

## PREFACE

---

Before we present each reason<sup>1</sup> of al-Muhājiroun's<sup>2</sup> deviation from the path of our Righteous Predecessors, we will first take a moment to remind ourselves of how to apply the classical litmus test for revealing the Straight Path of Allāh. This litmus test presents itself in the form of an archaic, wise statement from an illustrious Imām who hails from the Golden Period of Islām.

The Imām of the people of Sunnah of his time Imām Abū Muhammad Khalf al-Barbahārī (died 329H) said in his monumental work *Sharhus Sunnah*:

فانظر رحمك الله كل من سمعت كلامه من أهل زمانك خاصة فلا تعجلن ولا تدخلن في شيء منه حتى تسأل وتنظر هل تكلم فيه أحد من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم أو أحد من العلماء فإن أصبت فيه أثرا عنهم فتمسك به ولا تجاوزه لشيء ولا تختار عليه شيئا فتسقط في النار.

**May Allāh have mercy upon you - examine the speech of every one of the people of your particular time, and do act hastily nor enter into anything until you enquire and observe; did any of the Companions of Allāh's Messenger speak about it or any of the scholars? If you find a narration from them, then hold firmly to it, do not go beyond it for anything or give preference to anything over it and thus fall into the Fire.**

---

<sup>1</sup> **Please note:** not all of these reasons revolve around the core principles, rather a couple of them are extraneous issues which categorise al-Muhājiroun's methodology.

<sup>2</sup> Even though the name *al-Muhājiroun* is no longer used by this chameleon cult, we still decided to refer to them as such because, out of all of their false identities, this one preserves best their notoriety and scandalous ways.

Contained in this passage is a formula, for every single Muslim - no matter his level, which inoculates from the deceases of misguidance and misplaced dependency. Anything that has an authentic attachment to Islām must be like an umbilical cord that connects through the scholars, of each past generation, all the way back to the first three generations of Muslims. So let us absorb the wisdom which is contained in this passage and manifest it when we are called upon to recognise the true path of the Salaf. We will end this short introduction with a beautiful statement from the great Imām Mālik:

فَكُلُّ خَيْرٍ فِي اتِّبَاعِ مَنْ سَلَفَ      وَكُلُّ شَرٍّ فِي ابْتِدَاعِ مَنْ خَلَفَ

*Every good is in following the Salaf,  
While every evil is in the innovations of the Khalaf.*<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> He said this during his era (179 AH) so how much more should his wise words apply during these confused days of ours?

# 1 COMMANDING THE GOOD AND FORBIDDING THE EVIL

---

Allāh the Most High says in His Noble Book:

**“And let there be [arising] from you a nation inviting to [all that is] good, enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong, and those will be the successful.”** {*Āli ‘Imrān (3): 104*}

If you were to approach any member of al-Muhājiroun and ask him to recite the above verse, you would, in most cases, receive a verbatim recitation of this noble command; actually, he might even go one step further and proudly quote for you the well-known saying of the Prophet ﷺ: *“Whoever among you sees an evil action, let him change it with his hand; and if he cannot, then with his tongue; and if he cannot, then with his heart – and that is the weakest of faith.”*<sup>4</sup>

The accurate quotation of any verse or hadīth is a prerequisite in the field of da’wah; however, mere memorisation of text does not automatically qualify *anyone* to enjoin the good and forbid the evil, especially in matters pertaining to public relations. There are certain conditions the practitioner must abide by, and certain qualities he must exemplify to be successful in the field of public da’wah.

Before we examine al-Muhājiroun’s attempts to actualise the aforementioned noble verse, we’ll take a moment to familiarise ourselves with the characteristics of the caller and the conditions which he must abide by.

---

<sup>4</sup> Narrated by Muslim, 49.

## Knowledge and Wisdom

Allāh the Most High says:

**Say, “This is my way; I invite to Allāh with insight, I and those who follow me. And exalted is Allāh; and I am not of those who associate others with Him.”** {*Yūsuf* (12): 108}

## Gentleness

Gentleness is a *very* important attribute to possess for the one who transverse the path of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil; a lack of gentleness can quite easily cause all communications to break down, leading to a loss of objectivity. It becomes all too convenient for a person to reject advice when he feels he’s being undermined or disrespected; therefore, it’s essential that we remove all emotional obstacles which may hinder a person from seeing things with clear perception.

The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, through a few words,<sup>5</sup> reminds us of the importance of gentleness; he said:

ما كان الرفق في شيء إلا زانه ، ولا نزع من شيء إلا شانه .

*“Gentleness does not enter into anything except that it beautifies it; harshness does not enter into anything except that it disfigures it.”*<sup>6</sup>

He ﷺ also said:

إن الله رقيق يحب الرفق وإن الله يعطي على الرفق ما لا يعطي على العنف .

*“Indeed, Allāh is Gentle and He loves gentleness; He gives for being gentle more than for being harsh.”*<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> One of the things which was given to the Prophet was *jawāmi’ al-kalam* (a few words which contain comprehensive meaning).

<sup>6</sup> Reported by Muslim, 4698.

<sup>7</sup> Saheeh Muslim.

## Patience

“And be patient. Surely, Allāh is with those who are As-Sābirīn (the patient ones).”

{*Al-Anfāl* (8): 46}

Patience is another key quality which the caller must have when enjoining the good and forbidding the evil. Allāh the Mighty and Majestic says:

“Enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong, and be patient over what befalls you.”

{*Luqmān* (31): 17}

We will conclude this segment with the words of Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah:

لا بد من هذه الثلاثة: العلم والرفق والصبر، العلم قبل الأمر والنهر، الرفق معه والصبر بعده.

It’s essential that all three of these qualities exist (in a person who enjoins good and forbids evil): knowledge, gentleness and patience. Knowledge precedes the command or prohibition; gentleness consorts it and patience must follow it.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā*, vol. 28, p.137.

# AL-MUHĀJIROUN IN LIGHT OF THE CLASSICAL UNDERSTANDING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ENJOINING GOOD AND FORBIDDING EVIL

## Levels of Enjoining Good and Forbidding Evil

Shams ad-Dīn, Imām Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah said:

[Based on its effects,] forbidding evil has four levels:

**The first** is that it would end, and would be replaced by its opposite (i.e. good).

**The second** is that it would diminish without ending completely.

**The third** is that it would be replaced by [an evil] equivalent to it.

**The fourth** is that it would be replaced by [an evil] worse than it.

The first two levels conform to the *Shari'ah* (Islamic Law); the **third** is liable to *ijtihad* (scholarly judgement); the **fourth** is prohibited.<sup>9</sup>

## Weighing the Activities of al-Muhājiroun in Light of Ibn Qayyim's Levels of Enjoining Good and Forbidding Evil

Luton Protests	
Positives	Negatives
N/A	The EDL (English Defence League) did not exist before al-Muhājiroun decided to let loose their own undomesticated brand of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil. So what were the results of al-Muhājiroun's attempts to forbid an evil? How about the conception a far-right movement which has grown exponentially in the last year; An organisation which thrives on

<sup>9</sup> Taken from *The Fundamentals of Commanding the Good & Forbidding the Evil*. Compiled by Abu Khalil and Muhammad Jibali.

	<p>disseminating the highly contagious disease Islamophobia.</p> <p>So al-Muhājiroun gets to shout their abusive slogans at the top of their voices, and in return we are now at war with a Frankenstein which was created from elements of unbridled emotions and incoherent chemical reactions.</p> <p>The point is: al-Muhājiroun have handed the enemies of Islam a (perceived) justified platform from which they can launch their crusade against Islām.</p> <p><b>Verdict: Level Four (Haram)</b></p>
N/A	<p>As a direct retaliation of these protests against the troops in Luton, extreme bigots decided to materialise their anger and hatred for Islam by throwing petrol bombs into <i>Masjid al-Ghurabā</i>, causing severe structural damage to the building which accommodates an Islamic school for young kids. This is a clear case of the evil outweighing the good, actually it's nigh impossible to see any good.</p> <p><b>Verdict: Level Four (Haram)</b></p>

General Protests	
Positives	Negatives
N/A	<p>Despite al-Muhajiroun’s public protests against the oppressive and evil occupation of foreign forces in Afghanistan and Iraq, what benefits were cultivated through these demonstrations? Actually, historically speaking, what benefits have demonstrations ever brought about? Did the 36 million people across the globe, who took part in almost 3,000 protests against the Iraq war, prevent it from ever occurring?</p> <p>Demonstrations and protests produce the illusion of people having a say in geo-politics and policies. However, protests are nothing more than human valves which permit the frustrated person to release their inner anger without actually yielding any real benefit.</p> <div style="background-color: #444; color: white; padding: 5px; text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">       Verdict: Level Three (Ijtihad)     </div>
N/A	<p>Are demonstrations and protests a part of the Prophetic Methodology in remedying the deceases and ills of a society?<sup>10</sup> Nowhere in the Sunnah can evidence be brought to support this innovated practice which incidentally</p>

<sup>10</sup> The narrations which state that ‘Umar and Hamza “marched” are *da’if* (weak) due to the presence of Ishāq bin Abī Farwah in the *isnād* and he is *Matrūk*. See Ibn Hajar, *at-Taqrīb*, p.102 and *al-Isābah*, vol.4, p.280.

