

SALAFIMANHJ.COM
ANWAR AL-'AWLAKĪ AND HIS ERRORS IN THE FIQH OF JIHĀD
Vol.3

Shaykh Muhammad al-Mālikī

(hafidhahullāh)

ON ANWAR AL-'AWLAKĪ AND HIS ERRORS IN THE FIQH OF JIHĀD¹

SHAYKH MUHAMMAD SAYS:

**“THIS MAN (AL-'AWLAKĪ) IS IGNORANT AND DOES NOT KNOW THE
AHKĀM OF JIHAD IN THE FIRST PLACE!”**

Question 1:

What's your view on Anwar al-'Awlakī propagating and translating the book *Thawābit 'ala'd-Darb il-Jihād* [Constants on the Path of Jihād] by Yūsuf al-'Ayrī who was part of *al-Qā'idah fī Jazeerat il-'Arab* [al-Qā'idah in the Arabian Peninsula]?

Answer:

This involves spreading the book in order to benefit them. There is no doubt that da'wah to jihad is great however unfortunately they use jihad in an evil way and this book by Yūsuf al-'Ayrī emphasises the jihad that Bin Lādin and his likes propagate which is not jihad in reality because they apply criminal actions to jihad. They call criminal actions “jihad” and then they apply the Ahkām of jihad to these actions. For this reason we say: translating this book and its like into the English language is a huge error in the right of Islamic da'wah and jihad itself, because it is not jihad and this is like translating a book of Mut'ah by the Shi'a into the English language! As Mut'ah is not based on the Sharee'ah just as “jihad” (as al-'Ayrī and likes call for) is not based on the Sharee'ah. It is not permissible to translate their evidences and misguidance into other languages, such as this book (by Yūsuf al-'Ayrī).

Question 2:

Anwar al-'Awlakī stated in one of his lectures that Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (*rahimahullāh*) had a bay'ah with the Ottoman Khaleefah, what's your view on this?

Answer:

¹ Dated Sunday 6 December 2009 CE, at 11:45 AM.

What 'Awlakī says here has been transmitted before from some of those who had deviated ideologies and criticised (what they called) the “Wahhābī da'wah” as they claimed it was, they claim that Imām Muhammad rebelled against the authority of the Khaleefah. This is incorrect because the Ottoman Empire ruled over Hijāz which included Makkah, Madeenah and Tā'if and also the Eastern Region. As for Najd which was a desert area then the Ottoman Empire did not occupy it and did not take it, there was never ever any Turkish ruler over Najd. Except when Muhammad 'Ali Pasha arrived and sent his son Ibrāheem who later seized 'AbdurRahmān ibn Hasan ibn Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb, the author of *Fath ul-Majeed*. During negotiations the Turkish and Egyptian (who were under the Turks) forces surrounded Dir'iyyah and 'AbdurRahmān ibn Hasan promise to surrender himself if they stopped their attack on the Muslims in Dir'iyyah. They agreed to this and 'AbdurRahmān ibn Hasan surrendered himself yet the Turkish and Egyptian forces betrayed him and they attacked Dir'iyyah and killed and pillaged it, in the end placing one of their leaders over it. There is no historical proof that the Ottomans ruled over Najd to the extent that it can be said **“he had a bay'ah to the Ottomans”**. Regional leaders ruled over Najd such as 'Uthmān ibn Mu'ammār, Banī Khālid used to rule over al-Ahsā', while Āl Sa'ud ruled over Dir'iyyah, there was never ever any Ottoman rulers over the area of Najd.

Question 3:

This is a clear historical error, so why do the likes of al-'Awlakī regurgitate this?

Answer:

As I said, they want to misguide the people and they say **“if the Mashāyikh of the da'wah Salafiyyah, who follow Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb, as they say, reject rebelling against the leader”** and they intend by this the king here (in Saudi Arabia) or any Muslim leader, **“then how can they reject this when their main Shaykh rebelled against the leader”**. So they make this claim so that the 'Ulama will be abandoned; they intend by this claim that “the Imām of the likes of Shaykh Bin Bāz, Ibn 'Uthaymeen, Āli Shaykh and Fawzān – he himself did not obey the leader (i.e. the Ottoman Khaleefah)”. However, this is neither historically confirmed nor verified in creed.

Question 4:

Al-'Awlakī also states that the people who pay taxes to Western governments have co-operated with the Western governments in fighting against the Muslims and in supporting the disbelievers against the Muslims. So the mere payment of taxes according to 'Awlakī is supporting the kuffār against the Muslims.

Answer:

This is jahl (ignorance)! As you know these taxes which are paid in Britain are for internal public services, this is what I know about all of the governments which extract tax, I do not know that they use this wealth to send to the armies. Secondly, those people who pay tax are they compelled into doing this or are they pleased to do this? People do not like paying taxes even the kuffār, even the kuffār do not like paying taxes! However, they are compelled into doing this and it cannot be said about the one who is compelled that he has co-operated with the kuffār against the Muslims, this is an error and is incorrect. According to us in Islām, taxes are harām yet those people who pay taxes to the disbelieving, and even Muslim, governments, as most of the Muslim countries extract taxes except for Saudi Arabia – are they pleased and happy to pay such taxes? No not at all! The people who pay taxes are not pleased as their money is taken from them; also however, taxes are not taken for the military according to what I know, taxes are spent for the country (i.e. public services) and the military is funded from sources related to national security, this is what I know from state politics.

