

SALAFIMANHAJ.COM
EEMAAN AND KUFR SERIES
Vol.16

**The Mujaddid of the Era, Imām
Nāsiruddeen al-Albānī
(rahimahullāh)
and
Shaykh Sālih as-Sadlān
(hafidhahullāh)**

**ON SHAYKH KHĀLID AL-'ANBARĪ
AND HIS BOOK 'HUKM BI GHAYR
MĀ ANZALA ALLĀH'
[THE LAST THAT IMĀM AL-ALBĀNĪ
WROTE ON THE ISSUE OF TAKFEER!]¹**

**WITH SOME BENEFITS FROM SHAYKH 'ALI HASAN AL-HALABĪ AL-
ATHARĪ'S REFUTATION OF MUHAMMAD BIN SĀLIM AD-DAWSARĪ**

**AND QUESTIONING THE QUIXOTIC QUTBĪ QUEST OF
ABŪ ZUBAIR SALEEM BEGG (IMĀM OF LEWISHAM ISLAMIC CENTRE
AND FORMER USER OF NISBA 'AL-'AZZĀMĪ') AND THE TENACIOUS
TEMPER TANTRUM TEXAN, SALMĀN AWĀN ("ABU BAKR BIN NĀSIR")
OF THE WEBSITE 'MADKHALIS.COM', AND THEIR LAMENTABLE
PERSISTENCE IN REFERRING TO QUTB AND HĀKIMIYYAH**

**INTRODUCTION WRITTEN BY IMĀM AL-ALBĀNĪ
(RAHIMAHULLĀH)²**

¹ Shaykh, Dr Khālīd bin 'Alī bin Muhammad al-'Anbarī, *al-Hukm bi Ghayr Mā Anzala Allāh: Wa Usūl ut-Takfeer fī Dau' il-Kitāb wa's-Sunnah wa Aqwāli Salaf il-Ummah* [Ruling By Other Than What Allāh Has Revealed: Principles of Takfeer in Light of the Book, Sunnah and Statements of the Salaf of the Ummah] (Shāriqah, UAE: Maktabah as-Sahābah, 1425 AH/2004 CE, 5th Edn.), pp.7-12.

² **Translator's note ('AbdulHaq al-Ashanti):** Scanned copies of Imām al-Albānī's introduction to Shaykh Khālīd's book are on pages 5-6 of the fifth edition of *al-Hukm bi Ghayr Mā Anzala Allāh: Wa Usūl ut-Takfeer fī Dau' il-Kitāb wa's-Sunnah wa Aqwāli Salaf il-Ummah* [Ruling By Other Than What Allāh Has Revealed:

Imām al-Albānī stated in his introduction to the book *Hukm bi Ghayri Ma Anzala Allāh* by Shaykh, Dr Khālīd al-'Anbarī:

All praise is due to Allāh, the Lord of the Worlds, Who said in His Noble Book

“...and do not be from the Mushrikeen, from those who divided their religion and became sects each party rejoicing in what they have.”

{*ar-Rūm* (30): 31-32}

And may peace and blessings be upon Muhammad who made the sign of the Firqat un-Nājiyah as being holding firm to what he and his companions were upon and made it a Jama'ah, instructed to be from it and warned from opposing them, for he said (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*):
“Stick to the Jama'ah as the wolf eats up the lone sheep.”

And may peace and blessings be upon his family and his companions who were guided about whom the Lord of the Worlds warned from opposing their way, for He said in His Noble Book:

“And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.”

{*an-Nisā'* (4): 115}

And upon whoever follows and implements their way up until the Last Day, to proceed:

The noble brother Khālīd bin 'Alī al-'Anbarī gave me his book *al-Hukm bi Ghayr Mā Anzala Allāh wa Usūl ut-Takfeer fī Dau' il-Kitāb wa's-Sunnah wa Aqwāl Salaf ul-Ummah* – and I found that he has given the topic its right and has expended in it that in which there is no room for addition in the topic, in terms of clarity and elucidation. Within the book he has explained, may Allāh reward him with goodness, with a comprehensive explanation, that the kufr which expels one from the religion is Kufr al-Qalbī.³ And that this can

Principles of Takfeer in Light of the Book, Sunnah and Statements of the Salaf of the Ummah] (Shāriqah, UAE: Maktabah as-Sahābah, 1425 AH/2004 CE).

Interestingly, even Shaykh 'Isām Mūsā Hādī, who is close to Muhammad Ibrāheem Shaqrah, stated in his book *Muhaddith ul-'Asr: al-Imām Muhammad Nāsiruddeen al-Albānī, Kamā 'Araftuhu* [The Muhaddith of the Era: Imām Muhammad Nāsiruddeen al-Albānī As I Knew Him] (Dār us-Siddeeq), p.75:

The last that al-Albānī wrote on the issue of takfeer:

I came across, in my possession, the commendation of our Shaykh (Imām al-Albānī) to the book by the brother Khālīd al-'Anbarī, but he did not complete it all due to our Shaykh's illness and hospitalisation. It was the last that our Shaykh (rahimahullāh) authored on the issue of takfeer, his commendation was after the publication of the two books of 'Alī al-Halabī: *at-Tahdheer* and *Sayhat un-Nadheer* [The Cry of the Warner].

³ Shaykh Khālīd says about this:

sometimes manifest via statements, and this is well-known from all types of kufr, and at other times it can manifest via actions such as Istikbār (arrogance) towards submitting to the Shar' [Divine Legislation] and objecting to it like what occurred with the accursed Iblees when he was arrogant to submit to the Lord of the Worlds command and withheld from making sajdah to Adam and said:

“Will I prostrate to what You have created from mud?”

{*al-Isrā'* (17): 61}

So there is no difference between statement and action which spring from kufr firmly held within the heart.⁴ Some extremists who write about the takfeer of those who do not rule by what

The Shaykh said in one of his recorded statements:

Our brother (Khālid al-'Anbarī), may Allāh reward him with goodness, has a very beneficial treatise in this topic entitled *al-Hukm bi Ghayr Ma Anzala Allāh* in which he compiled the evidences from the Book, Sunnah and statements of the Salaf us-Sālih and Imāms. He gave the topic its right and expended much and he did not leave any room for anyone (to argue with it) according to what I know, and Allāh knows best.

⁴ Shaykh Khālid says about this:

Some people, who do not understand the applications of the 'Ulama, have found problems with Shaykh al-Albānī saying: “the kufr which expels one from the religion is Kufr ul-Qalbī” and have used this to throw doubt on a Shaykh of the Sunnah and accuse him of being “affected by the Madhhab of the Murji'ah” who view that kufr can only be committed by *takdheeb* (denial) and *juhūd* (rejection) and restrict the types of kufr to just Kufr ul-I'tiqād! The Shaykh (Imām al-Albānī) is free from Irjā', the Murji'ah and all who oppose the 'aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah. The Shaykh (Imām al-Albānī, rahimahullāh) did not say “Takdheeb ul-Qalbī” he is far from saying this as this is the statement of the Murji'ah who restrict kufr to “Takdheeb ul-Qalbī”. Rather the Shaykh (*rahimahullāh*) said “Kufr ul-Qalbī” and this includes Kufr ut-Takdheeb wa'l-Juhūd and Kufr ul-Ibā' wa'l-Istikbār and Kufr ul-I'rādh. So if the imān which is in the heart includes tasdeeq and actions of the heart such as *inqiyād*, *tawqeer*, love, humility and other than that then kufr of the heart likewise includes an absence of tasdeeq, meaning *takdheeb*, and an absence of actions of the heart. The Shaykh (*rahimahullāh*) explained this when he said:

“And that this can sometimes manifest via statements, and this is well-known from all types of kufr, and at other times it can manifest via actions such as Istikbār (arrogance) towards submitting to the Shar' [Divine Legislation] and objecting to it, like what occurred with the accursed Iblees”.

Iblees did not disbelieve out of *takdheeb* rather out of stubbornness and arrogance and thus was from the disbelievers, so this expression from the Shaykh was also used by Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimahullāh*) in his *Fatāwā*, vol.14, p.120 when he stated:

It was not kufr on account of apparent actions such as prostrating to idols, cursing the Messenger and the like. Rather, it was on account of it necessitating inner kufr.

So to conclude then, what was stated by Shaykh al-Albānī is neither problematic nor Irjā', rather the intent of it is to emphasise and affirm the issue of the necessary link between the outer and inner. These words from the Shaykh also, which is of the last of what he wrote on the issues of takfeer, refute the ignorant fools and small-minded ones who spread that Shaykh al-Albānī does not make takfeer due to actions.

Allāh has revealed are heedless and make takfeer merely on account of the action without restricting that action with kufr of the heart or not; and they thus base on this the lengthy claim of making takfeer merely on account of the action. As a result, they fall into the obstacle of khurooj whether they perceive it or not. What is also strange is that the one who makes this claim also relies upon the example of the kufr of Iblees, Fir'awn and their likes who have statements and actions which indicate Kufr ul-'Inād and Istikbār, and they thus include in this those who are not like that.

INTRODUCTION BY SHAYKH SĀLIH BIN GHĀNIM AS-SADLĀN (HAFIDHAHULLĀH)

All praise is due to Allāh the Lord of the worlds, and may prayers and peace be upon the master of the messengers and the Imām of the pious, and upon his family and all of his companions. To proceed:

The issue of 'Ruling by Other than what Allāh has revealed' is of the important academic issues and many works have been authored on the topic most of which are in support of previous views or are responses to transgressive emotions. A dangerous topic such as this necessitates that works written on this topic have to be with sincerity, impartiality and objectivity upon the manhaj of the Salaf of the Ummah in understanding the texts of the Qur'ān and Sunnah. Understanding the texts with the understanding of the Salaf us-Sālih is not a matter wherein there is a choice, rather it is an obligation which protects from deviation and misguidance. Allāh says,

For more on this defence of Shaykh al-Albānī in regards to the issues of īmān, takfeer and irjā' refer to the book the *Murji'at ul-'Asr*. Also refer to *at-Ta'reef wa't-Tanbi'ah* by the Atharī Shaykh, 'Ali bin Hasan al-Halabī, may Allāh protect him from the evils of the envious ones. Also see the book by our noble brother Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis (*hafidhahullāh*) *al-Imām al-Albānī wa'l-Irjā'*.