	<p>originated from the socialists and anarchists.</p> <p><b>Verdict: Level Four (Haram)</b></p>
N/A	<p>For argument sake, even if demonstrations and protests were permissible, were these protests accompanied by the noble qualities of patience, knowledge or gentleness? Or were they characterised with anger, chaos and empty chaotic slogans? What taste was left in the mouths of the non-Muslims after witnessing such antics? How many non-Muslims witnessed this spectacle and walked away saying: “Wow! Now I must learn more about this wonderful, composed religion called al-Islam!”</p> <p><b>Verdict: Level Four (Haram)</b></p>
<b>China Protests</b>	
Positives	Negatives
N/A	<p>Do we <i>really</i> consider yells and screams of “China - go to Hell!” as a productive part of calling people to Islam? Was this the Message of the Prophets to scream in unison for a whole country populated of 1.5 billion (100 million of which are Muslims) to go to hell? Did not Allāh say:</p> <p><i>Indeed, We have sent you, [O Muhammad], with the truth as a bringer of good tidings and a warner,</i></p>

*and you will not be asked about the companions of Hellfire.*

*{Al-Baqara (2): 119}*

What about the Chinese Muslims and non-Muslims, who fight not against Islam, are they to be encircled within your generic call to the Hellfire? Imagine if you were a Chinese person, oblivious to the call of Islam, and this was your first encounter with Muslims (i.e. screaming for your eternal damnation)?! Can you imagine the Prophet and his Sahābah shouting “Mecca – go to hell!?” No Muslim in his right mind could conjure such mental images, and even if he could, practical examples from the Sunnah would instantly douse these fiery images. Did not the Prophet have a *practical* opportunity to destroy the people of *Tā’if* after their rejection and humiliation of him? And what was his reply to the angel when presented with this opportunity:

*Maybe Allāh will produce from their offspring ones who will worship Him alone.*

**Verdict: Level Four (Haram)**

## 2 RULING BY OTHER THAN WHAT ALLĀH HAS REVEALED

---

Al-Muhājiroun state in their article ‘6 Reason Why All the Rulers Are *Murtad* (Apostates)’:

**“All their constitutions are kufr and declare sovereignty for kufr law rather than to Allāh.”**

This is where we get a *true* glimpse of al-Muhājiroun and their deep-set khawārijī ways. Just like the Khawārij, they commandeered ayah 44 from Surah al-Mā’idah and used it as a battering-ram to charge anyone who opposes their polarised cult mentality with disbelief.

Here we will provide a list of reputable classical scholars through to contemporary ones, culminating with Imām al-Albānī and Imām ’Uthaymeen, to show that there is no conflict among the recognised Salafī scholars, past and present, on the ayah in al-Mā’idah referring to kufr less than kufr.

1. Abū ’Ubayd al-Qāsim bin Sallām ؓ (d. 224 AH/836 CE) stated in *al-Īmān* (p.45):

**As for what is mentioned in the revelation,**

﴿وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

**“And whoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed – then it is those who are disbelievers.”**

{*Al-Mā’idah* (5): 44}

Then Ibn 'Abbās stated: “It is not the kufr which expels one from the religion” and 'Atā' said: “kufr less than kufr.” It therefore becomes clear to us that if it does not expel one from the religion of Islām then the person's deen remains, yet if he mixes some of this then this is sinful. So the meaning is nothing except the characteristics of the kuffār and their ways because ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed is from the ways of the kuffār.

2. The Shaykh of the Mufasssīrīn, at-Tabarī رحمه الله (d. 310 AH/922 CE) stated in *Jāmi ul-Bayān*, vol.6, pp.166-167:

وأولى هذه الأقوال عندي بالصواب: قول من قال: نزلت هذه الآيات في كفّار أهل الكتاب، لأن ما قبلها وما بعدها من الآيات ففيهم نزلت، وهم المعنيون بها، وهذه الآيات سياق الخبر عنهم، فكونها خبراً عنهم أولى.  
فإن قال قائل: فإن الله تعالى قد عمّ بالخبر بذلك عن جميع من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله، فكيف جعلته خاصاً؟!  
قيل: إن الله تعالى عمّ بالخبر بذلك عن قوم كانوا يحكم الله الذي حكم به في كتابه جاحدين، فأخبر عنهم أنهم بتركهم الحكم على سبيل ما تركوه كافرون، وكذلك القول في كلّ من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله جاحداً به، هو بالله كافر؛ كما قال ابن عباس".

The first of these statements is correct according to me, which is the view of the one who says that: “These verses (from al-Mā'idah) were revealed in regards to the kuffār of Ahl ul-Kitāb”. Because the verses which come before and after it were revealed in regards to them and they are the ones intended. The context of these verses are informing about them firstly. If someone says: “Allāh, exalted is His mention, informed of this generally about all who do not rule by what Allāh has revealed, so how can you make it specific?” Then it is to be said (in response): “Allāh made the report general in

regards to a people who used to reject what Allāh judged in His Book. So He informed of those people that due to their abandonment of the judgement are disbelievers.” Such is the view of all who do not rule by what Allāh has revealed while rejecting it, such a person is a disbeliever as Ibn ’Abbās stated.

3. Imām Abū ’Abdullāh bin Battah al-’Ukbarī رحمته الله (d. 387 AH/997 CE) included a chapter in *al-Ibānah*, vol.2, p.723:

باب ذكر الذنوب التي تصير بصاحبها إلى كفر غير خارج به من الملة

**Chapter on: ‘sins which lead the one who committed them to kufr but do not expel him from the religion.’**

Then he mentioned (in vol.2, pp.733-734) within the chapter:

الحكم بغير ما أنزل الله

**“Ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed,”**

Wherein he cited the narrations from Ibn ’Abbās, Ibn Mas’ūd and the Tābi’īn which indicate that ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed is minor kufr which does not expel one from the religion.

4. Imām Abū ’Abdullāh Muhammad bin ’Abdullāh al-Hākim an-Naysābūrī رحمته الله (d. 403 AH/1012 CE) said in *al-Mustadrak*, vol.2, p.393:

**“This hadīth (i.e. “kufr dūna kufr”) has a Sahīh isnād and Bukhārī and Muslim did not transmit it.”**

Adh-Dhahabī agreed.

5. Imām al-Baghawī رحمته الله (d. 516 AH/1122 CE) mentioned in *Ma’ālim ut-Tanzīl*, vol.3, p.61:

**Ibn ’Abbās and Tāwūs stated: “It is not the kufr which expels one from the religion. Rather if one does it then he is a**

disbeliever yet he is not like the one who disbelieves in Allāh and the Last Day.”

6. Al-Qādī Abū Bakr bin al-'Arabī ؓ (d. 543 AH/1148 CE) stated in *Ahkām ul-Qur'ān*, vol.2, pp.624-625:  
**Tāwūs and others said: “It is not the kufr which expels from the religion, however it is kufr less than kufr.”**

Then Imām Ibn al-'Arabī stated:

وهذا يختلف: إن حكم بما عنده على أنه من عند الله، فهو تبديل له يوجب الكفر، وإن حكم به هوى ومعصية فهو ذنب تدركه المغفرة على أصل أهل السنة في الغفران للمذنبين.

This may differ if he rules by his own self claiming that it is from Allāh, this is *tabdīl* and necessitates kufr. Yet if one rules by his own (rules) out of desire and disobedience then this is a sin and the person will be forgiven according to the basis of Ahl us-Sunnah in regards to the belief that the sinful will be forgiven.

7. Imām Abū 'Abdullāh Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Abī Bakr al-Qurtubī ؓ (d. 671 AH/1273 CE) stated in *al-Jāmi' li-Ahkām il-Qur'ān*, vol.6, p.190:

As for the Muslim then takfir is not to be made of him even if he commits a major sin. Meaning: whoever does not rule by what Allāh has revealed has, out of apostatising from the Qur'ān and rejecting the saying of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, become a disbeliever, as stated by Ibn 'Abbās and Mujāhid.

8. Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah ؓ (d. 728 AH/1328 CE) stated in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.7, p.312:

"وإذا كان من قول السلف: (إن الإنسان يكون فيه إيمان ونفاق)، فكذلك في قوله: (إنه يكون فيه إيمان وكفر) ليس هو الكفر الذي ينقل عن الملة، كما قال ابن عباس وأصحابه في قوله تعالى:

Therefore, from the statements of the Salaf were: "A person can have within him both *īmān* and *kufr*" and likewise within their saying: "that one can have within him *īmān* and *kufr*, it is not the *kufr* which expels one from the religion." Just as Ibn 'Abbās and his companions (students) stated in regards to the saying of Allāh,

﴿وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

"And whoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed – then it is those who are disbelievers."

{*Al-Mā'idah* (5): 44}

قالوا: كفروا كفراً لا ينقل عن الملة، وقد اتبعهم على ذلك أحمد بن حنبل وغيره من أئمة السنة".

They said it means: "They disbelieved with a type of *kufr* which does not expel one from the religion", and Ahmad and other Imāms of the Sunnah followed him in that.

Ibn Taymiyyah also said in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.7, p.350-351: He could be Muslim yet within him is *kufr* less than *kufr* which does not expel him from Islām absolutely, as the Companions said, such as Ibn 'Abbās and others: "*kufr* less than *kufr*" this is the saying of the generality of the Salaf and this is what Ahmad and others documented. This is also what al-Bukhārī bore testimony to in his Sahīh.

Ibn Taymiyyah also said in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.7, p.67: Ibn 'Abbās and his companions said: "*kufr* less than *kufr* and *dhulm* less than *dhulm*."

Ibn Taymiyyah also said in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.11, p.140:  
**More than one of the Salaf said: “kufr less than kufri, nifāq less than nifāq and shirk less than shirk.”**

9. Al-Hāfidh Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله (d. 775 AH/1373 CE) transmitted in *Tafsīr ul-Qur'ān ul-Adhīm*, vol.2, p.64:  
**“It is Saheeh (Ibn 'Abbās' statement “kufri dūna kufri”) according to the conditions of Shaykhayn.”**  
He utilised it as a proof.

10. Imām Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī رحمه الله (d. 852 AH/1448 CE) stated in *Fath ul-Bārī*, vol.13, p.120:

إن الآيات، وإن كان سببها أهل الكتاب، لكن عمومها يتناول غيرهم،  
لكن لما تقرر من قواعد الشريعة: أن مرتكب المعصية لا يسمى: كافراً، ولا  
يسمى – أيضاً – ظالماً؛ لأن الظلم قد فُسر بالشرك، بقيت الصفة الثالثة؛  
يعني الفسق.

**The verses, even though the reason for their revelation was in regards to Ahl ul-Kitāb, are still generally applied to others. However, what is acknowledged from the Qawā'id of the Sharī'ah is that: the one who commits an act of disobedience is neither named “a disbeliever” or “a transgressor” because dhulm is explained as being shirk. So what remains is the third description which is fisq.**

11. Shaykh 'AbdulLatīf bin 'AbdurRahmān bin Hasan bin Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb رحمه الله (d. 1293 AH/1876CE) stated in his book *Usūl wa Dawābit fi 'l-Takfīr*, p.36:

وأما الحكم بغير ما أنزل الله , وترك الصلاة, فهذا كفر عمل لا كفر  
اعتقاد.

