparent image is that of the Mujāhideen.” Al-'Awfī said: “SubhānAllāh al-'Adheem! These matters became clear and the image became apparent. I

---

<sup>3</sup> [TN]: Refer to al-'Awfī's interview here wherein he speaks about his experience in al-Qā'idah and his subsequent split from them: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CkOhkitiiXk>

began to focus on these until I knew that there were certain states which were orchestrating this small group in Yemen (i.e. the Hūthīs).” Then al-’Awfi said: **“Individuals from the Hūthīs came to us personally saying: ‘there is a link with Irān if you want money? We’re ready to get it for you.’”**

So if it is clear that the fighting is religious then it is obligatory on the Muslims from Ahl us-Sunnah to stand with the Saudi Salafī State via heart, pen and tongue. The war is between those who love the companions and those who make takfeer of the companions. The war is between the Muwahiddeen who have made worship solely for Allāh and those who call to shirk in Allāh’s Rubūbiyyah, even worse than the shirk of Abū Lahab and Abū Jahl!

**“Not equal are the companions of the Fire and the companions of Paradise. The companions of Paradise – they are the attainers [of success].”**

{*al-Hashr* (59): 20}

By Allāh, He is with the brave knights of tawheed who will gain a reward for upholding and defending Allāh’s tawheed and the companions of Allāh’s Messenger (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*). Allāh is with the Armies of tawheed and the protectors of the Sunnah and He will aid them to crush the Rāfidah with His Might, they should know that they are in the path of jihad and the one on the battlefield will profit and he should hope for martyrdom in facing the enemies of religion

**Say, "Do you await for us except one of the two best things while we await for you that Allāh will afflict you with punishment from Himself or at our hands? So wait; indeed we, along with you, are waiting."**

{*at-Tawbah* (9): 52}

## **TWO**

The enmity of the Rāfidah to the Ahl us-Sunnah is documented in history, for history and the Muslims have not forgotten what the treacherous Rāfidī minister Ibn al-’Alqamī did. Ibn Katheer stated in *al-Bidāyah wa’n-Nihāyah*, vol.13, p.200:

**Then came the year 656 AH when then Tartars took Baghdād and killed most of its inhabitants including the Khaleefah and the Abbasids (Banu’l-’Abbās) were exterminated.**

Then Ibn Katheer states:

**He arrived in Baghdād with his horde of disbelieving immoral oppressive brutes who neither believed in Allāh nor the Last Day. They surrounded Baghdād from its Western and Eastern sides and the armies of Baghdād**

were of the utmost weakness and humiliation, not numbering ten-thousand troops.

Then Ibn Katheer stated:

All of this was due to the views of the Rāfidī Minister Ibn al-'Alqamī...for this reason he was the first to present himself to the Mongols, he went out with his family, companions and servants and gathered with the Mongol ruler Hulugu, may Allāh curse him. Ibn al-'Alqamī went back to the Khaleefah suggesting to him to go out and meet Hulagu Khan and lower himself in front of him for the welfare of the people and to offer Hulagu one half of the land taxes [Kharaj] collected yearly in 'Irāq.

Ibn al-'Alqamī continued to convince the Khaleefah until he went out to meet Hulagu with 700 judges, scholars and prominent people. So when they came close to the residence of Hulagu, they drew back from the Khaleefah, all but 17 people who entered with the Khaleefah. As for those who stayed back, they came down from their horses and were killed, every last one of them.

The Khaleefah met with Hulagu and then returned to Baghdād in the company of at-Tūsī and al-'Alqamī and others. Then he returned to Hulagu and brought with him gold and jewels and as soon as he returned the orders were given to kill him and it is said that this order was suggested by al-'Alqamī and at-Tūsī. They went to the Khaleefah's room, surrounded him and kicked him to death while he was wrapped up as they did not want any of his blood to fall on the ground, according to their [Mongol] beliefs. It has been said he was strangled or drowned, Allāh knows best.

They [the Mongols] stormed through the country [al-'Irāq] killing whoever they were able to from men, women, young, old, sick and healthy. Many people hid inside wells and gardens, hiding for days so as not to be found; or they ran to the hills and mountains. The Mongols continued their rampage, killing people even on the roofs of their homes and inside the Masājīd, until the streets flowed with blood like rainwater in a valley. No one was spared except the Jews, Christians and those who took refuge in the abode of al-'Alqamī the Rāfidī, and a group of traders who took a covenant of security with him and gave a substantial amount of wealth to him so as to secure their lives and property.