Translator's note ('AbdulHaq al-Ashanti): *Murji'at ul-'Asr* has been translated by Abū Hayyān Salal bin 'AbdulGhafūr here: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/TheMurjiahOfTheEra_ebook.pdf

The claim of restricting kufr to just *takdheeb* (denial) and *juhūd* (rejection) was also erroneously levelled at Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī by the likes of the Muhammad ibn Sālim ad-Dawsarī (the unknown one who was later arrested by Saudi authorities for being linked to terrorists and rebels). Ad-Dawsarī, in a clear example of intellectual denial and partisan polemic, claimed in his *Raf ul-Lā'imah* that Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī restricted and limited kufr to just *takdheeb* (denial) and *juhūd* (rejection), even though in *Sayhat un-Nadheer* [The Call of the Warner] Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī clearly mentions in detail the types of kufr.

“And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.”

{*an-Nisā’* (4): 115}

Ibn ’Abbās (*radi Allāhu ’anhu*) said to the Khawārij: “With ’Ali are the Companions of the Prophet (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*) and they understand the Qur’ān more than you.” If those who wrote about this dangerous issue themselves do not rule by what Allāh has revealed in understanding the texts then how can they seek that others rule by what Allāh has revealed and make takfeer of them if they rule by other than what Allāh has revealed,

“Do you order righteousness of the people and forget yourselves while you recite the Scripture? Then will you not reason?”

{*al-Baqarah* (2): 44}

The one who claims to accept the texts of the religion from his predecessors who were commended by their Lord and their Prophet (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*) and (claims to) refer back to them to understand these texts, yet by his actions may actually say “I have a correct understanding which they (the predecessors) did not have” – has to reflect on himself and fear his Lord. How can one write on this dangerous issue and except success and be correct when he rejects the understanding of his Salaf us-Sālih of Allāh’s saying

﴿وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

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

{*al-Mā’idah* (5): 44}

I have found that the book by brother, Shaykh Khālīd bin ’Ali bin Muhammad al-’Anbarī *al-Hukm bi Ghayr Mā Anzala Allāh wa Usūl ut-Takfeer fī Dau’ il-Kitāb wa’s-Sunnah wa Aqwāl Salaf ul-Ummah* – agrees with what it’s title informs of in terms of the Prophetic Methodology and the understanding of the Salaf of the Ummah in all its issues and topics. May Allāh reward him abundantly for what he has researched, covered, investigated and compiled. He has brought benefit with what he has written and outlined to the people of Islām in every place: ’Ulama, thinkers, Mashāiykh, tullāb, du’āt and those being called. His book explains the types of major kufr which expel one from the religion: Kufr ut-Takdheeb, al-Juhūd, al-’Inād, al-I’rād, Shakk and an-Nifāq; and that kufr can be via beliefs, statements and actions,

he also mentions that the kufr highlighted by the Extremist Murji'ah is when they restrict kufr to just *takdhib* of the heart.

He then explains this all by noting the most important principles of takfeer along with its conditions and he does well and brings benefit by clarifying that takfeer is a Shari' ruling which is fully the right of Allāh and cannot be possessed by other than Him; and that none is to be made takfeer of except whoever has takfeer established with proofs which do not oppose the Book, Sunnah or agreement of Ahl us-Sunnah on his takfeer. (He also explains that) a Muslim is not made takfeer of due to a statement, action or belief until the proof is established on him and doubts have been removed; and that takfeer differs based on the different people, times and places and there has to be a differentiation between the application and the specific person upon whom it is applied; and that kufr has a root and branches and that a branch of kufr established by a Muslim does not necessitate him being a disbeliever, and that a man can have within him both kufr and īmān. This is of the greatest principles of the Ahl us-Sunnah, if a person rejects a ruling which has been agreed upon then the person is only made takfeer on if it is something which is known in the deen by necessity and this in itself is something which is relative. For it could be known by a person yet not by another person.

After that he (i.e. Shaykh Khālid) also expended effort, may Allāh reward him, in explain the issue of the era: ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed. He was successful to the utmost in presenting and explaining it and laid a foundation and rules wherein he compiled the statements of the scholars past and present in regards to this issue and he explained that they all emanate from the one same niche and that they do not make takfeer of the rulers except if he makes it halal (istihalla) to rule by man-made laws, or if he rejects ruling by the Islamic Sharee'ah, or if he claims that the Sharee'ah is not suitable for the contemporary era or that the Sharee'ah and other than it are the same – and the likes. Then he affirmed, may Allāh reward him with good, the Ijmā' of the Salaf and the Khalaf on not making takfeer of the one who rules by other than what Allāh has revealed without Juhūd (rejection) or 'Inād (stubbornness) in three ways and it was truly a precious demand.

He (Shaykh Khālid al-'Anbarī) has exposed the shortcomings of those doubts of the opposers and has established the Hujjah on them that their understanding of the apparentness of the verses which they comment on is an understanding which matches the understanding of the Khawārij. This is not from his (Shaykh Khālid's) own words rather with the testimony of Ahl ul-'Ilm and Tafseer, and tracking the books of the opposers who make unexplained takfeer of all who do not rule by what Allāh has revealed hereby falling into a peculiarity which is heartbreaking and brings tears to the eyes, and you see them distorting the words of the people

of knowledge and regarding them in a way which is inadequate and splicing them so as to agree with what they seek.

All of this (from Shaykh Khālid) is in a sober academic manner with neither abuse nor dispraise, this precious book has come at its right time and agrees in its detail of the issue of ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed with what was stated by the Noble father and Muftī of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Shaykh, al-'Allāmah 'Abdul'Azeez bin 'Abdullāh bin Bāz,⁵ Shaykh Muhammad bin Sālih al-'Uthaymeen⁶ and Shaykh al-'Allāmah Muhammad Nāsiruddeen al-Albānī (rahimahumullāh). It is hoped that everyone who reads this book will be just, impartial and objective and have the understanding of the Salaf of the Ummah and the truth has more right to be followed. I ask Allāh to grant success to the Muslims, the rulers and the ruled, to act in accordance with the Book, Sunnah and manhaj of the Salaf of the Ummah, and that He unites their word, brings their hearts together and makes the guided, Allāh is sufficient for me and He is the best Disposer of affairs.

Written by

Dr Sālih bin Ghānim as-Sadlān⁷

Professor of the College of Sharee'ah

Imām University, Riyadh

22/1/1417 AH

⁵ Shaykh Khālid says on this:

Some trustworthy individuals narrated to me that some people of the takfīrī ideology tried to get a fatwa from Shaykh Ibn Bāz (rahimahullāh) against this book of mine and he refuted them, however after his death they became established, and unto Allāh is the final end.

⁶ Shaykh Khālid says on this:

I was informed by a trustworthy individual that Shaykh Ibn 'Uthaymeen (rahimahullāh) was asked about this book of mine and commended and praised it, just as he frankly and expressly stated that the Lajnah erred in warning from the book and he mentioned that none will benefit from the fatwa except the Takfīrīs and Thawrīs and that it divided the Muslims. In the same way, a group of senior 'Ulama from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia have praised the book.

⁷ Shaykh Khālid says on this:

Shaykh as-Sadlān, may Allāh preserve him and increase his life, praises this book on a number of occasions and in numerous lectures, and he deems the Lajnah to have erred when it warned against the book. May Allāh reward him with the best.

CONCLUSIONS

ONE

In this then, which from what we know is the first English language translation of these introductions to Shaykh Khālīd's book,⁸ both Imām Muhammad Nāsīruddeen al-Albānī (*rahimahullāh*), the Mujaddid of the era, and Shaykh Sālih as-Sadlān (*hafidhabullāh*), one of the senior 'Ulama of Riyadh, read the book by Shaykh, Dr Khālīd al-'Anbarī (*hafidhabullāh*) and commended it.

TWO

The Mujaddid of the era, Imām al-Albānī (*rahimahullāh*) clearly and frankly praised the book by Shaykh Khālīd al-'Anbarī **and this was the last that Imām al-Albānī (rahimahullāh) ever wrote on takfeer and ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed.** This in itself is sufficient a commendation against any aspersions cast, for Imām al-Albānī (*rahimahullāh*) was not known for hasty sanctimonious praise or rash commendations of individuals and their works except after thorough examination, investigation and analysis of their works. Any detailed commendation from Imām al-Albānī therefore, let alone an introduction to a work, is very significant indeed. Even Shaykh 'Isām Mūsā Hādī, who is close to Muhammad Ibrāheem Shaqrah, stated in his book *Muhaddith ul-'Asr: al-Imām Muhammad Nāsīruddeen al-Albānī, Kamā 'Araftubu* [The Muhaddith of the Era: Imām Muhammad Nāsīruddeen al-Albānī As I Knew Him] (Dār us-Siddeeq), p.75:

The last that al-Albānī wrote on the issue of takfeer:

I came across, in my possession, the commendation of our Shaykh (Imām al-Albānī) to the book by the brother Khālīd al-'Anbarī, but he did not complete it all due to our Shaykh's illness and hospitalisation. It was the last that our Shaykh (rahimahullāh) authored on the issue of takfeer, his commendation was after the publication of the two books of 'Ali al-Halabī at-Tahdheer and Sayhat un-Nadheer [The Cry of the Warner].