As for ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed, and abandoning the Salāh, then this is kufr of actions and not kufr of belief.

12. Imām as-Sa’dī رحمته الله (d. 1307 AH/1889 CE) stated in *Taysīr ul-Karīm ur-Rahmān*, vol.2, pp.296-297:

فالحكم بغير ما أنزل الله من أعمال أهل الكفر، وقد يكون كفرًا ينقل عن الملة، وذلك إذا اعتقد حله وجوازه، وقد يكون كبيرة من كبائر الذنوب، ومن أعمال الكفر قد استحق من فعله العذاب الشديد ... ﴿وَمَنْ لَمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾ قال ابن عباس: كفر دون كفر، وظلم دون ظلم، وفسق دون فسق، فهو ظلم أكبر عند استحلاله، وعظيمة كبيرة عند فعله غير مستحل له.

Ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed is from the actions of the people of kufr. It can be kufr which expels one from the religion, if he believes that it is halāl and permitted for him to rule by it; or it could be a major sin. Of the actions of kufr are that which deserve a severe punishment.

﴿وَمَنْ لَمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

“And whoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed – then it is those who are disbelievers.”

{*Al-Mā'idah* (5): 44}

Ibn 'Abbās said: “Kufr less than kufr, dhulm less than dhulm and fisq less than fisq.” It is major dhulm when there is *istihlāl* and a major sin when the person does it without making *istihlāl*.

13. Shaykh Muhammad al-Amīn ash-Shinqīrī رحمته الله (d. 1392 AH/1972 CE) stated in *Adwā' ul-Bayān*, vol.2, p.101:

It is reported from Ibn 'Abbās that he said in regards to this verse: “It is not the kufr that you are going towards”. This is reported from him by Ibn Abī Hātim and al-Hākim who said: “It is Sahīh according to the conditions of the Shaykhayn, and the Shaykhayn did not report it, as stated by Ibn Kathīr.”

14. Imām al-Albānī ؒ (d. 1999 CE) stated in *as-Sahībah*, vol.6, pp.109-116:

It has arrived from the Salaf what supports this and this is found in regards to what they said about “kufr less than kufr” and this has been authenticated from *Tarjumān ul-Qur’ān* Ibn 'Abbās ؓ, and some of the Tābi’īn and others documented this from him. There has to be mention of what has been made easy to deduce from them and maybe this will enlighten the path in front of those who have been misguided today in this dangerous issue and traversed the way of the Khawārij who make takfir of the Muslims who have committed disobedience, even if such Muslims pray and fast.

15. Imām Muhammad bin Sālih al-'Uthaymīn ؒ (d. 2000 CE) stated in his commentary on *at-Tabdhīr min Fitnat it-Takfir*, pp.68-69:

However, due to this narration those who have been tested with takfir have not been pleased and begin to say “this narration is unacceptable! It is not authentically relayed from Ibn 'Abbās!” so it can be said to them: “How can it not be authentic when those who are more virtuous and greater in knowledge than you in hadīth have accepted the narration?! Yet you say ‘we don’t accept it!’” In relation to the narration of Ibn 'Abbās, then it is sufficient for us that the noteworthy scholars such as Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn

**Qayyim and others have all received the narration with acceptance and relay it as being an authentic narration.<sup>11</sup>**

Hence, from this list we can see that there is no difference whatsoever in regards to the interpretation of the ayah and there was never any issue raised with regards to its interpretation. Thus, the assertion about the ayah is a modern development around the issue of ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed, invented by those of the contemporary Khawārij/Takfīrī persuasion such as Al-Muhajiroun. Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

**Whoever explains the Qur'ān or hadīth and interprets them in a way other than what is well-known from the Companions and Successors opens the door to heresy and deviation.<sup>12</sup>**

---

<sup>11</sup> From his notes to the book *Tabdhīr min Fitnat it-Takfīr*, pp.68-69.

<sup>12</sup> Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.13, p.243.

### 3 AL-WALĀ WAL BARĀ

---

Al-Muhājiroun posit that any kind of walā' is major kufr which expels one from the religion. Al-Muhājiroun state in the article *6 Reasons Why All the Rulers Are Murtad'*:

**“The so-called Muslim governments ally with the disbelievers against the believers and for this they are Kafir.”**

Is it as simple as this? Does every case of Walā' necessitate takfir? These people need to look carefully at the story of Hātib Ibn Abī Balta'ah when he wrote to the Quraysh informing them of the journey of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ and you will see that not every case of muwālāt is major kufr. If every case were indeed major kufr, why the need for Allāh's Messenger to ask Hātib: *“What is this, O Hātib?”* And within Hātib's sincere reply are we shown that there is Muwālāt which doesn't amount to major kufr:

**“I intended to do them some favour so that they might protect my relatives (at Mecca), and I did not do this out of disbelief or an inclination to desert my religion.”**

This statement shows that every case of Muwālāt is not necessarily a case of major kufr, and this fact was sealed by the Messenger's response to Hātib's words: *“He (Hātib) has told the truth.”* This is only a question which you would ask if you are taking into consideration the internal aspect.

According to Islām and its scholars, there are different types of Muwālāt of the kuffār - some of which are kufr and apostasy and some forms which do not reach this level. There is general Tawallī and

Muwaddah and using their skills for a need for Muslims in their affairs and there is taking kuffār as close confidants and other types to the extent that some scholars enumerated twenty types. Shaykh Sālih ibn Fawzān al-Fawzān in his book *Durūs fi Sharh Nawāqid ul-Islām* divided al-Muwālāt into five types.<sup>13</sup>

Shaykh Sālih bin Sa'd as-Suhaymī stated in *Fath Rabb ul-Ard wa's-Samā' fi Bayān Ma'nā al-Walā wa'l-Barā'*:

**It is well-known among the people of knowledge that “Tawallī” is allegiance to the kuffār via the heart and having love and affection for them which is based upon dislike for Muslims and hating the Muslims and their dīn. The intent of Mahabbah (love) for the kuffār is on account of their dīn and longing to aid them against Muslims. Having affection for the kuffār in this is referred to as ‘Tawallī’ and this is kufr in and of itself. It involves allying with a disbeliever with ones heart on account of the disbeliever’s dīn and loving it more than Islām and preferring it over Islām or believing that it is the same as Islām, like those who believe in unity of religions.<sup>14</sup>**

Ibn 'Atiyyah ؓ stated in *al-Muharrar al-Wajeez*, vol.5, p.127 in regards to the ayah:

**“And whoever is an ally to them among you, then indeed, he is one of them.”** {*al-Mā'idah* (5): 51}

That:

**Whoever has allegiance to them with his belief and deen is one of them in kufr and deserves to be placed forever in the Hellfire.  
Whoever allies with them with his actions via helping them and**

---

<sup>13</sup> We give particular mention to the Shaykh here because many of the Takfiris like to think that he supports some of their innovated beliefs. For a full translation of these five types of muwālāt refer to our forthcoming work: *Removing Doubts Surrounding 'Kufr Dūna Kufr' and Other Related Topics*.

<sup>14</sup> Shaykh Sālih bin Sa'd as-Suhaymī, *Fath Rabb ul-Ard wa's-Samā' fi Bayān Ma'nā al-Walā' wa'l-Barā'* (Cairo: Dār ul-Imām Ahmad, 1431 AH, 2010 CE, ed. Hasan al-'Irāqī), p.41.

the likes, neither due to belief (in their dīn) nor due to a deficiency in imān, is one of them in being detested and censured, as it applies to them it also does to him.

Shaykh 'AbdurRahmān as-Sa'dī ﷺ stated in regards to the *ayah*:

**“And whoever is an ally to them among you, then indeed, he is one of them.”** {*al-Mā'idah* (5): 51}

That:

**Tawallī at-Tām [Complete Tawallī] necessitates going over to their deen and slight Tawallī leads to full Tawallī, then bit by bit until he becomes a worshipper from them.**<sup>15</sup>

Scholars of the past also allowed the use of non-Muslim, *kuffār* and *mushrik* forces to be drafted upon for Muslims, if there is a benefit in that for the Muslims.<sup>16</sup> Shaykh as-Sindī stated in his explanation of the hadīth: *“I do not gain assistance from a mushrik”*, from *Sunan Ibn Mājah* (vol.3, p.376, under hadīth no.2832):

---

<sup>15</sup> Al-'Allāmah, Shaykh 'AbdurRahmān bin Nāsir as-Sa'dī, *Taysīr al-Karīm ir-Rahmān fī Tafṣīr Kalām il-Mannān* (Beirut: Resalah Publishers, 1421 AH/2000 CE), p.235.

<sup>16</sup> Therefore, this shows that the issue of drafting *kuffār* forces is something which was mentioned by scholars in the past and the scholars who also ruled this in the present era were thus preceded in their rulings. Ibn Qudāmah al-Maqdisī ﷺ stated in *al-Mugnī* (vol.13, p.98):

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

Imām an-Nawawī stated in his explanation, vol.11-12, p.403, under *hadīth* no.4677:

**His saying ﷺ: “Go back, for I do not seek help from a mushrik;” and it is mentioned in another hadīth that the Prophet ﷺ sought help from Safwān bin Umayyah before his Islām, as a result some scholars give the first hadīth precedence over the second one. Imām Shāfi'i and others said: “If the disbeliever has good opinion of the Muslims and the need has come to utilise him, if not then it is disliked. So these two hadīths are taken in light of two circumstances.”**

It shows that gaining assistance from a mushrik without a need is harām. But if there is a need then it can be done as an exception and this is not opposed.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> See Bandar bin Nā'if bin Sanahāt al-'Utaybī, *Wa Jādilhum Bilatī Hiya Ahsan, Munāqishatun 'Ilmiyyatun Hādīyyatun li-19 Mas'alatīn Muta'alaqatin bi-Hukkām il-Muslimīn* (Riyadh: Maktabah 'AbdulMusawwir bin Muhammad bin 'Abdullāh, 1427AH/2006 CE, Fourth Edition), pp.38-42.