Question 5:

Also al-'Awlakī always tries to make analogies between *al-Inghimās fi'l'Aduw* [Lone Fighters Challenging Large Enemy Ranks] and so-called “martyrdom operations”, what do you think about this?

Answer:

No! *Al-Inghimās fi'l'Aduw* has principles to it and is between two warring factions. Inghimās can include when the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) instructed Hudhayfah ibn al-Yamān (*radī Allāhu 'anhu*) to go and spy on the enemies during the Battle of al-Ahzāb. Inghimās is only between two opposing armies as for a person putting on explosives and going towards civilians and detonating the explosives among them – then making a Qiyās between the two is incorrect and many of the people of knowledge have refuted such a Qiyās.

Question 6:

Al-'Awlakī has also stated, and this is also dangerous as many of the youth in London have been influenced by it, - 'Awlakī was asked **“is this country (i.e. Britain) Dār ul-Harb and is it allowed to extract Ghaneemah from them?”** 'Awlakī answered: **“Firstly, this does not need an answer as the condition of this country is clear”** then 'Awlakī stated **“so what remains is the issue of Ghaneemah and from a fiqh point of view there is no problem in taking Ghaneemah from them however with conditions”** then 'Awlakī

says: “the money which is taken is not Ghaneemah rather it is al-Fay”!!!? What is your view on this?

Answer:

(Shaykh Muhammad laughs)... this man is ignorant and he does not know the Ahkām of jihad in the first place! Ghaneemah is after a successful conquest and there is no successful conquest up to today! Indeed, there isn't even any warfare within Britain! Secondly, al-Fay' is taken after a land has been conquered so as to ensure that the disbelievers have the lower-hand and the believers have the upper-hand. Al-Fay' is for those who have honour, power and the upper-hand. As for what takes place now (in the name of taking Ghanā'im and al-Fay') then this is theft and is neither al-Fay' nor Ghaneemah!

Question 7:

'Awlakī mentions that this monies is to be distributed by the leader of “the Jama'ah” who takes charge of distributing as he will?!

Answer:

(Shaykh Muhammad laughs)...there is no doubt that this speech is void and to be rejected from a number of angles. Firstly, this “Jama'ah” that he mentions and its leadership is neither *Shari'* [Divinely Legislated] nor Saheeh [correct], as the “leader” is unable to control those in the “Jama'ah” so how can he be the “leader”?! The conditions of leadership in Islām is that the leader is able to instruct and be subsequently obeyed, and forbid and be obeyed, and has a standing like for example if the British government order something it is obeyed, yet does 'Awlakī and the likes of these heads of these Islamic movements in the West have such authority? As for the leader like what we have here in Saudi then yes he instructs, forbids and the likes as he is able unlike the leaders of these Jama'āt, so this is incorrect (for 'Awlakī to say this).

Question 8:

Awlaki does not recognise Maslahah and Mafsadah within the fiqh of jihad and has stated that “all of jihad is Mafsadah”!? What's your view on this?

Answer:

Allāhu Musta'an! If it is a “Mafsadah” then why did the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) leave it for Makkah? If “all of Jihād is Mafsadah” then why did Allāh encourage the believers to fight? This is incorrect for him to say this, rather Jihad is established on what Masālih (benefits) and Mafāsīd (harms) will be achieved by the Muslims. If there are any Mafāsīd involved in it then at that point it is to be left just as the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) did in Makkah and Madeenah for a year. If there are any benefits in it then it is to be done as the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) did for nine years in Madeenah. So this is from the statements of the Prophet

(*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*), why did the Prophet leave taking Makkah. The companions viewed that they were able to take Makkah yet the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) chose another way which was to make a Treaty based on his estimation of the Masālih and Mafāsīd. So this 'Awlakī is jāhil and he has neither studied *Shari' ilm* nor Usūl ud-Deen!

Question 9:

Also al-'Awlakī stated recently in one of his articles that “**Āl Saud play a central role in fighting against Islam**” and that “**Āl Saud today are the 'Abdullāh ibn 'Ubayy of yesterday**”.

Answer:

This clearly shows his ignorance! 'Abdullāh ibn 'Ubayy ibn Salūl was a Munāfiq and it is well known that they manifest themselves when the power of the Muslims is great while the power of the kuffār is weak, so they manifest Islām when the Muslims are strong and they hide their kufr. So now we say: does Āl Saud have power? Who from the Muslims has power? Why is it that now only Āl Saud rule by Islām while the other countries rule by other than Islām? How can it be said that this example (Āl Saud) are Munāfiq? This is something very strange!

Questioner:

BarakAllāhu feekum Shaykh Muhammad!