⁸ *al-Hukm bi Ghayr Mā Anzala Allāh: Wa Usūl ut-Takfeer fī Dau' il-Kitāb wa's-Sunnah wa Aqwāli Salaf il-Ummah* [Ruling By Other Than What Allāh Has Revealed: Principles of Takfeer in Light of the Book, Sunnah and Statements of the Salaf of the Ummah] by Shaykh Khālīd was translated into English by the two respected brothers Abū Khaliyl and Zayd Adib Ansārī as *Ruling by Other Than What Allāh Revealed: The Fundamentals of Takfeer* (Detroit, USA: al-Qur'an was-Sunnah Society of North America, 1997).

So here we have a clear corroboration, from one *who is not linked* to the Shaykhs of the *Imām al-Albānī Centre* in Jordan – such as Shaykh Mashhūr Hasan, Shaykh Husayn al-'Awāishah, Shaykh, Dr Bāsīm bin Faysal al-Jawābirah, Shaykh Muhammad Mūsā Nasr, Shaykh and Khateeb Abū Islām, Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, Shaykh Akram Ziyādah, Shaykh Abū Talhah 'Umar bin Ibrāheem and Shaykh Ziyād bin Saleem al-'Abbādī - clearly testifying to the fact that the introduction to Shaykh Khālīd al-'Anbarī's book from Imām al-Albānī was the last that Imām al-Albānī (*rahimahullāh*) wrote on the issue of takfeer and ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed.⁹

THREE

One of the senior scholars of Riyadh and Professor at Imām University, Shaykh Sālih Sadlān (*bafīdhahullāh*), praised the book by Shaykh Khālīd al-'Anbarī and still does up to this day. In fact, Shaykh Sadlān has introduced a number of Shaykh Khālīd's recent books! Shaykh Sālih Sadlān (*bafīdhahullāh*), himself is the author of the book *Wujūb Tatbeeq ash-Sharee'ah al-Islāmiyyah fī Kullī 'Asr* [The Obligation of Implementing the Sharee'ah During Every Time], Riyadh: Dār Balansiyyah, 1420 AH/1999CE – thus it in no way can be said that Shaykh Sālih Sadlān (*bafīdhahullāh*) is one who “waters down” the issue of implementation of the Sharee'ah an ruling by it, as some claim.

FOUR

Shaykh Sālih Sadlān (*bafīdhahullāh*), himself a student of Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāheem, clearly stated that Shaykh Khālīd is in agreement with the three Imāms of the era: Muhammad Nāsiruddeen al-Albānī, 'Abdul'Azeez Bin Bāz and Muhammad ibn Sālih al-'Uthaymeen (*rahimahumullāh*). Shaykh Sālih Sadlān, himself a senior scholar of Riyadh, also deems the fatwa against the book as being erroneous, errant and misplaced.

FIVE

⁹ In fact, some of the brothers in Jordan, as relayed by Abu'l-Azhar as-Salafī, have recently heard Shaykh 'Isām Mūsā Hādī say: “**Shaykh 'Ali al-Halabī is correct in all that he has written on the Usūl and Furū' of Īmān.**”

That Imām 'Uthaymeen (*rahimabullāh*) praised the book by Shaykh Khālid al-'Anbarī and deemed the fatwa against it as erroneous, errant and only being in the benefit of the Takfīrīs. This is manifested today when we see only the Takfīrīs and deviants making use of the fatwa as a proof, despite it being fully commended by the Mujaddid of the era, Imām al-Albānī.

SIX

Interestingly, Shaykh AbdusSalām as-Sulaymān; Shaykh Badr al-Utaybī (from Riyadh); Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Rayyis (from Riyadh); Shaykh Bāsim bin Faisal al-Jawābirah, a former teacher of Hadeeth at Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University in Riyadh (in his book on extremism which won the Prince Nā'if prize for Islamic research three years ago); Shaykh AbdusSalām as-Sihaymī (in his book on the ideology of terrorism and violence in Saudi Arabia) and many of the Shaykhs of Madeenah Islamic University within their lessons and classes - all quote from Shaykh Khālid al-'Anbarī's works in regards to issues of takfeer and ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed, with some of them referring to the very same book which was criticised!

SEVEN

Hence, it is intellectual denial and academic chauvinism, spiced with Qutbī-Takfīrī realpolitik, to make blanket statements such as **“the senior scholars have said...”** and **“the senior scholars have ruled...”** - as this clearly is not the case, especially when the Mujaddid of the era and other senior 'Ulama studied the book in great detail.

EIGHT

In March 2008, some brothers from Brixton while in Jordan asked Shaykh, Dr Bāsim bin Faisal al-Jawābirah (currently a professor of hadeeth at the University of Jordan, formerly of Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University in Riyadh, prize winner of the Prince Naif Award for Islamic Research in 2007 for his book on Extremism¹⁰ and student of Imām al-Albānī and al-'Allāmah 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Abbād) about this objection that is always made against Shaykh Khalid's book. He said this was due to the fact that Shaykh Khalid's book was one of the first to seriously take on and challenge the takfeer ideology and it therefore caused a lot of controversy, thus the Takfiris waged a damning campaign against the book and were thus able to manipulate a

¹⁰ http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Extremism-Bāsim.pdf

number of scholars at that time.¹¹ Hence, many senior 'Ulama regarded the fatāwā of the Lajnah on the books by Shaykh 'Ali and Shaykh Khalid as being influenced by others, thus recently in Madeenah, the Muhaddith of Madeenah, al-'Allāmah 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Abbād al-Badr (*bafidbabullāh*) was asked: **“who should we take knowledge from in the land of Shām [the Levant]?”** Shaykh 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Abbād (*bafidbabullāh*) responded saying:

“Upon you is to stick to Shaykh 'Ali Hasan in Jordan.”

This was on 5/1/2009 CE. Some of the brothers present asked: **“and what of the fatwa of the Lajnat ud-Dā'imah?”** Shaykh 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Abbād (*bafidbabullāh*) responded saying:

“Do not be affected by that!”

Shaykh Husayn bin 'Abdul-Azeez Āl ash-Shaykh (Imām and *Kbateeb* of *Masjid an-Nabawi*, Madeenah, and also the judge of the large Law Court in Madeenah) was asked the following question¹²:

¹¹ This manipulation is not a mere figment of our imagination, or some kind of “Madkhali” propaganda, rather it has now been seen that some of those Majāheel who were trying to wage war against Shaykhs Khālīd al-'Anbarī and 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī were hardcore Takfīrīs some of whom were with al-Qa'ida! The best example of this being, as Shaykh Ibrāheem ar-Ruhaylī (*hafidhahullāh*) mentioned last year in Indonesia, is with **Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī author of Raf' ul-Lā'imah 'an Fatwa al-Lajnat id-Dā'imah**, who was recently in prison in Saudi Arabia for being linked to the terrorists and Saudi Takfīrīs! He was arrested on 19/4/1424 AH in al-Ahsa, his name is even listed here on this Khawārij website (**beware of the Khawārij web-links!**) in red (no.244) in the list of those Takfīrīs who have been arrested in Saudi Arabia: <http://www.shamikh.org/vb/showthread.php?t=14140> – his name is alongside Khawārij, rabble-rousers, Harakīs and terrorists! This is the **Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī author of Raf' ul-Lā'imah 'an Fatwa al-Lajnat id-Dā'imah** who was trying to refute Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, and even managed to manipulate some of the 'Ulama to write commendations for him, despite the fact that he had no credible works prior whatsoever.

So let this be a warning to those who try and mount campaigns against Imām al-Albānī and his students based on desires, misquotations, *hasad*, *jahl* and *bātil*. Indeed, in *at-Tanbihāt al-Mutawā'imah fī Nusrat il-Haqq il-Ajwibat al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwā al-Lajnat id-Dā'imah* (Cairo: Dār ul-Manhaj, 1424 AH/2003 CE), pp.330-331 - Shaykh 'Ali supplicated against ad-Dawsarī for his lies and accusations and thus ad-Dawsaree's condition was later exposed in the form of his affiliations, subsequent arrest and lack of any credible academic works since. Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī was able to manipulate a number of 'Ulama to write introductions to his works against Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī. Yet Shaykh 'Ali Hasan brought clear closure to Dawsarī's agenda with his devastating **610 page refutation** of ad-Dawsarī entitled *at-Tanbihāt al-Mutawā'imah fī Nusrat il-Haqq 'il-Ajwibat il-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwā al-Lajnat id-Dā'imah*: *Wa Naqd 'ala Aghāleet wa Mughālatāt 'Raf' ul-Lā'imah*, *bi't-Tab'a al-awwal wa'th-Thāniyah* (Cairo: Dār ul-Manhaj, 1424 AH/2003).

Sections of this will be translated soon, and we have appended a small section at the end of this paper for benefit!

¹² On 5th Rabee al-Awwal 1422 AH, during the QSS Conference held in Chicago, Illinois (USA).

Respected Shaykh - may Allāh reward you - what is your view on the fatwa which was issued by the Permanent Committee concerning the two books by Shaykh 'Ali [bin Hasan al-Halabī], 'at-Tahdheer' and 'Saihatu Nadhir', that they call to the madhhab of Irjā' in that action is not a condition for the perfection of Īmān, while bearing in mind that this book does not even contain any research into this matter of shart sihhah, or shart kamāl? Also has the Committee read the books of Shaykh Alee or has it sufficed with the views and studies of other people? May Allāh reward you.