# 4 LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

---

Narrated 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Amr Ibn al-'Ās ؓ: "I heard Allāh's Messenger ﷺ saying:

*"Allāh does not take away knowledge by taking it away from (the hearts of) the people, but He takes it away through the death of the scholars; till no scholar remains and then people will take ignorant people as their leaders who when consulted will give their verdict without knowledge. So, they will go astray and will lead the people astray."*<sup>18</sup>

Abū Hurayrah ؓ narrated that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said:

*"There will come upon the people years of deceit wherein the liar will be regarded as truthful and the truthful will be considered a liar and the dishonest will be trusted and the trustworthy one will be considered dishonest and the Ruwaybidah will begin to speak!"* -Then it was asked: *"What is the Ruwaybidah?"* He ﷺ replied:- *"The foolish insignificant man who speaks about general affairs."*<sup>19</sup>

Al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī ؒ reports the hadīth:

من أشراط الساعة أن يلتمس العلم عند الأصغر.

**"From the signs of the Hour is that knowledge will be taken from the Smaller ones."**<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Sahīh al-Bukhārī, vol. 1, no. 100.

<sup>19</sup> Reported by Ahmad in his Musnad, Ibn Mājah and others with a weak chain of narration, but Ahmad has another chain of narration for the hadīth, which makes the hadeeth *hasan*.

<sup>20</sup> Imām al-Albānī stated in *Silsilat ul-Ahādīth as-Sahībah*, vol.2, p.316:

It was reported by Ibn ul-Mubārak in *az-Zuhd*, no.61; Abū 'Amru ad-Dānī in *al-Fitan*, vol.2, p.62; al-Lālik'ī, *Sharh Usūl us-Sunnah*, vol.1, p.230; at-

Ibn al-Mubārak رحمه الله said:

الأصاغر من أهل البدع.

“The smaller ones are the people of innovation.”

Indeed, Imām ash-Shātībī highlights that one of the causes for splitting and division is:

أن يعتقد الإنسان في نفسه أو يُعْتَقَدَ فيه أنه من أهل العلم والاجتهاد في الدين،  
ولم يبلغ تلك الدرجة.

“When a person believes, or others believe that the person, is from the people of ‘Ilm (knowledge) and ijtihād in the dīn when in fact the person has not reached that level whatsoever.”<sup>21</sup>

The following story illustrates this:

قال: مالك بن أنس: (بكى ربيعة يوماً بكاء شديداً، فقيل له: مصيبة نزلت بك؟  
فقال: لا ولكن استفتي من لا علم عنده!

Imām Mālik bin Anas رحمه الله said: “One day Rabi’ah was crying immensely, so he was asked ‘has a calamity befallen you?’ Rabi’ah replied: ‘No! But a person without knowledge was asked to give a fatwa.’”<sup>22</sup>

---

Tabarānī, *al-Kabīr* and from him ‘AbdulGhanī al-Maqdisī , *al-‘Ilm*; Ibn Mandah, *al-Ma’rifah*, vol.2, p.120, no.1.

Then Imām al-Albānī stated: “This isnād is good...”

<sup>21</sup> Al-‘Allāmah al-Muhaqqiq Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm bin Mūsā bin Muhammad al- ash-Shātībī (d.790 AH/1388 CE), Abū ‘Ubaydah Mashhūr bin Hasan Āl Salmān (ed.), *al-‘Tisām* (Ammān: ad-Dār ul-Athariyyah, 1428 AH/2007 CE), vol.2, p.128.

<sup>22</sup> Recorded by al-Fasawī in *al-Ma’rifah wa’-Tārikh*, vol.1, p.670; al-Khatib al-Baghdādī, *al-Faqīh wa’l-Mutafaqqih*, vol.2, p.324, no.1039; Ibn ‘AbdulBarr, *Jāmi’ Bayān ul-‘Ilm*, vol.2, p.1225, no.2410; Ibn us-Salāh, *Adab al-Muftī wa’l-Mustafī*, p.85; Ibn ul-Jawzī, Mashhūr Hasan (ed.), *Ta’dhīm ul-Futūyā*, p.112, no.46; at-Tartūshī, *al-Hawādith wa’l-Bida’*, p.70; Abū Shāmah, Mashhūr Hasan (ed.), *al-Bā’ith*, p.179.

All of these prophetic narrations and statements of the Salaf apply to al-Muhājiroun. If you take a look among the ranks of al-Muhājiroun, you will clearly see it's a case of the blind leading the blind. Prior to their break off from Hizb ut-Tahrīr, al-Muhājiroun always referred to Omar Bakrī as 'their Shaykh', even though he had major flaws in his aqīdah. However, anyone who does a casual study on this mercurial man will instantly learn that not only does he have no routes, chains of transmission and an authentic chain of knowledge which links him to the scholars, but his basic credentials are also extremely dubious. Let's not forget that the scholars, in terms of knowledge, basīrah and conduct, are the inheritors of the Prophets and inheritance by nature must be sourced. No credible scholars know him or recognise him as a man who possesses knowledge; rather, if any scholar does know *of* him, it's due to his notoriety and unsavoury reputation. Thus, he is merely a scholar because al-Muhājiroun *say so* and take him *as so*, and this is a clear manifestation of the words of Allāh's Messenger ﷺ: ***"and then people will take ignorant people as their leaders who when consulted will give their verdict without knowledge."*** Other people who al-Muhājiroun apply scholarly titles to are: 'Abdullāh Faisal<sup>23</sup>, Usāmah bin Ladin and Abū Qatādah.

Firstly, do al-Muhājiroun *really* want to attach themselves to the ignoramus Abdullāh el-Faisal when he says things like: **"...Ibn 'Abbās is known for making many mistakes"**. Or is he only "their scholar" when he says things which coincide with their cultish mentality? So is it the case that whenever Abdullāh El-Faisal says something in their favour he is adorned with the lofty title of 'Shaykh', but when he says disgusting statements like **"put your hands those who want to go to Jannah, it's easy just kill a kāfir, just kill a kāfir"** is he still their scholar?<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Proof they refer to him as "their Shaykh" is here, where "Abu Walīd" from East London, the one sporting an 'al-Muhājiroun' T-Shirt, lauds praise upon Faisal: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0gOK3jF94lE&feature=related>.

<sup>24</sup> For more abominable statements by Faisal, refer to our book: *Abdullah El-Faisal al-Jamayki: A Critical Study of his Statements, Errors and Extremism in Takfir* (London: Jamiah Media, 2011).

As for Bin Lādin and Abū Qatādah, despite their own deviations, even these individuals would feel embarrassed by al-Muhajiroun’s childish antics! It’s not hard to connect the dots here; what’s apparent is that these individuals only become scholars because they “agree” with them to some extent, and not that they have knowledge firmly rooted in the Kitāb and Sunnah. The last three are not even scholars, and also they are not *their* “scholars”. Therefore, al-Muhajiroun are totally marooned from the people of knowledge - past and present. Their quotations from past scholars are irrelevant as they violate the scholarly methodology and tradition. The simple fact is they have no attachment at all to the people of knowledge. So what about the term *Ruwaybidah*?<sup>25</sup> Just scour the endless al-Muhajiroun YouTube videos<sup>26</sup> for human representations of this profound term.

---

<sup>25</sup> Ruwaybidah: The lowly, ignoble man who speaks out about the public affairs.

<sup>26</sup> Here’s a classic example: “Abū Walid”, an ignorant East London based al-Muhajiroun speaker and ‘Abdullah El-Faisal fan, cannot even adequately pronounce the Qamarī and Shamsī letters in Arabic, but here he is on Youtube “teaching” lessons on issues in ‘*aqidah* which are of a technical nature. In part 4 of a “lesson” conducted by “Abū Walid” on “Nawabit al-Takfir” (!?), Abū Walid quotes a fabricated hadeeth and tries to use it to explain the correct belief in imān:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0V448VGI6rQ&feature=related>

The hadīth is from ‘Alī ibn Abī Tālib that Allāh’s Messenger ﷺ said: “*Faith is knowledge in the heart, words on the tongue and action with the limbs.*”

**This hadeeth is Mawdū’ (fabricated):** Ibn al-Jawzi in his book on fabricated hadīth *al-Mawdū’āt*, vol.1, p.128 stated that this narration contains **Abu’s-Salt AbdusSalām bin Sālih al-Harawī** in the chain of transmission and Abū Hātim and others regarded him as a Kadhhāb (prolific liar). Ibn ‘Adiyy stated: “**Abu’s-Salt relays rejected (Manākīr) ahādīth in regards to the virtues of Ahl ul-Bayt and he was accused due to this.**” Abū Zur‘ah stated: “He is not trustworthy.” Imām ad-Dhahabī stated about him in his book *ad-Du‘afā’ wa’l-Matrūkīn*: “**More than one person accused him of lying.**” Ad-Dāraqutnī stated: “**He was a filthy Rāfidī.**” See *Tabdhīb ul-Kāmil*, vol.18, p.73. Al-‘Uqaylī stated about him: “He is a prolific liar.” Imām al-Albānī mentions in his book *Silsilat ud-Da‘ifah wa’l-Mawdū‘ah*, vol.6, p.519 that Yahyā Ibn Ma‘īn gave three different confusing statements on him, and only Ibn Ma‘īn and al-Hākim deemed him as trustworthy. Abu’s-Salt AbdusSalām bin Sālih al-Harawī also narrated the fabricated narrations attributed to the Prophet ﷺ: “*I am the city of knowledge and Ali is its door, so whoever wants knowledge should seek it from its door.*”

# 5 REBELLING AGAINST THE RULERS

---

Omar Bakrī has claimed, on page 111 (footnote 123) of his book on his definition of Ahl us-Sunnah<sup>27</sup>, that Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal رحمه الله incited the common people against the rulers saying: **“Imām Ahmed rose against and publically championed people against the state...”!?**

Firstly, we start with the hadīth from Allāh’s Messenger:

أخرج مسلم في “صحيحه” عن حذيفة بن اليمان - رضي الله عنه - قال: قلت: يا رسول الله! إنا كنا بشر فجاء الله بخير فنحن فيه فهل من وراء هذا الخير شر؟ قال: “نعم”، قلت: هل وراء ذلك الشر خير؟ قال: “نعم” قلت فهل وراء الخير شر؟ قال: “نعم” قلت: كيف؟ قال: “يكون بعدي أئمة لا يهتدون بهدائي، ولا يستنون بسنتي، وسيقوم فيهم رجال قلوبهم قلوب الشياطين في حثمان إنس” قال: قلت: كيف أصنع يا رسول الله - أن أدركت ذلك؟ قال: “تسمع وتطيع للأمر وإن ضرب ظهرك وأخذ مالك فاسمع وأطع.”