Then Ibn Katheer stated:

**The minister Ibn al-'Alqamī before this even worked hard to divert the military and remove their names from the Dīwān. Thus, the military during the final days of Caliph al-Mustansir were a hundred thousand fighters including princes, senior kings and the likes. Ibn al-'Alqamī strove to minimise the army so that not even ten-thousand troops remained. He then wrote to the Mongols encouraging them to attack Baghdād and he facilitated this for them, relating to them the situation of the country and its military weakness in terms of man-power. All of this from Ibn al-'Alqamī was so as to ensure that the Sunnah would be totally removed and so that the Bida' of the Rāfidah would be dominant, leading to a Fatimid Caliph and enslaving the 'Ulama and Muftīs.**

Then Ibn Katheer said:

**The people have differed over the number of those Muslims killed during the sacking of Baghdād. It has been stated eight hundred thousand were killed; and it has been stated that a million were killed. From Allāh we came and unto Him we shall return, there is no power or movement except by Allāh, the Exalted and the Mighty.**

Ahl us-Sunnah should take a lesson from what occurred with Ibn al-'Aqamī, the author of the book *Mādhab Ta'rif 'an Hizbillāh?* [What Do You Know About Hezbollah?] stated:

**When the Khomeini Revolution began in Irān in 1979 CE, the Iranian administration attempted to incite a proxy revolution against Saudi Arabia (from within). This led to what was called a Shi'a Uprising in al-Qateef in the year 1400 AH (1980 CE) and this led to slogans such as "our origin is Husaynī and our leader is Khomeini" and "down with the Saudi administration" and "down with Fahd and Khālid".**

Via the emergence of the Khomeini Revolution, and harmonious communication between Irān and Shi'ite leaders in Saudi Arabia, they were entrusted to establish an organisation headed by Shaykh Hasan as-Saffār. The organisation was named: *The Organization of the Islamic Revolution to Liberate the Arab Peninsula*, and later became known as the *Organization of the Islamic Revolution in the Arabian Peninsula*. Of the most recent events that have been co-ordinated by the brothers of Ibn al-'Alqamī is their transgression against the grave of the Sahābah such as the grave of 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān (*radi Allāh 'anhu*), refer to this article entitled *The Rāfidah and the Incident at the Baqi'*:

[http://www.islamancient.com/mod\\_stand,item,32.html](http://www.islamancient.com/mod_stand,item,32.html)

O Ahl us-Sunnah, these Rāfidah are indeed treacherous, look at their harm, lies and plotting, is there really any sane Sunnī who would take a Rāfidī as a close confide? Of the vile errors that has occurred is when Ahl us-Sunnah debate the Rāfidah, this is a creedal error as the Salaf have reached consensus on this being an error. Imām al-Ājurī stated in his book *asb-Share'ab*, vol.1, p.59:

**This is what we have forbidden and caution against, based on what has arrived from the Imāms of the Muslims.**

Then he said:

**If he wants to debate and argue with you, then this is disliked according to the 'Ulama, do not debate him and be wary of him upon your deen.**

Then he said:

**Your remaining silent with them and your abandoning them is harsher upon them than you debating them, this is what the Muslims scholars from the Salaf us-Sālih stated.**

How many obstacles are put in place due to these debates, such as the Rāfidah presenting their doubts to the common people from Ahl us-Sunnah. How many times do doubts affect the hearts and remain firmly lodged therein, without it being answered directly or understood without correct understand, causing the doubt to remain allowing Shaytān to beautify it. Also within these debates with the Rāfidah some of those debating them are easy with them so as to convince the Rāfidī that he is being fair with him.

Thus, you'll see him saying to an accursed Rāfidī: “my respected brother” or “O honourable Shaykh” or the likes!<sup>4</sup> It may end up showing the people that the Rāfidah are wrong but it is not correct to regard them as “noble brothers” or “honourable Shaykhs” – this is a grave calamity. If it is said: “Many people have been guided at their hands and have thus left Rafd.” Then it is to be said to this: “And many people from Ahl us-Sunnah have been misguided and have downplayed the differences between the Rāfidah and Ahl us-Sunnah, and maintaining the capital takes precedence over gaining extra profit, as the Shar' and the intellect indicate.”