The Shaykh answered:

Firstly O brothers! Shaykh 'Ali and the other Shaykhs (of the Committee) are in unity and conformity. And Shaykh 'Ali is a senior and elder brother, who is from the generality of Mashāyikh (himself) - from those who actually issued the verdict itself. And he knows them and they know him, and there exists love between him and them. And Shaykh 'Ali has been given - and to Allāh is all the praise - such knowledge and insight (baseerah) that allows him to actually deal with this knowledge-based matter that is between him and the Mashāyikh - and the truth of this matter is in the process of being clarified. As for Shaykh Ali and his Shaykh, Shaykh al-Albānī, then they are those who are upon the manhaj of the Sunnah, and no one doubts about them, that they are upon an acceptable and pleasing manhaj – and all praise is due to Allāh. Shaykh 'Ali is amongst those who defend the manhaj of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah - all praise is due to Allāh. The fatwa did not state that the Shaykh is Murji'ah - Allāh forbid that it should state such a thing. Rather, it opposes Shaykh 'Alee concerning what is in the book (of Shaykh 'Ali), and also contests with him concerning this matter.

As for others who wish to extract from the contents of this fatwa that it necessitates the judgement upon Shaykh 'Ali that he is a Murji'ah. For this I have not understood from it, and I also think that my brothers (the Mashāyikh) do not understand this either. And this (i.e. the fatwa) does not change or oppose what there is between Shaykh 'Ali and the Mashāyikh (i.e. of love and respect). For they (the Mashāyikh of the Committee) respect him and revere him. Shaykh 'Alee has written a knowledge-based reply to them, al-Ajwibat al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwā al-Lajnah ad-Dā'imah, in accordance with what the Salaf of this Ummah are upon, in that there is no one amongst us except that he is one who takes or who gives, and everyone's saying can be accepted or rejected, except the occupant of this grave,

meaning the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu 'alayhi wasallam)-as has been said by Imām Mālik: in all of speech is what can be accepted and what can be rejected, save what is from the Messenger. And I consider that Shaykh 'Alee will agree with me that the Committee did not say - as is often claimed about him (i.e. Shaykh 'Ali) that Shaykh 'Ali is from the Murji'ah! Never! They did not say this. They only contested what is in the book! And is this type of contestation between the Salaf for anything but for the love for knowing the Sunnah, and to safeguard it? Rather, this dispute is only about a small part of the whole of the book. The respected Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Āl ash-Shaykh is amongst those who loves Shaykh 'Ali - and I know this - and he respects him and also supplicates for him, and even after Shaykh 'Ali met the respected Shaykh. As for when others take this fatwa and then rejoice with it - in that which is for them - and they do not take that from it which is against them, then this is the way of Ahlul-Bid'ah.

Based on the above statements alone from the Muhaddith of Madeenah, al-'Allāmah 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Abbād and Shaykh Husayn Āli Shaykh (Imām and *Khateeb* of *Masjid an-Nabawi*, Madeenah, and also the judge of the large Law Court in Madeenah) - (*hafidhabumullāh*) - we can append the following:

- ✓ The Muhaddith of Madeenah advised **“do not be affected”** by the particular fatwa of the Lajnah against Shaykh 'Ali's two books.
- ✓ The Muhaddith of Madeenah encourages, advises and exhorts that in the land of Shām [the Levant] Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī is to be referred to mainly.
- ✓ The Muhaddith of Madeenah clearly praises Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī.
- ✓ Shaykh Husayn Āli Shaykh (Imām and *Khateeb* of *Masjid an-Nabawi*, Madeenah, and also the judge of the large Law Court in Madeenah) testifies that Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī is from the senior scholars and from the generality of Mashāyikh himself.
- ✓ That there is love between the Lajnah and Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī.
- ✓ That Shaykh 'Ali has been given knowledge ('ilm) and insight (baseerah) that enables him to deal with the matter with an academic method of scholarship.
- ✓ That Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, and his Shaykh Imām al-Albānī, were both on the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah and no one doubts this.
- ✓ Shaykh Husayn Āli Shaykh (Imām and *Khateeb* of *Masjid an-Nabawi*, Madeenah, and also the judge of the large Law Court in Madeenah) also stated that the **“fatwa did not state that the Shaykh is Murji'ah - Allāh forbid that it should state such a thing”** and

“...the Committee did not say - as is often claimed about him (i.e. Shaykh ʿAli) that Shaykh ʿAli is from the Murjiʿah! Never! They did not say this.” This is a clear testimony to the fraud and deception of the likes of Abū Zubair Saleem Begg, Salmān ʿAwān (“Abū Bakr bin Nasir”) – both of madkhalis.com and other new-age bohemian Takfīrī activists who make this claim as an *argumentum ad nauseam*. This is not surprising from Ahl ul-Bidaʿ as they only use the fatwa as it benefits them and yet are in denial over what the Lajnah have produced over history which is in total contrast to their methodology, hence Shaykh Husayn Āli Shaykh stated: **“As for when others take this fatwa and then rejoice with it - in that which is for them - and they do not take that from it which is against them, then this is the way of Ahlul-Bidʿah.”**

- ✓ That the Mashāykh love and respect Shaykh ʿAli bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī.
- ✓ That the Muftī of Saudi Arabia, Shaykh ʿAbdulʿAzeez Āli Shaykh (*bafidbabullāb*), on the testimony of Shaykh Husayn Āli Shaykh – loves and respects Shaykh ʿAli bin Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī.

Note also: these are not our words! Rather the words of the scholars, in this instance Shaykh Husayn Āli Shaykh (Imām and *Khateeb* of *Masjid an-Nabawi*, Madeenah, and also the judge of the large Law Court in Madeenah) and the Muhaddith of Madeenah, ʿAbdulMuhsin al-ʿAbbād al-Badr!

NINE

In fact then, the claims that Shaykh Khalid has a problem in the issue of īmān do not stand up in terms of the evidence, as opposed to the other side of the matter wherein there was a major campaign by those who incline to excessive takfeer and Qutbism to discredit his book, along with those works by Shaykh ʿAli – all of this was a logical progression from the allegations initiated by Safar al-Hawali against Imam al-Albani. Consequently, Shaykh Bandar bin Nāyif al-ʿUtaybī states in his book *al-Hukm bi Ghayr mā Anzala Allāh: Munāqashatun Taʿseeleeyatun ʿIlmiyyatun Hādīʿatun* [Ruling by Other than What Allāh Has Revealed: A Sober Introductory Academic Discourse], which features an introduction from Shaykh Muhammad bin Hasan bin ʿAbdurRahmān Āli Shaykh (member of the Lajnat ud-Dāʿimah wa Hayat Kibār ul-ʿUlama in Saudi Arabia). Shaykh Bandar al-ʿUtaybī has three chapters in the book:

- “**
- **Whoever says īmān is speech, belief and action has departed from the Murjiʿah**
 - **Whoever says īmān increases and decreases has differed from the Murjiʿah**
 - **Whoever says that istihnāʾ in īmān is allowed as differed from the Murjiʿah**

- Whoever says that kufr can be by speech and action has differed from the Murji'ah
- Whoever says that it is an obligation to listen and obey the rulers even if they are oppressive has differed from the Murji'ah.”^{13 14}

Shaykh Bandar bin Nāyif al-'Utaybī also states in his book *al-Hukm bi Ghayr mā Anzala Allāh: Munāqashatun Ta'seeleeyatun 'Ilmiyyatun Hādi'atun* [Ruling by Other than What Allāh Has Revealed: A Sober Introductory Academic Discourse], which features an introduction from Shaykh

¹³ Shaykh Bandar bin Nāyif al-'Utaybī, *al-Hukm bi Ghayr mā Anzala Allāh: Munāqashatun Ta'seeleeyatun 'Ilmiyyatun Hādi'atun* [Ruling by Other than What Allāh Has Revealed: A Sober Introductory Academic Discourse], Cairo: Maktabah 'AbdulMusawwir bin Muhammad bin 'Abdullāh, 1427 AH, 1st Edn., p.63-70.

¹⁴ Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal was asked about the one who says “īmān increases and decreases” and he replied **“this person is free from irjā”**, see: al-Khallāl, *as-Sunnah*, vol.3, p.581. Imām Ibn ul-Mubārak stated to Qadi Abī Ya'la, as is mentioned in *Tabaqāt ul-Hanābilah*, vol2, p.40: **“Whoever says īmān is speech and action that increases and decreases, then irjā', from the first of it to the end of it, has left such a person.”** Imām al-Barbahārī said similar to this in *Sharh us-Sunnah*, p.132. This is what the Imams of the Salaf re-iterate as being from the creed of the Salaf, yet some of the contemporaries from the Khalaf (!) go further than this and mention other limits which have no *daleel* or proof for. The difference between the Murji'ah and Ahl us-Sunnah has also been exemplified by Imām Sufyān ath-Thawrī (*rahimahullāh*) who said:

“We say īmān is speech and action, while they (the Murji'ah) say īmān is speech and not action. We say īmān increases and decreases, while they say īmān neither increases nor decreases.”

See *al-Īmān* (Maktabah al-Islamiyyah), p.184. Also from the signs of the Murji'ah according to the Salaf is that the Murji'ah view that obedience should not be given to the leaders. See the narration which has an authentic chain of transmission that Ahmad bin Sa'eed ar-Ribātī said that 'Abdullāh bin Tāhir said to him that the most hated people to him were the Murji'ah due to them viewing that obedience should not be made to the leaders, see Imām as-Sābūnī, *'Aqeedat us-Salaf wa As-hāb ul-Hadeeth*, p.109. Also refer to the narration of Sufyān ath-Thawrī who said: **“How can I be a Murji'i when I don't view that the sword be used (to remove the tyrannical leaders).”** Reported by Ibn Shāheen in *al-Kitāb ul-Lateef*, p.15 which has an authentic chain of transmission. Abu'l-Fadl as-Saksakī al-Hanbalī (d. 683 AH) stated in his book *al-Burhān fī 'Aqā'id Ahl il-Adyān*, p.96:

The sect known as the Mansūriyyah, who are misguided innovators, brand Ahl us-Sunnah with Irjā' merely on account of Ahl us-Sunnah not making takfeer of those who abandon the prayer if they do not reject (its obligation) claiming that this (avoidance of takfeer) “leads to the belief that īmān is only speech and not action”.