Reported in *Sahīh Muslim*<sup>28</sup> from Hudhayfah ibn al-Yamān رضي الله عنه wherein he asked the Prophet ﷺ if there was any evil after this good and the Prophet ﷺ responded saying “Yes.” Hudhayfah asked “how can this be?” The Prophet ﷺ said “*There will be after me leaders who will neither be guided by my guidance nor follow my Sunnah and men will emerge from them who will have the hearts of devils in the bodies of men.*” Hudhayfah asked “What should be done if that happens?” The Prophet ﷺ said “*Listen and obey the leader, even if he beats your back and takes your money, listen and obey!*”

---

<sup>27</sup> [http://road2jannah.com/e-books/ahlul\\_sunnah\\_wal\\_jammah.pdf](http://road2jannah.com/e-books/ahlul_sunnah_wal_jammah.pdf).

<sup>28</sup> Vol.3, p.1476.

Secondly, There is no mention of “**championing the people against the state**” in *Usūl us-Sunnah*<sup>29</sup> of Imām Ahmad, nor in *Tabaqāt ul-Hanābilah*<sup>30</sup> by Qādī Muhammad ibn Abī Ya’lā nor in *Sharh Usūl I’tiqād Ahlis-Sunnah* of Imām al-Lālikā’ī. This is one of the common doubts of the people of *takfīr*, they apply this new modern interpretation about “**Imām Ahmad championing the people against the state**” but the reality is that Imām Ahmad mentions in his *Usūl us-Sunnah* that revolt against a Muslim leader is not to be made. He states under point 53-54:

**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 revolter has disobeyed the Muslims, and has contradicted the narrations of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. And if the one who revolted against the ruler died he would have died the death of ignorance. 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.<sup>31</sup>**

Imām Ahmad رضى الله عنه did not mention anything whatsoever about the “**implementation of the Sharī’ah;**” he states that *any* Muslim ruler that assumes power must be obeyed and that revolting against him is not permissible. Imām Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā’īl bin Yahyā al-Muzānī (d. 264 AH/878 CE) stated in his famous *Sharh us-Sunnah*,<sup>32</sup> point 14:

<sup>29</sup> Edited by Fawwāz Ahmad Zumarī in 1411 AH.

<sup>30</sup> Abdurrahmān al-’Uthaymīn (ed.), Riyadh: Maktabah al-’Ubaykān, 2005 CE; also Muhammad Hāmid al-Faqīhī (ed.), Cairo: 1952 CE; Beirut: Dār ul-Ma’rifah.

<sup>31</sup> See *Foundations of the Sunnah by Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal* (Birmingham: Salafi Publications, 1417 AH/1997 CE), pp.37-38.

<sup>32</sup> See Ismā’īl bin Yahyā al-Muzānī, *Kitāb Sharh us-Sunnah* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ibn Hazm, 1420 AH/2000 CE, ed. Jamāl ’Azzūn), p.85.

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

In his *ʿIṭiqād Abl us-Sunnah*, Imām Abū Bakr al-Ismāʿīlī (d.371 AH/902 CE) states in point nos.44-49:

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

45 – They view that *duʿā* 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 Muʿtazilah 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.<sup>33</sup>

Imām Abū ʿUthmān as-Sābūnī (d. 449 AH) stated in his book *ʿAqīdat us-Salaf wa As-hāb ul-Hadīth*:

The People of Hadīth view the establishment of Jumūʿah, the two ʿEids and other prayers behind a Muslim Imām, righteous or sinful, as long as he is not a disbeliever who is outside the fold of the religion. They (the People of Hadeeth) make *duʿā* for the Muslim rulers for success and righteousness,<sup>34</sup> and they<sup>35</sup> do not

---

<sup>33</sup> See al-Hāfidh Abī Bakr Ahmad bin Ibrāhīm al-Ismāʿīlī, intro. By Shaykh Hammād bin Muhammad al-Ansārī, *Kitāb ʿIṭiqād Abl is-Sunnah* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ibn Hazm, 1420 AH/1999 CE, ed. Jamāl ʿAzzūn), pp.55-56.

<sup>34</sup> Shaykh ʿAli Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī stated in a class given at the *Imām al-Albānī Centre* ʿAmmān, Jordan on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2006 CE:

To the extent that Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal ؒ would say: “If my *duʿā* would be accepted, I would make *duʿā* for the sultān (governer/ruler),” because if the

view (that it is permissible to make) revolt against them (the Muslim rulers) even if they see from them deviation from justice towards injustice, oppression, transgression and its likes.<sup>36</sup>

Imām Abū Ja'far at-Tahāwī, author of '*Aqīdah Tahāwīyyah*', which was explained by Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafī, states:

ولا نرى الخروج على أئمتنا وولاية أمورنا وإن جاروا ولا ندعوا عليهم، ولا ننزع يداً من طاعة، ونرى طاعتهم في طاعة الله عز وجل فريضة ما لم يأمرنا بمعصية، وندعو لهم بالصلاح والمعافاة [شرح الطحاوية" (ص ٣٧١)]

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 them and we do not take back the covenant of obedience from them and we view that obedience to them is from obedience to Allāh and obligatory as long as they do not command to disobedience and we make du'ā to Allāh for them to have correctness and good health.

As for the consensus, which clearly indicates this, is that which was stated by Imām an-Nawawī رحمه الله in his explanation of *Sahīh Muslim* wherein he stated:

وأما الخروج عليهم، وقتاهم، 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.<sup>37</sup>

---

ruler is rectified then so would the people under him and also the affairs of the society.

<sup>35</sup> i.e., the people of *hadīth* who are the saved sect and the aided group.

<sup>36</sup> See translation: Abū 'Uthmān Ismā'il ibn 'AbdurRahmān as-Sābūnī, '*Aqīdat us-Salaf wa As-hāb ul-Hadīth* [The Creed of the Pious Predecessors and the People of Hadeeth]. London: Brixton Mosque Islamic Centre, 1420 AH/1999 CE, pp.93-4.

<sup>37</sup> Meaning: 'even if those Muslim rulers are sinners and transgressors'. This is found in vol.12, p.229 of Imām an-Nawawī's *Sharh* of *Sahīh Muslim*.

This principle can also be found in another monumental work, the Imām of the Sunnah, the Shaykh of the *Hanābilah*, al-Barbahārī in his work *Sharh us-Sunnah*:

ولا يحل قتال السلطان، والخروج عليهم وإن جاروا وذلك قول رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم – لأبي ذر (الغفاري): ” اصبر وإن كان عبدا حبشيا“ و قوله للأَنْصار: ”اصبروا حتى تلقوني على الحوض“.

**It is not permissible to fight the ruler or rebel against them, even if they are oppressive. This is due to the statement of Allāh’s Messenger ﷺ to Abū Dharr: “Have patience (with the ruler), even if he is an Abyssian slave.” Moreover, his ﷺ statement to the Ansār: “Have patience until you meet me at the Hawd.”<sup>38</sup>**

There are other ahādīth from the Prophet in regards to rebelling against the leaders.<sup>39</sup> Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-’Asqalānī transmitted this in his book *Fath al-Bārī* (vol.13, p.7) from Imām Ibn Battāl, who has an explanation of *Sabīh Bukhārī* which has been published:

ونقل الحافظ ابن حجر-رحمه الله-الإجماع على عدم جواز الخروج على السلطان الظالم: فقال قال ابن بطلال:(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 (٧/١٣)]

<sup>38</sup> *Sharhus Sunnah*, p. 70.

<sup>39</sup> From Umm Salamah رضي الله عنها that the Prophet ﷺ 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 said “Should we not fight against them?” The Prophet ﷺ replied “No, as long as they pray.”

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

The fuqhā (Islāmic jurists) have reached consensus that obedience must be made to the leader who becomes dominant (mutaghallib) 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.

Ibn Taymiyyah stated in *Minhāj us-Sunnah*, vol.3, p.392:

فقد نهى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن قتالهم مع إخباره أنهم يأتون أموراً منكراً فدل على أنه لا يجوز الإنكار عليهم بالسيف كما يراه من يقاتل ولاة الأمر من الخوارج والزيدية والمعتزلة وطائفة من الفقهاء وغيرهم

The Messenger of Allāh forbade the Muslims from fighting against the rulers along with informing the Muslims that they will see some sins (from the leaders). This indicates that it is impermissible to revolt against the rulers by means of the sword (i.e. with weapons) as the Khawārij, Zaydiyyah, Mu'tazilah and a group of fuqhā view as permissible.