### **THIRD – THE MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD AND THE HŪTHĪS**

---

<sup>4</sup> [TN]: This is referring to the mode of discussion that is prevalent on the London-based Arabic channel *al-Mustaqillah* wherein some of the participants either have *tasāhul* with the Rāfidah, as is the case with the presenter Dr Muhammad al-Hāshimī, or some of them at times display gross open disrespect to the Salafī 'Ulama of Saudi, as is the case with Abū Muntasir al-Balūshī and 'Adnān 'Urūr.

The *Ikhwān ul-Muslimeen* [Muslim Brotherhood] wrote a statement to the Custodian of the Two Holy Sanctuaries, our king 'Abdullāh bin 'Abdul'Azeez, may Allāh grant him success, and I have three points to append to their statement:

1. Their call for the Saudi military to cease fighting against the transgressive Hūthīs, because their blood is sanctified, yet at the same time they have silence and meekness in regards to the Hūthī incursion into the land of tawheed and Sunnah. Indeed they have meekness and silence in regards to Ahl us-Sunnah who are killed at the hands of the Rāfidah in Irān or due to Irān such as what occurs in al-'Irāq and Lebanon. Indeed, they (the Muslim Brotherhood) stand with *Hiẓballāh* [Hezbollah] in Lebanon which aims to destroy the edifice of Ahl us-Sunnah there. So do you see these shameful stances of the Ikhwān ul-Muslimeen affirm that they are a product of the British as indicated by the author of the book *al-Ikhwān ul-Muslimeen fi'l-Mizān* [The Muslim Brotherhood in the Scales].<sup>5</sup>
2. In their statement they indicated that Saudi is calling for rectification and unity. So if they truly believe this about Saudi why do they hold Saudi account for the war against Saddam when they used to visit King Fahd (*rahimabullāh*) and Prince Nāyif and then betray what they would say to them and then they (Ikhwān ul-Muslimeen) would support Saddam Hussein when he invaded Kuwait and Saudi, as mentioned openly in the media by Prince Nāyif (*hafidbabullāh*). Ikhwān ul-Muslimeen [The Muslim Brotherhood] are indeed politicians and not people of religion and they play with the type of politics which is not *Shari'* and their danger increases when they make out to the people that they are people of religion and have concern for the religion and by Allāh they are liars, either knowingly or in reality. May Allāh hasten the Muslims' freedom from them, look at how much they have co-operated with the Rāfidī State Irān, where is their *'aqeedah* if indeed they are people of *'aqeedah* and deen?!

#### **FOURTH – THE HIZBĪS AND HARAKĪS IN SAUDI**

---

<sup>5</sup> [TN]: authored by Salāh Shādī, printed by Dār ul-Wathā'iq in Kuwait. Or it could be referring to Fareed 'AbdulKhāliq's book *al-Ikhwān ul-Muslimeen fi Mizān il-Haqq* (Cairo: Dār as-Sahwa, 1987 CE).

There are various strands of them in regards to these events: those who are quiet and others who criticise the Hūthīs however include the Saudi State as being liable for blame. If the transgression was against Palestine, Afghanistan, Chechnya or Bosnia you would hear khutbahs and text messages for dua for their brothers, and this is right. However, why are they silent about the Hūthī transgression on the land of the Saudi State of tawheed and Sunnah, may Allāh protect it, and about the displacement of thousands of Yemenis in Yemen due to the Hūthīs.

The Hizbīs in Saudi play about in the name of religion and Islām, as soon as the terrorist atrocities of the Khawārij occurred (in Saudi) some of them (Hizbīs) placed the blame on the Americans while some of them placed the blame on the Saudi State itself saying that Saudi just wanted to get rid of “the good people”, this is what they claimed as if they are talking about the Yahūdī State! Then, when their lies and deceptions were exposed they rejected those terrorist actions with a degree of freeing the perpetrators from the actions by claiming that those perpetrators intend to kill Americans. When their deception was again exposed they (the Saudi Hizbīs) were forced to reject those terrorist atrocities so that the people would not distant themselves from them and so that they will not be debased in the people’s eyes. It was also the fact that they became scared when the State became strict (on these matters).