Shaykh Mashhūr's words should also be taken into consideration by the likes of the ignoramus Salmān 'Awān (“Abu Bakr bin Nāsir”) an American student at one of the Islamic universities in Saudi Arabia, who has oddly taken it upon himself to attempt “correct” the 'Ulama from his home in Texas!? 'Awān, who feebly tries to hide his real identity on internet forums due to his utter fear of exposing himself, has become an ideologue of the claim that Imām al-Albānī and his students have fallen into irjā'.

For more on this see Shaykh, Dr Khālīd al-Anbarī, *The Murji'ah of the Era*, translated by Abū Hayyān Salal bin 'AbdulGhafūr: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/TheMurjiahOfTheEra_ebook.pdf

Muhammad bin Hasan bin 'AbdurRahmān Āli Shaykh (member of the Lajnat ud-Dā'imah wa Hayat Kibār ul-'Ulama in Saudi Arabia), p.57:

Some people apply to those who say what the three Imāms did (i.e. al-Albānī, Bin Bāz and al-'Uthaymeen) a number of accusations...

Shaykh Bandar al-'Utaybī says (p.59):

They accuse those who oppose them as permitting ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed! This is a lie and it can be answered with the following three points:

Firstly: whoever permits ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed is a disbeliever based on the consensus of Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah; so do the ones who make this claim also make takfeer of Ibn Bāz, al-Albānī and al-'Uthaymeen?!¹⁵

Secondly: those three Imāms (rahimahumullāh) all clearly and frankly said that whoever makes that permissible (= istahalla) has disbelieved, thus there is no avenue to obligate them with what they clearly opposed.

Thirdly: the one who says this has confused two issues:

- 1. Takfeer, which is the realm of discussion and involves discussing with the opposer**
- 2. Deeming it as sinful – wherein there is no difference of opinion**

Then Shaykh Bandar al-'Utaybī states, pp.61-62:

The claim of Irjā!

Those who make this assertion intend making takfeer of those who rule by other than what Allāh has revealed in cases wherein takfeer is not necessitated. Then they necessitate Irjā' (for anyone who does not make takfeer in such erroneous cases) and ascribe the person as being from the Murji'ah or as having the doubts of the Irjā'.

I say: the answer to this is from three aspects:

Firstly: their lack of understanding the estimation of the people of knowledge who have oppose them in this issue and it is as if the one who makes this claim does not realise that in this issue he is actually arguing with the Imāms of Ahl us-Sunnah of the era, such as Imām Bin Bāz, al-Albānī and Ibn 'Uthaymeen (rahimahumullāh).

Shaykh Bandar al-'Utaybī continues:

Those three Imāms were the Imāms of fatwa during their time and during their time the final word was with them. The word of Ahl us-Sunnah was united on their words and referring back to them and the people of truth trusted their religious

¹⁵ Shaykh Bandar states: not to mention Ibn 'Abbās (*radi Allāhu 'anhumā*), Tāwoos, 'Atā', 'AbdulLateef bin 'Abdurrahmān ibn Hasan and Sulaymān bin Sahnān (*rahimahumullāh*); and the Salaf!

leadership, may Allāh have mercy on them, be pleased with them and reward them with good for what they put forth for Islām and the Muslims.

Secondly: whoever says this (claim of irjā') do not know the difference between Ahl us-Sunnah and the Murji'ah in the issue of takfeer, even though the difference between the two is like the distant between the heavens and the earth.

Shaykh Bandar al-'Utaybī states (p.63):

I say: the reality of the difference is represented by the fact that the Murji'ah make the condition of belief, such as istihlāl for example, in all cases which necessitate takfeer. While Ahl us-Sunnah necessitate istihlāl in some cases which necessitate takfeer yet do not necessitate in other cases.

Then Shaykh Bandar al-'Utaybī states:

Thirdly: Whoever says this (claim of irjā') neither knows the views of the Murji'ah nor the issues which save a person from Irjā'. For the Imāms of Islām have documented certain issues wherein whoever opposes them has left the ranks of the Murji'ah and is innocent from Irjā'...

TEN

Those behind the website "Madkhalis.com" interestingly only refer to the Lajnah on this issue!? For there is a plethora of other Fatāwā and a whole corpus of rulings which those behind the website do not accept from the Lajnah as it is against them. Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī therefore stated:

As for us, all praise is due to Allāh, even if we do not agree with our Shaykhs on a fatwa due to a purely academic view and proof which we hold to be stronger – we still agree with them in a hundred fatwas.¹⁶

Such as the Fatwa of the *Committee of Senior Scholars*, no.951/2, under the leadership of Imām 'Abdul'Azeez bin Bāz, and in which the Lajnah are in total agreement, that Safar al-Hawālī and Salmān al-'Awdah should be prevented from public speaking in the form of lectures, seminars, lessons and sermons due to their transgression and **"in order to protect the society from their errors"**. Also, the *Lajnah ad-Dā'imah li'l-Iftā* (fatwā no. 18870) dated 11/6/1417 AH corresponding to 23 October 1996 CE stated:

Making al-Hākimiyyah as a separate category of tawheed is a newly invented practice which was not stated by any of the Imāms, according to what we know.

¹⁶ Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, *at-Tanbihāt al-Mutawā'imah fī Nusrat il-Haqq il-Ajwibat al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwa al-Lajnatī'd-Dā'imah* (Cairo: Dār ul-Manhaj, 1424 AH/2003 CE), p.287.

Imām Bin Bāz stated:

Tawheed is not four categories it is just three categories as the people of knowledge have stated and Tawheed ul-Hākimiyyah is within Tawheed ul-'Ibādah. From Tawheed ul-'Ibādah is ruling by what Allāh has legislated, and Salāh, Siyām, Zakāh, Hajj and ruling by the Shar' – all of this is within Tawheed ul-'Ibādah.¹⁷

ELEVEN

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF IRJĀ' IS BEING SILENT WITH REGARDS TO THE PEOPLE OF INNOVATION¹⁸

In the *Fatawā* of Shaykh ul-Islām ibn Taymiyyah (vol.12, pp.466-468) is to be found a firm statement which exposes the image of the deviated Irjā' which these individuals have fallen into, whether they realise it or not! Wherein Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimahullāh*) states:

...before those people who make takfeer with that which is bātil, are a people who do not know the creed of the people of Sunnah and Jamā'ah as is necessary, or they know some of it and are ignorant of the rest of it and the little of what they do know is not made clear to the people, rather indeed they hide it! They do not forbid innovation which opposes the Book and the Sunnah and they do not censure the people of innovation or punish them. Rather indeed, they impugn the Sunnah and the principles of the deen with absolute censorship. They do not distinguish between what the Book, the Sunnah and Ijmā' indicate and what the people of innovation and division say. Or they try to resolve all of the different schools of thought! As the scholars resolve some issues in Ijtihād which can form disputes. This way has overcome many of the Murji'ah,¹⁹ some of the pseudo scholars of fiqh, the Sūfīs and the philosophers, as it overcame the first ones from the people of desires and theological speculative rhetoric. Both deviant parties are outside the fold of the Book and the Sunnah.

¹⁷ Shaykh Bin Bāz, *Majmū' Fatāwā wa Māqālāt Mutanawwi'ah* (Buraydah, Saudi: Dār Asdā' al-Mujtama', 1421 AH/2000 CE, Third Edition), vol.30. Also see: <http://www.binbaz.org.sa/mat/4719>

¹⁸ Shaykh 'Ali ibn Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, *ad-Durur al-Mutalā'ilah binaqd al-Imām al-'Allāmah Muhammad Nāsiruddeen al-Albānī (al-Firyah) Muwāfaqatihi al-Murjiah* [Gleaming Pearls in Destroying the False Claim that Imām al-Albānī Agrees with the Murji'ah] ('Ajmān: Maktabah al-Furqān, 1423AH/2002 CE), pp. 69-70.

¹⁹ As seen in them keeping silent over Qutb with regards to *takfeer* and at the same time censuring those who support the Sunnah.

The website “Madkhalis.com”, which is a site composed by individuals who have resigned themselves to internet forum obscurantism and fringe community activism, took exception to Shaykh Khālīd al-'Anbarī being invited to a variety of Salafī Marākiz in the west. Yet these Salafī centres also invite and have links with the Salafī Shaykhs of Yemen, Algeria, Jordan, Riyadh and Madeenah. This is more than can be said about those behind the website “Madkhalis.com” who are linked to places such as Lewisham Islamic Centre in South-East London. Lewisham Islamic Centre in South-east London is where Abū Zubair Saleem Begg - formerly known as “al-'Azzāmī”, a nisba which he used to use himself by the way but seems to have discarded of late! - is the Imām! His use of the *nisba* was out of his *ghulū* towards 'Abdullāh 'Azzām (*rabimahullāh*) and his association with those linked to an infamous website which was run from a shed hide-out in Tooting, South London. The website was full of uncorroborated reports, unlegislated calls for armed jihad without backing of the 'Ulama in some instances and takfeer and slander of the Salafīs. Now such elements request “sympathy” from the Muslims, yet when one acts without guidance from the 'Ulama, makes takfeer of Ahl us-Sunnah and makes false accusations against them and the Salafīs- the end result is going to be destruction, Allāh says,

“Thus, We recompense the criminals.”