Ibn Abi'l-'Izz al-Hanafi in *Sharh ut-Tahāwīyyah*, p.370 mentions:

وأما لزوم طاعتهم وإن جاروا؛ لأنه يترتب على الخروج من طاعتهم من المفسدات 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.**

Omar Bakrī Muhammad throughout the 1990s believed that Imām Muhammad Ibn 'AbdulWahhāb revolted and rebelled against the Ottomans and Bakrī preached this. This was before his so-called 're-birth' as an avid follower of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb! Let's look at the views of Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb in regards to revolting and rebelling against the Muslim rulers. Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb stated:

**The Imāms from every Madhhab are agreed concerning the one who forcefully took over a region or regions that he has the ruling of "Imām" in all matters. If this had not been so then the affairs of the world would never have been established. This is because for a very long time, before the era of Imām Ahmad till this day of ours, the people have never gathered behind a single Imām. And they do not know anyone from the Scholars who has mentioned that any of the Shari'ah rulings cannot be correct (effected, implemented) except by the overall Imām (the Khalifah).<sup>40</sup>**

Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb said in his letter to the people of al-Qasīm:

وأرى وجوب السمع والطاعة لأئمة المسلمين برّهم وفاجرهم ما لم يأمروا  
بمعصية الله ومن ولي الخلافة واجتمع عليه الناس ورضوا به وغلبهم بسيفه حتى  
صار خليفة وجبت طاعته وحرم الخروج عليه

I believe that it is obligatory to hear and obey the leaders of the Muslims, whether they are righteous or immoral, so long as they do not enjoin disobedience towards Allāh. Whoever has become

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ad-Durar us-Sunniyyah fil-Ajwibatun-Najdiyyah* vol.7,p.239.

Caliph and the people have given him their support and accepted him, even if he has gained the position of Caliph by force, is to be obeyed and it is harām to rebel against him.<sup>41</sup>

And he also said:

الأصل الثالث : أن من تمام الاجتماع السمع والطاعة لمن تأمر علينا ولو كان عبداً حبشياً...

One of the main principles of unity is to hear and obey whoever is appointed over us even if he is an Abyssinian slave...<sup>42</sup>

As for protests, marches and demonstrations which al-Muhājiroun also justify, then this is not the method of the Salaf in bringing about change. Hence, protests and demonstrations are alien to Islām from two angles:

1. It is a type of revolt against the leaders.
2. It resembles the methods of the anarchists and politicians in bringing about change.<sup>43</sup>

So what evidence does *al-Muhājiroun* provide to keep their well-oiled demonstration machine moving? The only “evidence” used by al-Muhājiroun for demonstrations is the story of ’Umar ibn al-Khattāb’s conversion to Islām, in which the companions were organised into two lines, led by ’Umar and Hamza ؓ. They supposedly “marched” to the Ka’bah “demonstrating”. This is the only proof provided by one of the al-Muhājiroun cult, namely the Luton-based ignoramus “Abū Turāb” (aka ’AbdulQādir), who mentioned it in one Youtube video, which was subsequently removed after we exposed this falsehood in 2009:

---

<sup>41</sup> *Majmū’at Mu’allaḡāt al-Shaykh*, vol.5, p.11.

<sup>42</sup> *Majmū’ah Mu’allaḡāt al-Shaykh*, vol.1, p.394; quoted in *Da’āwa al-Munāwi’im*, pp.233-234.

<sup>43</sup> Imām Nāsir ud-Dīn al-Albānī said with regards to demonstrations and protests:

**“In short, the demonstrations which take place in some Islamic countries are not in accordance with the Islāmic Sharī’ah; rather, they are blind imitation of the disbelievers.”** (Fatāwā Jeddah –Taqwa Tape stores cassette two).

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R2JbsTMj0Yw&feature=related>.

The hadīth which mentions the incident is *da'eef*, Dr. 'Abdul'Azeez al-Farīh said in his edit and checking of *Mahdus-Sawāb fī Fadā'il Amīril-Mu'minīn Umar bin al-Khattāb*, vol.1, p.149 by Ibn ul-Mabrid (d.909AH):

**Recorded by Ibn ul-Jawzī in *al-Manāqib* (p.12), Reported by Abū Nu'aym in *ad-Dalā'il* (vol.1, p.241), and in *al-Hilyah* (vol.1, p.40) and in its *isnād* is Ishāq bin Abī Farwah and he is Matrūk (see *at-Taqrīb*, p.102). Also see *al-Isābah* of Ibnu Hajr (vol.4, p.280).**

However, even though al-Muhājiroun have been made *fully* aware of the weakness of this narration, they still insist on gathering together to perform protests and demonstrations. This, once again, shows you the cult mentality that governs al-Muhājiroun. The Book and Sunnah is whatever their collective, juvenile minds agree on. Because anyone who *truly* gives precedence to the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah, would have ceased participating in demonstrations and protests directly after finding out the weakness of this narration. The most ironic thing about this *whole* issue is that al-Muhājiroun love to inform us of how much they hate the ways and methods of the disbelievers, but at every opportunity we find them adopting the anarchistic methods of the Socialists and the Atheists as a redundant means to rectify the affairs of our Muslim Ummah. So what should be given importance: speech over action or action over speech?

العبرة بالحقائق والمعاني لا بالافاظ والمباني

**What really should be taken into consideration are the realities and implications, not mere terms and verbal formations.**

Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

والخوارج كانوا من أظهر الناس بدعة وقتالا للأئمة وتكفيرا لها

**The khawārij are the most apparent in terms of innovation, fighting the rulers and declaring them as disbelievers.<sup>44</sup>**

---

<sup>44</sup> *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, vol.7, p.217.

## 6 GENERAL TAKFĪR

---

In this section we will once again bear witness to a classic trait of the Khawārij manifested in the likes of Anjem Choudary and Co. Not only do al-Muhājiroun fire from the hip when it comes to the rulers, they also like to pronounce serious rulings on other Muslims, such as taking them out of the fold of Islām, even though they are totally unqualified to make such rulings. Al-Muhajiroun, on their now defunct website *'thesavedsect.com'* in 2005, had an article entitled *'The Necessity of Making Takfīr of Ibn Bāz'*.

Now we turn our attention, with concern, to Choudhary's excessive-compulsive *takfīr* disorder (ECTD). We clinically diagnosed him with such, because of the intrusive thoughts which constantly cause him to declare anyone or anything a *kāfir*. In the first part of a Press TV interview conducted on 20 March 2009 Anjem Choudhary, after 4:23 into the interview (as per the Youtube clip), makes unequivocal and unrestricted *takfīr* of the *Muslim Council of Britain* (MCB) and the *Muslim Association of Britain* (MAB). On three separate occasions, Choudary didn't conclude his discourse (or interview), except during it he made unrestricted *takfīr* of someone or of a Muslim organization such as the *MCB* or *MAB*. Before we investigate Choudhary's flagrant disregard, (and to some extent ignorance), of the cautionary principles which safeguard a Muslim from harming himself, let us first remind ourselves of the perils of making unrestricted, knee-jerk *takfīr*. In the Two Sahīhs from Ibn 'Umar ؓ who said: the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said:

إذا قال الرجل لصاحبه "يا كافر" فإنها تجب على أحدهما. فإن كان الذي قيل له كافر فهو كافر. وإلا رجع إليه ما قال.

*“Whenever a man says to his brother: “O kāfir!” then it applies to one of them or it returns to the one who actually said it first.”*<sup>45</sup>

In the Two Saḥīḥs it is reported that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said:

*“Cursing a Muslim is sin and killing him is kufr.”*<sup>46</sup>

He also said ﷺ:

*“Whoever accuses a believer of kufr then it is as if he has killed him.”*<sup>47</sup>

Imām Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā‘il bin Yahyā al-Muzānī (d. 264 AH/878 CE) stated in his famous *Sharḥ us-Sunnah*,<sup>48</sup> point 15:

**15 – Withholding from making *takfīr* 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 *dīn*. So one gains nearness to Allāh by freeing oneself from him, abandoning him, hating him and staying away from what he has innovated.**

Another ridiculous accusation, that begs to be refuted, is when Choudhary said: **“I think that the whole world today is governed by non-Islāmic law.”**<sup>49</sup> Even in the most destitute of Muslim countries, we still find remnants of the *Sharī‘ah*, albeit, distorted and contorted. The main point here is to refute the absolute manner in which he makes this redundant claim. This statement is a classical axiom, because its alleged truth is taken for granted, and then that which is taken for granted, serves as their (al-Muhajiroun’s) starting point for many other absurd postulations. Thus, one postulation gives birth to another postulation

---

<sup>45</sup> Al-Bukhārī, *as-Sahīḥ, ḥadīth* no.5752; Muslim, *as-Sahīḥ, ḥadīth* no. 60

<sup>46</sup> Al-Bukhārī, *as-Sahīḥ, ḥadīth* no.48; Muslim, *as-Sahīḥ, ḥadīth* no. 64

<sup>47</sup> Reported by at-Tabarānī from the *ḥadīth* of Hishām bin ‘Urwah – *ḥadīth* graded *Sahīḥ* by al-Albānī as in *Sahīḥ al-Jāmi’ as-Sahīr* (1269).

<sup>48</sup> *Op.cit.*

<sup>49</sup> Part 3 of the Press TV interview on *youtube*.

until you have a whole spawn of illegitimate beliefs. On the basis of the above statement, it is not hard to understand how *al-Muhājiroun* find it easy to declare anyone or anything as a *kāfir*.

Of the more extreme statements is what is found in a lecture entitled ‘*The Tawāghīt of Saudi Arabia*’ (formerly available on the *takfirī neo-khāwarij* old website of Omar Bakrī’s *al-Muhājiroun* cult followers: Islām4uk.com and now available on the fraudulently titled website ‘salafimedia.com’). The speaker from Luton who refers to himself by the pseudonym ‘Abū Turāb’, real name being ‘AbdulQādir, also suffers from excessive-compulsive *takfir* disorder (ECTD), and is a characteristic of a variety of *takfirīs* such as ‘Abdullāh Faisal al-Jamaykī. After 37 minutes and 37 seconds into the lecture, ‘Abū Turāb’ from Luton makes *takfir* of the Muftī of Saudi Arabia, Shaykh ‘Abdul’Azīz Āli Shaykh. After 40 minutes and 50 seconds into the lecture, ‘Abū Turāb’ says that: **“Saudi Arabia is the leading country of shirk, kufr and bida’.”** *La hawla wa lā quwwata ila billāh!* So this jāhil, ‘Abū Turāb’, is actually claiming that Saudi Arabia is top of the list in calling to *shirk, kufr* and *bida’* in the entire world!? So neither the nations of Mushrikīn, whether in Asia or Africa, nor the nations of the People of the Book, and neither the Zionist state nor the European secular states come in at first place, but rather Saudi Arabia does according to this cult follower of Omar Bakrī! The logical conclusion of this is well known, that they are therefore legitimate targets for assassination. When confronted over this during a heated discussion in Brixton on Saturday 25<sup>th</sup> April 2009, ‘AbdulQādir (“Abū Turāb”) lied and tried to say to the Salafis that he did not make this statement, even though it is recorded and has been listened to by many.

Such is the extent of their ignorance they have no concept of a principle which plays a hefty role when applying the hazardous chemicals which make up *takfir*. This principle stems directly from the Qur’an. Allāh states:

﴿وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّى نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا﴾

**And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning).** {*al-Isrā’* (17): 15}

On the basis of the verse, the principle of establishing the proofs and removal of all preventive factors was established and implemented by the Salaf, and has been applied by the scholars until this present day.

So why do al-Muhājiroun think they have the knowledge and the capacity to circumvent this fail-safe principle when declaring groups and individuals as disbelievers? This is just another reminder of their pretentious Khawāriji ways and their cultish group-mindset.

We will suffice here with a statement from Shaykh ul-Islām ibn Taymiyyah:

هذا مع أي دائماً ومن جالسين يعلم ذلك مني ، أي من أعظم الناس نهيًا عن أن ينسب معين إلى تكفير وتفسيق ومعصية ، إلا إذا علم أنه قد قامت عليه الحجة الرسالية التي من خالفها كان كافرًا تارة ، وفاسقًا أخرى ، وعاصيًا أخرى ، وإني أقرر أن الله قد غفر لهذه الأمة خطأها ، وذلك يعم الخطأ في المسائل الخيرية القولية والمسائل العملية . وما زال السلف يتنازعون في كثير من هذه المسائل ، ولم يشهد أحد منهم على أحد لا بكفر ولا بفسق ولا بمعصية .

However, and those who sit with me know this about me, I am always one of those who most emphatically forbid describing a specific person as a *kāfir*, *fāsiq* or sinner, unless it is known that *shar’i* proof has been established against him, and it has been proven whether he is a *kāfir*, a *fāsiq* or a sinner. I affirm that Allāh has forgiven this ummah for its mistakes, which includes mistakes in narrative and practical issues. The Salaf continued to debate many of these issues but none of them testified that anyone else was a *kāfir* or a *fāsiq* or a sinner.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> *Majmū’ ul-Fatāwā*, vol.3, p.229.

## 7 AT-TĀGHŪT

---

According to al-Muhājiroun the *Tawāghīt* are the rulers, as emphasised by Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq, Anjem Choudary and the cult followers. In an article entitled ‘*The Apostasy of the Rulers*’ (available Online) they state:

**“They did not fulfil the two pillars of Tawheed, the one who does not have the pillars of Tawheed is Kafir, the first pillar is Al Kufr Bil Taghout, the leaders do not reject the Taghout, and so they are Mushrik and Kafir. Anybody who believes in Allāh without to reject the kufr and the taghout is not Muslim.”**

In the vastness of the issue of *tāghūt* and its types, attention is only given to discussing one type of *tāghūt*, that being the tyrannical *hākīm* (ruler). Fundamental issues are left, in order to emphasise a political definition. They indiscriminately charge every single Muslim ruler with being a *tāghūt* without taking into consideration *istihlāl*, *ibāha* and the impediments of *takfir*. This conclusively proves that they are all about politics, revolution and rulers, as just as they have done with *tawhīd* by restricting it they have done with the types of *tāghūt*.<sup>51</sup>

According to Ahl us-Sunnah however, the term is not only to be applied to the rulers. “Tāghūt” is not only found in the Qur’ān but was also discussed by classical Islamic scholars. Here is a list of statements from both classical and contemporary scholars. It states in the Tafsīr of the Imām of the Mufasssīrīn, Imām at-Tabarī ﷺ:

---

<sup>51</sup> Refer to the following article from 2006:  
[http://www.islamicthinkers.com/index/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=478&Itemid=26](http://www.islamicthinkers.com/index/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=478&Itemid=26).

اختلف أهل التأويل في معنى "الجبت" و "الطاغوت" فقال بعضهم: هما صنمان كان المشركون يعبدونهما من دون الله وقال آخرون: "الجبت" الأصنام، و "الطاغوت" تراجمة الأصنام

The scholars differ with regard to the meanings of *al-Jibt* and *at-Tāghūt*, so some of them held the view that they were two idols that the pagans used to worship besides Allāh. Others held the view that *al-Jibt* refers to idols and *at-Tāghūt* refers to those who used to speak on behalf of the idols. - Then he mentioned who held this view:-

حدثني محمد بن سعد قال، حدثني أبي قال، حدثني عمي قال، حدثني أبي، عن أبيه، عن ابن عباس قوله: "ألم تر إلى الذين أوتوا نصيبًا من الكتاب يؤمنون بالجبت والطاغوت"، "الجبت" الأصنام، و "الطاغوت"، الذين يكونون بين أيدي الأصنام يعبرون عنها الكذب ليضلوا الناس.

Muhammad Ibn Sa'd said: my father narrated to me saying: my uncle narrated to me saying: my father narrated to me from his father from Ibn 'Abbās who commented on His statement: "Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Scripture? They believe in *Jibt* and *Tāghūt* and say to the disbelievers that they are better guided as regards the way than the believers (Muslims)." (Ibn 'Abbās commented) "They were those who used to stand in the presence of these idols speaking on behalf of them in order to misguide the people."

Then Imām at-Tabarī stated:

وزعم رجال أن "الجبت"، الكاهن، و "الطاغوت"، رجل من اليهود يدعى كعب بن الأشرف، وكان سيّد اليهود.

Others claimed that *al-Jibt* to be a soothsayer and *at-Tāghūt* was alleged to be a man from the Jews called K'ab Ibn Ashraf, who was their leader.

Imām at-Tabarī relayed that:

"الجبت" السحر، و "الطاغوت" الشيطان

[Umar Ibn al-Khattāb said:] “*Al-Jibt* is sorcery and *at-Tāghūt* is the Shaytān.”

Imām at-Tabarī then commented:

وذلك أن "الجبت" و "الطاغوت": اسمان لكل معظّم بعبادةٍ من دون الله، أو طاعة، أو خضوع له، كائنًا ما كان ذلك المعظّم، من حجر أو إنسان أو شيطان.

This is because both terms *al-Jibt* and *at-Tāghūt* are two nouns which include everything venerated by anything that is worshiped, obeyed or submitted to besides Allāh. Irrespective whether this venerated thing constitutes a stone, a human or devil.<sup>52</sup>

The famous Spanish scholar al-Qurtubī stated in his exegesis of *ayah* 36 of Surat un-Nahl:

“And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], Worship Allāh and avoid tāghūt.” -Means: leave all that is worshipped other than Allāh like Shaytān, the fortune-teller, the idol and all who call to misguidance.”

Ibn ul-Qayyim stated:

At-Tāghūt is whatever the servant transgresses his bounds in regards to what is worshipped, followed or obeyed. The Tāghūt is everyone who refers judgment to other than Allāh and His Messenger, or worships a person other than Allāh or follows another person without guidance from Allāh or obeying other than Allāh.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Tafsīr at-Tabarī Sūrah an-Nisā verse 51.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., vol., p.328.

Muhammad bin Ya'qūb al-Fayrūzabādī (729-817 AH/1329-1414 CE) stated in his classic lexicon *al-Qāmūs al-Muhīt wa'l-Qābūs al-Wasīt*<sup>54</sup> under the item 'taghā':

**And at-Tāghūt: al-Lāt, al-'Uzza, the fortune-teller, Shaytān, and every leader of misguidance, the idols and whatever is worshipped by other than Allāh, this is attributed to Ahl ul-Kitāb.**

Ar-Rāghib al-Asfahānī (d. 502 AH/1108 CE) stated in his etymological study *Mufradāt Alfādh ul-Qur'ān*,<sup>55</sup> p.108 under the item 'tāghā':

**At-Tāghūt is an expression for: every transgressor and all that is worshipped other than Allāh... and based on what has preceded: the magician, fortune-teller, the defiant jinn and the one who averts from the way of goodness – are all named as “tāghūt”.**

Layth ibn Sa'd, Abū 'Ubaydah, al-Kasā'ī and most of the classical Arabic linguists and grammarians stated:

“At-Tāghūt is all that is worshipped other than Allāh.”

Al-Jawharī said:

**“at-Tāghūt, al-Kāhin, ash-Shaytān and every head of misguidance.”<sup>56</sup>**

Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb رحمته الله stated in *ad-Durur*, vol.1, p.137:

---

<sup>54</sup> This has been edited by Muhammad Na'im al-'Arqasūsi and published in Beirut by Mu'assasat ar-Risālah in 1419 AH/1998 CE. Other editions are also present.

<sup>55</sup> This has been edited by Safwan 'Adnan Dawudi (Damascus: Dar al-Qalam, 1412 AH/1992 CE). Other editions are also available.

<sup>56</sup> Abū Yūsuf Madahat bin al-Hasan Āl Farrāj, *Fatāwā al-A'immah Hawl Qadayā al-Ummah al-Masīriyyah min Shaykh ul-Islām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb ilā Samāhat ish-Shaykh 'Abdul'Azīz bin 'Abdullāh bin Bāz* [The Rulings of the Imāms Around Ongoing Issues of the Ummah: From Shaykh ul-Islām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb Upto the Eminent Shaykh 'Abdul'Azīz bin 'Abdullāh bin Bāz]. Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat ur-Rushd, 1428 AH/2007 CE, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn., vol.1, p.325. Introduction by Shaykh Ibn Jibrīn.

The Tawāghīt are many and what is clear to us are five: the first is Shaytān, then the tyrannical leader, the one who takes a bribe, the one who is worshipped and is pleased with that and the one who acts without knowledge.

Imām Ibn 'Uthaymīn رحمته الله stated in *Sharh ul-Usūl uth-Thalāthah* (Riyadh: Dār uth-Tharayā, 1420 AH/2000 CE), p.151:

...and the 'Ulama of evil are those who call to misguidance and kufr or call to bida' (innovation) or call to making halāl what Allāh has made harām, or make harām what Allāh has made halāl - all are tawāghīt.