{*Yūnus (10): 13*}

Abū Zubair was also famed for his prancing around all over London calling to the ideas of Safar al-Hawālī along with what he had “studied” with Abū Baseer at-Tartūsī (the fake-Shaykh of south-east London), in order to openly accuse Imām al-Albānī of *irjā*, *tajabhum* and not understanding “**the reality of imān**”. Using *al-Muntada al-Islami* in London as a base from which to do this, Abū Zubair gained notoriety for even stooping to the level of comparing Imām al-Albānī to the Jahmiyyah and even getting into ridiculous public debates with Ali Timimi for not agreeing with his temper tantrums! Yet the naïve attachment to Safar and Salmān, in hindsight, was proven to be somewhat hasty and thus now they have no Salafī Shaykhs visit them whatsoever and in fact invite the likes of MPACUK and other Ikhwānīs and Harakīs to their Masjid! Indeed, Lewisham Islamic Centre do not even deem it allowed for a person to call her/himself “Salafī” – as has been observed from the incoherent lecture of their former Imām Shakeel Begg. Thus, they have no scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah whatsoever whom they are close to, and furthermore so much for the “Islamic Awakening” instigated by Safar and Salmān! The latter openly cavorting with liberals, Sūfīs and Rawāfid, while the former has written letters to George Bush Jnr saying:

“We Muslims desired to see you elected and we have proof that the votes which gave you victory were our votes, and I personally advised Muslims to vote for you.”²⁰ (!!!?)

So much for **“Fiqh ul-Wāqi”**, they should have taken their own advice! To add to the academic dishonesty recently Abū Zubair has tried to make out as if he is some sort of advocate for Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān!? Even labelling Shaykh Fawzān as one of the **“Islamist ideological warriors”**!? What on earth is Abū Zubair talking about!? This is an attempt by Abū Zubair to transfer his love of Safar over to Shaykh Fawzaan and all who know the manhaj of Abū Zubair from over ten years ago can see this from a mile off! For Abū Zubair neither refers back to Shaykh Fawzān in matters related to manhaj nor in most other matters of the religion, Abū Zubair deeming himself as more than apt to interpret the sources himself. Thus, it is academic dishonesty for Abū Zubair to dare claim that he in some way “respects” Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān and it is a clear proof that Abū Zubair follows his desires, taking that which is for him from Shaykh Fawzān’s works and totally denying or downplaying what is against him from Shaykh Fawzān’s works. Beware!

Therefore, we do not take advice from either Salmān 'Awān (aka “Abu Bakr ibn Nasir” and user of fake forum name “justabro”, and we prefer to call him “justafoe” or “justashow”!)²¹ or Abu Zubair Saleem Begg when it comes to which Shaykhs to invite. We have the statements of the Mujaddid of the era, Imām al-Albānī and that weighs just a little bit more on the scales than the rants of Tooting’s temper tantrum takfiri tweets! Moreover, to add to the frustration, decrepitude and lamentable situation of the redundant and Extremist Murji’ah da’wah of Abū Zubair and Salmān Awān, Shaykh Khālīd al-Anbarī not only visits about four Masājid in London, but also is a regular at four or five other Masājid around the UK, not to mention regularly visiting Canada, Kyrgyzstan and other countries!

So the Salafī da’wah is growing in abundance with the youth are becoming aware of the creedal errors and contradictions of Qutbism. So these Salafī haters, such as Abū Zubair Saleem Begg (new Imām of Lewisham Islamic Centre, yet no relation to Shakeel Begg!),²² should remember that when they teach advanced level Qutbism to the remnants of the followings of Abū Hamza al-Misrī, Abdullah (“el”) Faisal al-Jamaykī, Abū Qatdādah and Abū Baseer Tartūsī

²⁰ <http://www.sunnahonline.com/ilm/contemporary/0025.htm>

²¹ There are other takes on his username that we could use which also rhyme but we thought it apt to merely suffice with these two examples!! From Houston, Texas, he is an American student at Umm ul-Qura’ University who is a scornful individual of the Takfiri persuasion and mocks the Salafī 'Ulama out of frustration of his own decrepit situation which is one of no scholars whatsoever and no role for the Muslims!

²² For more on “Shakeel Begg” refer to this here:

who now scour Lewisham Islamic Centre in a kind of peculiar free-for-all of Takfīrī kinship! And most of these woeful Khawārij leftovers themselves have absolutely no comprehension of the issues being taught to them and are totally confused by the Qutbism presented to them; Lewisham is not exactly the most intellectually riveting environment wherein such matters can be discussed! As for the Extremist Irjā' which is taught by Abū Zubair Saleem Begg, then this is in the form of his utter and absolute silence and denial of Sayyid Qutb's creedal discrepancies and carrying on as if Sayyid Qutb is a religious authority! Indeed, Abū Zubair Saleem Begg recently stated in the beginning of lesson four of his "Adab Shar'iyyah" (!?) class:

"And we also quoted the examples of Ibn Taymiyyah for instance and Sayyid Qutb about how they, sort of, thanked Allāh subhānu wa Ta'ala whenever they heard a {sic} bad news or news which is considered bad normally by people such as news of execution. Sayyid Qutb said 'alhamdulillah I've been preparing for that for the last fifteen years.'"²³

Abū Zubair Saleem Begg at the end of lesson two of his lecture explaining the book by 'AbdurRahmān 'AbdulKhāliq, which is a book which Abū Zubair uses in order to justify the category of Tawheed ul-Hākimiyyah, someone mentions to Abū Zubair Saleem Begg: **"...Shaykh Faisal says in one of his tapes..."** referring to Abdullah ("el") Faisal al-Jamaykī, and Abu Zubair says nothing against Faisal!? This is Extremist Irjā' with the innovators! If you are going to make out as if you are some sort of flag-bearer of the 'aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah, and refuting those with corrupt creed, then do this in totality and not just partially. Yet this is a clear demonstration of irjā' which manifests itself in the Ikhwānī notion of **"we co-operate in what we agree on and we excuse each other on what we disagree on"**. It is also out of sheer conceit as such elements are too arrogant to return back to what most of the 'Ulama of Ahl us-Sunnah have stated about Sayyid Qutb.

Other examples of the Extremist Irjā' of Abū Zubair can be seen in his forum's allowance of all and sundry to speak and give ignorant comments. So whose words does Abū Zubair utilise to justify this? Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal? No. Imām al-'Awzā'ī? No. Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah? No! Ibn ul-Qayyim? No. Maybe Ibn Qudāmah? No. What about Imām Muhammad ibn 'AbdulWahhāb? No! How about Imām Bin Bāz? No. Imām 'Uthaymeen? No. Rather Abū Zubair justifies such Cyber rants and temper tantrum Takfīrī codswallop via referral to the words of the novelist Eric Blair (aka George Orwell)?! What next? Hiding behind the words of H.G. Wells? These are the sources that Abu Zubair Saleem Begg uses to justify the type of banter that even cattle would find intellectually horrendous! Firstly, justifying such oppression and slander

²³ <http://www.lewishamislamiccentre.com/media/adab-shariyyah-lesson-four-by-abuz-zubair--213>

via referral to George Orwell is not exactly **“ruling by what Allāh has revealed” (!?)** and secondly, justifying such internet ranting is even a mockery of Orwell’s literature! And why the site (Islamic Awakening) is so detested by the Salafīs is due to Abū Zubair tolerating the following, all in order to boost numbers:

- ✓ Backbiting Imāms of Ahl us-Sunnah and the ʿUlama
- ✓ Backbiting and speaking ill of Imām Bin Bāz – wherein posts are allowed which make takfeer of Imām Bin Bāz and refer to him by horrific names
- ✓ Backbiting of Imām ʿUthaymeen and allowing the likes of Yousef Khattāb (Joey Cohen),²⁴ al-Muhajiroun, assorted al-Qāʿidah sympathisers and many others who use pseudonyms, to slander the ʿUlama.
- ✓ Takfeer of the ʿUlama
- ✓ Takfeer of the Salafīs
- ✓ Promotion of the ideas of the Khawārij of the era
- ✓ Defence of the Khawārij of the era, yet scorn towards Salafīs
- ✓ Intellectual denial
- ✓ Cowardice
- ✓ Usage of images in order to mock those who call to tawheed and the Sunnah
- ✓ Tolerance of all and sundry, even hardcore Takfirī ideas, merely in order to increase use of forum.
- ✓ Slander of the Salafīs
- ✓ Embroiling the Muslim youth in debates which they neither adequately comprehend nor benefit from in their Islamic studies

The above are just a few of the things which are tolerated, and we dare say *promoted*, by Abū Zubair and his cohorts all on account of their utter frustration with the Salafī daʿwah. Do they really think that allowing such deplorable views is in some way “positive” in the right of Islamic daʿwah?! Then Abū Zubair has the audacity to state to his minions during his lessons at Lewisham Islamic Centre: **“do not get obsessed with these issues” (!?)** – yet he actively encourages and tolerates **“these issues”** in the first instance by devoting websites to **“these issues”**! So we advise these individuals to quit their quixotic Qutbī quests and quarrelsome quotations from Qutb, and to quash the questionable quibbles and quips of Qutbism, by

²⁴ For more on him see: http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_KufrDoonaKufr.pdf

quenching the queasiness of their quagmire via the Qur'ān and the manhaj of the Qurūn al-Mufaddalah!²⁵

SHAYKH 'ALI BIN HASAN AL-HALABĪ AL-ATHARĪ

(hafidhahullāh)

²⁵ For further responses to the allegations made by Abū Zubair, Salmān Awān (both behind the site 'madkhalis.com') and their ilk see a beneficial site which has some excellent articles: www.themadkhalis.com

ON SOME OF THE MANY RIDICULOUS ERRORS OF MUHAMMAD BIN SĀLIM AL-DAWSARĪ²⁶

6. Then Dawsarī appends (on page 18) trying to be a scholar, trying to be big, trying to be elaborate and trying to be detailed about the title of my treatise *al-Ajwibat al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwa al-Lajnatī'd-Dā'imah*, saying:

What is correct is that al-jawāb (the answer) is about ('an) something and not 'alā (on), so it is said: al-Ajwibat al-Mutalā'imah 'an Fatwa al-Lajnatī'd-Dā'imah. !!!