He also stated:

At-Tāghūt is all who oppose the rule of Allāh and His Messenger, because whatever opposes the rule of Allāh and His Messenger is tughyān and transgression...<sup>57</sup>

Therefore, a caller and leader of misguidance and innovation can also be rendered as a *tāghūt*. This has to be taken into consideration by the cult members and blind followers of Omar Bakrī and Anjem Choudary! This is a definition of Tāghūt which they neatly sweep under the carpet and forget to highlight.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> *Majmū' al-Fatāwā wa Rasā'il Shaykh Ibn 'Uthaymīn*, vol.1, p.39.

<sup>58</sup> A good example of al-Muhajiroun brushing this under the carpet is in an article entitled '*At-Tawheed and rejection of at-Taghout*', they state in this article:

**“As for the Shari'ah definition of Taghoot, it is that which is worshipped, obeyed, submitted to, or followed other than Allāh (swt). This may include Shaytan idols, stones, sun, stars, angels, or even human beings. Likewise saints, graves, pirs, rulers and leaders, other ruling systems besides Islam may also be falsely worshipped and made into Taghoot.”**

So they seemingly admit that it can apply to misguided scholars, yet do not explicitly state this, rather opting to use the word 'pir'. They also admit in the article that:

**“So everything that is worshipped besides Allāh , while being pleased with this worship – whether it is something worshipped, someone followed, or**

And Allāh knows best!

*We end by praising Allāh the Most High, by Whom all good deeds are completed. And may His peace and blessings be upon His final Messenger Muhammad, his family and Companions.*

Written by Abu Ameenah AbdurRahman  
and AbdulHaq al-Ashantī  
'Jumadā al-Ākhir 1432 AH/May 2011 CE

---

**someone obeyed in the absence of obedience to Allāh and His Messenger, then that is considered Taghoot.”**

Indeed, they seem to forget what they have written in their own articles! They need to reflect on this in light of their total and utter devotion and blind following of Omar Bakri Muhammad and Anjem Choudary. They continue in the article by saying:

**“So the fact that the Tāghūt does not only include stars, stone and wooden idols but also people who make laws against the shari’ah is manifest from the Quran and supported from the statements of the salaf and the classical scholars.”**

Hereby proceeding to drone on and on only about *Tabakkum* and nothing at all about blind following and cultish devotion to scholars and leaders – which is also a manifestation of dedication to the Tawāghūt.

Al-Muhājiroun also like to shove down the throat of any unsuspecting person that as soon as a ruler governs by other than what Allāh has revealed he automatically turns into a *tāghūt*. This is why they restrict the verse in al-Mā’idah to the scholars, even though the verse applies to anyone who rules by other than what Allāh has revealed. They deceitfully do this because if they were to apply the verse correctly, he would necessitate that all of mankind become *tawāghūt*, because all of mankind, in some shape and form, rule by other than what Allāh has revealed. So they have to distort its meaning and restrict its application, making sure that it only applies to the rulers.

**APPENDIX:**  
**WHERE WAS OMAR BAKRĪ AND WHERE IS HE NOW?!**  
**(OMAR BAKRĪ, THE RĀFIDAH OF LEBANON AND**  
**‘HIZB USH-SHAYTĀN’)**

When Omar Bakrī, the “brains”(!!!) behind Al-Muhajiroun, was the head of Hizb ut-Tahrīr in the UK, it was known from HT that they requested Khomeini to be the Khalīfah of the Muslims! Bakrī’s shape-shifting and continual support for “Hezbollah” proves that he is neither cemented nor established upon any verified foundations except for falsehood. In reality, as also noted by ‘AbdurRahmān Dimashqiyyah in his book on Hizb ut-Tahrīr, Bakrī during his early days in the UK used to “teach the Ja’farī Madhhab” as a valid school of thought! Indeed, in the late 1990s, al-Muhajiroun used to have Shi’a and Rāfidī members in the group! Well, this was in the early 1990s, so let us fast forward to 2011, when Bakrī landed himself in Lebanon and was facing legal proceedings against him: Bakrī appealed to “Hezbollah” chief Hassan Nasrallah for help!<sup>59</sup> Bakrī stated:

**"I urge Hassan Nasrallah to look at the injustice facing Omar Bakrī who backs all resistance (movements) against Israel," Hezbollah's arch-foe, he said in an interview on the private television station NTV.<sup>60</sup>**

In an article in Lebanese newspaper *The Daily Star* on November 25 2010 Hussein Dakroub reported:

**Hizbullah MP Nawar al-Sahly, Bakrī’s lawyer, said that some witnesses’ testimonies indicated that the cleric has nothing to do with the charges leveled against him. Sahly said that he was**

---

<sup>59</sup> Hassan Nasrallah born August 31, 1960; became the third Secretary General of the Lebanese political and paramilitary organization Hezbollah after Israel assassinated the previous leader, ‘Abbās al-Musawī, in 1992.

<sup>60</sup> Accessed 18 May 2011 CE, story dated from Monday 15 November 2010: <http://www.alarabiya.net/articles/2010/11/15/126168.html>

defending Bakrī on orders from Hizbullah leader Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah.<sup>61</sup>

Even those who float in the ideological orbit of Bakrī, such as Bilāl Daqmāq stated in an article in *ash-Sharq al-Awsat*:

**“...we do not agree with Bakrī's recent political sympathies with Hezbollah and the Shia of the International Tribunal...”<sup>62</sup>**

Misbāh al-Hanoon, a close Lebanese associate of Bakrī's, stated about the charges levelled against Bakrī:

**“...he does not know how to fire a shot and is against using weapons, so how could he use a Kalashnikov PKS?!”<sup>63</sup>**

So Bakrī is “against using weapons”?! This is an odd stance for one who claims to support “resistance”, “fighting” and armed jihad! While on al-Jazeera, the Arabic language station [hidden from his blind followers in Luton and London] Bakrī was asked by the presenter:

**“Being frank, and you are in front of millions of people now, is what you do because you are scared of pressures from security, so you sought refuge in the ones who you consider to be the strongest force here in Lebanon? Or is this out of real conviction? Discuss this change with us.”**

Answer from Omar Bakrī:

**“The change which has occurred, is not actually a change, it was a firm position which some were trying to disprove. As for what is connected to my attacks against Hezbollah and its forces, and even against the Shi'a in Lebanon, then this was due to erroneous**

---

<sup>61</sup> Accessed 18 May 2011 CE:

<http://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Politics/Nov/25/Omar-Bakri-released-on-LL5-million-bail.ashx#ixzz1MiMfxs68>

<sup>62</sup> Accessed 18 May 2011 CE:

<http://awsat.com/details.asp?section=4&issueno=11676&article=595464&feature=>

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

information that there were Rāfidah who make takfir of the Sahābah, slander the mother of the believers 'Ā'ishah, believe in the Qur'ān being distorted etc. – which are issues which I reject and consider to be outside the fold of Islām. However, when Sayyid Hasan Nasrullāh appeared and took on board the fatwa of Imām al-Khameini that 'we prohibit slander of the Sahābah and 'Ā'ishah'..."

In another interview Bakrī states:

**“O Ahl us-Sunnah open your ranks and unite with your brothers in Qiblah in decisive issues which is to expel the foreign enemies from Muslim lands!”**

Bakrī also states:

**“How can I put a ruling of ‘Rāfidah’ on those who are the people of Qiblah from the Muslims from the Shi’a in Lebanon?”**

Then Bakrī states in a “message to ‘Hezbollah’:

**“They [‘Hezbollah’] should continue with the Shari’ obligation [to fight the Israeli army], so let them continue with that **and we shall support them with all our might.**” (!?)**

So Bakrī now openly calls for ‘Hezbollah’ to be supported and denies that they are Rawāfid. So now, let us take a look at the statements of ‘Sayyid’ Hasan Nasrullāh, whom Bakrī has been bending over backwards for. Hasan Nasrullāh considers himself to follow the tradition of al-Khomeini, for Hasan Nasrullah states, as can be seen on Youtube: **“However, we attached ourselves to the school of thought of Imām al-Khomeini.”**<sup>64</sup>

As for Hasan Nasrullāh’s statement that it is “impermissible” to slander the Sahābah and 'Ā'ishah then there are several points to this: Firstly, defaming the Sahābah is not merely ‘impermissible’ it is kufr! Secondly, do you not know that the Shi’a have something called taqiyyah?

---

<sup>64</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L55b-y007h4&feature=related>

In the book *al-Kāfi*, vol.9, p.110 by al-Kulaynī there is a transmission from Abū 'Abdillāh Ja'far as-Sādiq that he said: **“taqiyyah is my dīn and the dīn of my fathers, the one who does not practice taqiyyah has no dīn.”** Meaning: there is no *dīn* for the one who has *nifāq* and manifests something yet internally believes in something else. Do you want that we become deceived by those who have this *nifāq* wherein they manifest something yet internally believe in something else? Even their ruined Mufti al-Khomeinī gave them a ruling that the prayer of a Shi'i with Ahl us-Sunnah is better than praying by oneself, Khomeinī stated:

**“...because when he prays with Ahl us-Sunnah he gets two rewards, the reward of Salah and the reward of taqiyyah. But if he was to pray by himself he would only get one reward.”**

Khomeinī also stated in his book *al-Makāsib al-Muharramah*, vol.2, p.162:

**Leaving taqiyyah is a sin which can lead to the bottom of hell and is equal to rejecting the prophethood and Allāh.**

Do you want us to believe in their statements that they manifest? How can they be trusted when the main source Shi'a works contain abuse of the Sahābah and takfīr of them?! The main Shi'a books claim that the Sahābah all apostated except for a few, maximum seven!<sup>65</sup>

This is the current, or should it be said 'on-going', condition of Bakrī, who is propped up by his minions as one of the great scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah in our time, a source to be referred to in matters of creed, imān and kufr, and a mujahid who does not know how to fire a shot?!?

---

<sup>65</sup> See:

<http://shiacult.wordpress.com/2011/04/04/shia-belief-all-the-people-apostated-after-the-death-of-prophet-s/>