This is my answer (jawāb) on it (alayhi!):

²⁶ Abridged from Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan bin 'Ali bin 'AbdulHameed al-Halabī al-Atharī, *at-Tanbihāt al-Mutawā'imah fī Nusrat il-Haqq il-Ajwibat al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwa al-Lajnatī'd-Dā'imah* (Cairo: Dār ul-Manhaj, 1424 AH/2003 CE), pp.343-347; 381-393.

The first edition of ad-Dawsarī's book *Raf' ul-Lā'imah* was 88 pages in total and had introductions from Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān and Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeed ar-Rājihī. The second edition was of 156 pages and had extra introductions from Shaykhs Ibn Jibreel, 'Abdullah Sa'd (currently in prison in Saudi, as he has been for the last six years or so for being linked to Takfīrīs and going against the Saudi state) and Sa'd bin Humayd.

Shaykh 'Ali's response to 'Abdullāh Sa'd's introduction to ad-Dawsarī's book is some 81 pages and is very detailed as it clears up many misconceptions and false perceptions, hopefully we can produce a translation of that in the future inshā'Allāh. Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān also addresses Shaykh 'Ali with respect by referring to him as **"the brother, Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī"** (see *at-Tanbihāt al-Mutawā'imah fī Nusrat il-Haqq il-Ajwibat al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwa al-Lajnatī'd-Dā'imah*, pp.189-190) – which is more than can be said of the ignoramuses today who make ridiculous statements about Shaykh 'Ali such as "he is not even a Shaykh"?!

As we stated beforehand, ad-Dawsarī, who Shaykh 'Ali refers to as being **"majhūl"**, is not known for many academic works, edits, studies etc. Moreover, he was part of those who were leading a serious and direct campaign against the students of the *da'wah* of Imām al-Albānī. Interestingly, ad-Dawsarī was imprisoned by the Saudi government, as many scholars have highlighted such as Shaykh Ibrāheem ar-Ruhaylī (*hafidhahullāh*) who mentioned this last year in Indonesia. Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī was arrested on 19/4/1424 AH in al-Ahsa, his name is even listed here on this Khawārij website (**beware of the Khawārij web-links!**) in red (no.244) in the list of those Takfīrīs who have been arrested in Saudi Arabia: <http://www.shamikh.org/vb/showthread.php?t=14140> – his name is alongside Khawārij, rabble-rousers, Harakīs and terrorists! This is the **Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī author of Raf' ul-Lā'imah 'an Fatwa al-Lajnat id-Dā'imah** who was trying to refute Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, and even managed to manipulate some of the 'Ulama to write commendations for him, despite the fact that he had no credible works prior whatsoever.

This is what the *miskeen* said! Which in itself is evidence, from many evidences, of his compounded ignorance!

Firstly: The source of this precious discovery (!) could be, and the knowledge is with Allāh, the book *Mu'jam ul-Aktā' ish-Shā'i'ab* by al-'Adnānī and his speech regarding this point is very accurate however it is not as the rough-drafter (i.e. ad-Dawsarī) understands or understood it!! The speech of al-'Adnānī within the book which relates to: **the answer = on = the question [al-jawāb = 'an = su'āl]** and what he stated is closest to the truth without a doubt. However, the affair is in regards to the one who did not understand what he said due to his narrow-mindedness and his lack of insight,²⁷ or due to his fondness for biased partisanship and fault-finding, even with that which is void. This is just like our companion (the rough-drafter) or the discovery that he reached! Or both of them together are well-informed!

Secondly: Conversion into the transitive form (*ta'diya*) of the word '*al-jawāb*' (answer) with '*alā*' (on) is totally correct, this is when the (intended) answer is not connected to a direct question that is answered, but rather it refers to an answer which has the meaning of replying,²⁸ discussing, commenting, criticising and correcting. In this case takes it carries a different meaning so it is allowed within Arabic grammar to convert it (the word '*jawāb*') into the transitive form with: *fee*, '*alā*', *li* and even at some rare times to use '*an*'.²⁹

This is the evidence unto you:

Thirdly: the evidence for what I have said is plentiful:

1. The *hadeeth* of the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) which was reported by Muslim in his Saheeh (*hadeeth* no.2166): “wa inna **nujābu 'alayhim**, wa la yujābūna **'alaynā...**” (“...and we answer them but they do not answer us...”)

²⁷ See *al-Qāmūs al-Muheet*, p.1577

²⁸ He himself (ad-Dawsarī), may Allāh guide him, fell into the same error that he accused me of making!! He stated: “I decided to refute (**Radd 'alayhi**) what he had written...”!! This is the meaning exactly that I have explained.

²⁹ In the *Musnad* of Imam Ahmad (18095) within the *hadeeth* of Safwān bin 'Assāl al-Murādī in regards to seeking knowledge is his saying: “*wa ajābahu 'alā nahwin min mas'alatihī*” (“and he answered the issue that he had”) and within another copy of the *hadeeth*: “*fa ajābahu 'an mas'alatihī*” (“he answered the issue that he had”)!

2. The statement of Imām ash-Shāfi'ī³⁰: “The Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) **yujeebu 'alā** nahwi ma yus'alu 'anhu” (“...answered whatever was asked of him...”). Imām at-Tirmidhī transmitted this from him within his *Sunan* (*badeeth* no.792).
3. The statement of Imām an-Nasā'ī in his *Sunan* (*badeeth* no.3970): “**Mujāwibatān 'alā qawlika**” (“in answering your saying”).
4. The statement of Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in *al-Majmū'*, vol.24, p.349: “**al-jawābu 'alā hadha min wujūhin...**” (“the answer to this has a number of aspects...”). In *al-Fawā'id an-Nūrāniyyah al-Fiqhiyyah* (p.249): “**al-jawābu 'alā qawlihim...**” (“the answer to their saying is...”)
5. The custom of Arabic authors and their ilk in titling the following works do not necessitate the authors to make the conversion (of the word 'jawāb') into the transitive form via use of 'an only:
 - Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī (*rahimabullāh*), **al-Ajwibatu al-Wāridah 'alā'l-As'ila al-Wāfidah**.
 - Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimabullāh*), **al-Jawābu Saheeh li-man Baddala Deen al-Maseeh**.
 - 'Allāmah al-Luknowī (*rahimabullāh*), **al-Ajwibatu al-Fādilah li-l-As'ilati'l-Asbratil-Kāmilah**.
 - Al-Hāfidh as-Sakhāwī, **al-Ajwibatu al-Mardiyyah fīmā Su'ila 'anhu min al-Abādeeth an-Nabawiyyah**.
 - Al-Hāfidh as-Sakhāwī, **al-Ajwibatu al-'Urfiyyah li'l-Masā'il as-Sarfyyah**, as is found within *Iktifā' al-Qanū'* (p.469). All of these works are published.
 - Al-Hāfidh as-Sakhāwī, **al-Ajwibatu 'alā Masā'il min al-Mabsool**, as is found within *ad-Durur al-Kāminah*, vol.4, p.299
 - Az-Zurqānī, **al-Ajwibatu al-Misriyyah 'alā'l-As'ilati'l-Maghribiyyah**
 - Az-Zurqānī, **al-Ajwibatu al-Mu'allalah fi'l-Masā'il al-Mujabbalah**, as is found within *Fibris Makhtootāt* of Chester Beatty (p.3847). Also see *Kashf udb-Dhunūn*, vol.1, p.12 and *al-Badr ut-Tālī'*, vol.1, p.330.

And there are plenty of further examples like this!³¹

³⁰ The proof of his words in regards to language are not hidden from the student of knowledge! See Imam al-Bayhaqī, *Manāqib ush-Shāfi'ī*, vol.2, pp.41-59.

³¹ **Translator's note:** Hence, those who still like to champion what was written by Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī now have to account for this ridiculous error from him in regards to the Arabic language.

Fallen claims

Fifth: his (ad-Dawsarī's) claim against me that:

“He (i.e. Shaykh 'Alī Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī) makes much tajreeh of his brothers who are Du'āt, and also of the students of knowledge who oppose him in these and other issues. Even with whoever does not agree with him in authenticating hadeeth or weakening hadeeth – this is well-known and verified in his books. On the other hand, he does not object to the secularists, atheists, heretics and the corrupt at all and does not give them even a quarter of what he dedicates to (refuting) his brothers, Allāhu Musta'an!”

Yes, Allāhu Musta'an against the people of transgression, enmity, oppression and falsification!

An explanation:

A reply to his claims are from a number of aspects:

1. What you (O Dawsarī) call, in your terms of expression, “Tajreeh” is, in the language of 'Ilm you do not adequately comprehend as maybe you do not know it, is under the issue of al-Jarh wa't-Ta'deel with its acknowledged rules. Within this science terms such as Mukhti', Mudallis, Kadhhāb, Majhūl, Juhūl and the likes are utilised. However, where are you to knowledge O my brother Ibn Sālim?!
2. As for me making “Tajreeh/Jarh” of those who do not agree with me in authenticating or weakening hadeeth – then this is a lie of the drafter (ad-Dawsarī) and his falsification. I know very well that the **science of hadeeth is ijtihād** wherein there can be a view and another view so long as these views emanate from those who are qualified people to give their view. As for mere claimants to the science then their writings soon fall and their words fade away. In order to cover himself in regards to the fact that he does not even mention the least amount of proof of his claim, the drafter states falsely: **“this is well-known and verified in his books.”**

Samples of Academic Hadeeth Studies

The opposite of what has been stated about me, all praise is due to Allāh, is abundant and here unto you are some proofs of that:

1. My treatise *Tanqeeh ul-Andhār bi Da'f Hadeeth "Ramadān: Awwaluhu Rabmatun, wa Awsatuhu Maghfīrah wa Ākbaruhu 'Itq min an-Nār"* [Bringing Attention to the Weakness of the Hadeeth "Ramadān – the first of it is mercy, the middle of it is forgiveness and the last of it is salvation from the Hellfire"]. Riyadh, KSA: Dār ul-Maseer, 1418 AH. Within my research I also debated (the view of) Shaykh Abū 'AbdurRahmān adh-Dhāhirī (*hafīdhahullāh*) and on page 9 I referred to him as: "al-'Allāmah, al-Muhaqqiq, al-Bāhith, al-Mudaqqiq, Shaykh, al-Ustādh..." So where is this language of praise in comparison to this false claim (of ad-Dawsarī)?
2. My treatise *al-Kashf wa't-Tibyān li 'Ilal Hadeeth: "Allāhumma innī As'aluka bi Haqq is-Sā'ileen"* [Exposing and Clarification of the Defects of the Hadeeth "O Allāh I ask You by the right of the askers"], Dammām, KSA: Dār ul-Hijrah, 1410 AH. Within my research I also debated (the view of) the respected Shaykh Ismā'eel al-Ansarī (*rahimahullāh*) and on page 5 I described as "the noble Shaykh strove to authenticate the hadeeth and verify its pillars." On page 9 I stated **"...written by the noble Shaykh Ismā'eel al-Ansarī, researcher at Dār ul-Iftā' wa'l-Buhūth al-'Ilmiyyah wa'l-Irshad in Riyādh, may Allāh grant him success in that which is good."** I also said towards the end of my introduction: **"If I have been correct in what I have written then that is from the complete favour of Allāh upon me. If I have erred or fallen short then that is from my own weakness and shortcomings, and I ask Allāh for forgiveness, pardon, correctness, steadfastness and for Him, Glory unto Him, to grant success to our dignified Shaykhs and well-versed teachers to accept the truth even if it is against them, and that they do not narrow their hearts to clarity and attention."**³² So where are my words from his (ad-Dawsarī's) claims?!
3. My treatise *Tanweer ul-'Ayn'ayn fī Turuq Hadeeth fī Kashf al-Wajh wa'l-Kaffayn* [Enlightening the Eyes to the Routes of the Hadeeth Regarding Covering the Face and Hands].³³

³² I repeat these words today, in this instance, after more than ten years since when I first wrote this.

³³ Recently, I came across a new treatise entitled *an-Naqd ul-Bannā' li-Hadeeth Asmā'*, printed about a year or more ago, by our noble brother who is specialised in hadeeth and who is a student of knowledge of the Prophetic hadeeth, Tāriq 'Awadullāh, may Allāh grant him success. Within it he commented on my treatise *Tanweer ul-'Ayn'ayn fī Turuq Hadeeth fī Kashf al-Wajh wa'l-Kaffayn* [Enlightening the Eyes to the Routes of the Hadeeth Regarding Covering the Face and Hands] and critiqued it in an academic manner – even though I do not agree with him! He described me with the following, may Allāh increase him in goodness, on page 187:

"...he (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī) is from our brothers who are occupied with this noble science (of hadeeth) and he is from our brothers who have a thankful hand in defending the Sunnah and refuting Ahl u-Bida'."

I say: may Allāh thank him for his justice and uprightness.

'Ammān, Jordan: Dār 'Ammār, 1410 AH. I stated towards the end of my introduction (pp.10-11): “Verification, narration, precision and patience are gleaming signposts which the student of knowledge and the preacher has to crown himself with in his path of thinking, and his method of study and his methodology in adopting opinions. As for whoever is not a student of knowledge then it is obligatory upon him to adopt the ideas of those whose knowledge has been attested to and whose deen has been assured of. I ask Allāh, glory unto Him, that I be in agreement with what is correct and that I have left error and doubt. From Allāh’s success, and all praise is due to Allāh, glory unto Him, along with His abundant virtue and favours, is what if my pen slips and my understanding leaves that which is true, is that Allāh’s Pardon is Greater and His Mercy is Vast. I seek from every loving brother, beloved one, advisor and student of knowledge that if he sees within this Juz’ an error of the pen or in judgement to be patient with beautiful patience and to lead us to that which is he truth. The truth, by Allāh, is more beloved to us than our own selves.”³⁴ So where is my right in light of his (ad-Dawsarī’s) falsehood?!

There is no reason except confusion

However, it appears that the drafter (i.e. ad-Dawsarī) is mixing things up! It may be that he views some of my strong, and I do not say “harsh”, refutations on some of the Ahl ul-Bida’ such as the destroyer of the Sunnah, Ibn 'AbdulMannān, Mahmūd Sa'eed Mamdūh, al-Ghumārī, as-Sābūnī, al-Ghazālī and the likes – and ad-Dawsarī, may Allāh guide him, did not distinguish between the Sunnī and the Bidī'ī amid his “safeguarding of uniting the word and unifying the ranks”!³⁵

3 – As for his (ad-Dawsarī’s statement about me that): “...he does not object to the secularists, atheists, heretics and the corrupt at all...”

The ruling on refuting the secularists and atheists

I say: the answer to this is from two sides:

ONE: general, which is that I say: is “refuting the secularists, atheists, heretics and the corrupt...” Fard 'Ayn or Fard Kifāyah? If he says it is Fard Kifāyah – then he has refuted himself

³⁴ I repeat these words today, and I will continue to repeat these words so long as there is a pulse in my veins , inshā'Allāh.

³⁵ As ad-Dawsarī says on page 21 of the Second Edition of *his Raf' ul-Lā'imah!*

and contradicted his own words! Why is he obligating the individual (fard) with what is being adequately conducted by other than him?! If he says it is Fard 'Ayn then he has come with something which none from the past, or present, has stated!

TWO: detailed, which is that I say: I have, all praise is due to Allāh, refuted the “secularists, atheists, heretics and the corrupt...” with many things and not just once, such as with these:

Strong Academic Samples

- a. A refutation of famous secularists such as Muhammad Ahmad Khalafullāh and Husayn Ahmad Ameen – as found in my book *al-'Aqlāniyyūn: Afrākeh al-Mu'tazilah al-'Asriyyūn* [The Rationalists: Chicks of the Contemporary Mu'tazilah], pp.65-67. Madeenah an-Nabawiyyah: Maktabat ul-Ghurabā', 1413 AH.
- b. A refutation of those influenced by some atheists 'who claim to protect the *deen* yet reject what the Messengers came with' as found in the treatise of al-'Allāmah as-Sa'dī, *Intisār ul-Haqq*, p.9 – which I edited, Dammām: Dār Ibn ul-Qayyim, 1408 AH.
- c. A refutation of some of the contemporary atheists and their attempts to utilise the story of the Gharāneeq so as criticise Islām and the Muslims in the form of refuting Salmān Rushdie who wrote on the 'Satanic verses' which caused tremendous reactions in the Islamic world, Western world and across the globe generally. I wrote articles in some Jordanian newspapers about this atheist entitled '*Āyāt Salmān Rushdie Bayna'l-Ams wa'l-Yawm*' [The Signs of Salmān Rushdie Between Yesterday and Today]. Just as in my book *Dalā'il ut-Tabqeeq li Ibtāl Qissat il-Ghrāneeq* (Jeddah, KSA: Maktabat us-Sahābah, 1412 AH), p.17.
- d. A refutation of the “corrupt one” Ibn 'Arabī, the Sūfī and Hulūlī in Shaykh Taqeeuddeen al-Fāsi's *Juz' 'Aqeedat Ibn 'Arabī wa Hayātibi* (Dammām, KSA: Maktabat Ibn al-Jawzī, 1408 AH).
- e. A refutation of all “corrupt ones” who all into resembling the Mushrikeen about whom it is deserving that it be said of them: *Tashbeeh ul-Khasees bi Ahl il-Khamees* – which in fact is the name of the treatise written by Imām adh-Dhahabī, printed in Jordan by Dār 'Ammār in 1408 AH.

Other than these are many and Allāh is the Most High and Ever-Able. So where is my situation and reality to his lies and oppression?

Sixth: his (ad-Dawsarī's) statement about me that:

“He (i.e. Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī) views himself as being of the guardians of Salafiyyah and its Manhaj, and that all who disagree with him are Khalafīs and not Salafīs – as if the Salafī Manhaj is a monopoly of just a specific group or restricted to a specific place.

Guardianship or False Claims and Propaganda?!

I say:

1. The claim of possessing “guardianship over Salafiyyah and its Manhaj” is a major and dangerous issue. For many “groups” today claim it and accuse their opposers of contradicting it, so the issue is not restricted to a specific “person” or restricted to a certain “place”! Furthermore, if we want to, or if we strive to, consider ourselves, or view ourselves, as being guardians and protectors of Salafiyyah – then this consideration of us is for our senior Mashā'iykh who we ascribe ourselves to and attach all of the Ummah to: they are the reference points who are to be referred back to, (and this is to be understood) clearly and lucidly.

As for safeguarding this then yes (Na'am) and it is a blessing (Ni'ma)

Yes, I safeguard as much as I can, all praise is due to Allāh, along with our Mashā'iykh and our brothers, the Salafī Manhaj so that it can remain pure with no doubts. This is a matter which should make all of us want to give victory to it

As for his (ad-Dawsarī's) statement that it is “...as if the Salafī Manhaj is a monopoly of just a specific group or restricted to a specific place.”

By Allāh, this statement is probably the most truthful thing that Ibn Sālim has drafted! Yes, the Salafī Manhaj is not a monopoly of just a specific group, be it formal or local!

The Salafī Manhaj is above all people

(It is not the monopoly of):

*Neither a Hay'a nor a Lajnah,
Neither a Jam'iyyah nor a Markaz,
Neither a person nor personalities,
Neither groups nor individuals,*

And it is not a monopoly of a specific place:

*Neither Najd nor Hījaz,
Neither Damascus nor 'Ammān,
Neither Egypt nor Lubnān,
Neither Yemen nor Pakistān*

This is what we say and this is what we are upon, so that the connection is more exalted and linked to evidence and textual proof and nothing else from statements and personalities!