

# **A WARNING AGAINST THE WEBSITE 'SALAFIMEDIA.COM'**

## **THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SALAFIS AND OMAR BAKRI'S CULT GROUPS (FROM MUHAJIROUN TO SALAFIMEDIA.COM)<sup>1</sup>**

**“A DECEPTIVE AND DIABOLICAL PLOT DEVELOPED IN  
2009 BY MEMBERS OF ‘AL-MUHAJIROUN’ (WHOSE IDEAS  
WERE BEHIND MICHAEL ADEBOLAJO AND THE  
WOOLWICH ATTACK)  
AND EX-ABDULLAH FAISAL JAMAYKI GROUPIES TO  
PRESENT THEMSELVES AS “SALAFI” IN ORDER TO  
CONFUSE MUSLIMS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC...HEREIN  
IS A RIGOUROUS DEMOLITION OF THEIR EVIL PLOYS...”**

---

*In the Name of Allah, the Most Beneficent, Most Merciful*

This is a warning against the website which since 2009 has been referring to itself as 'salafimedia'<sup>2</sup> in order to cause confusion among Muslims and the general public about

---

<sup>1</sup> By Abu Ameenah 'AbdurRahmān Bennet and AbdulHaq al-Ashanti.

<sup>2</sup> See here: <http://www.youtube.com/user/SALAFIMEDIAUK/videos> and  
<http://www.youtube.com/user/salafimediaHD>

The one behind the 'salafimedia.com' website is "Abū Waleed", an ignorant and petite East London based al-Muhajiroun comedian and former 'Abdullah El-Faisal groupie – a big mouth with a noticeably miniscule stature who was nowhere near as vocal in Brixton in April 2009 when directly facing the Brixton Salafis. He can be seen here around ten years ago sitting next to 'Abdullah El-Faisal al-Jamaykee in this lecture in London entitled *'The Effects of Oppression'* (!? indeed, Faisal should take his own advice; it is as if he does not listen to his own lectures!). "Abu Waleed" can be seen sporting a "Muhajiroun T-Shirt" (!?):  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ogOK3jF94lE&feature=related>

"Abu Waleed" cannot even adequately pronounce the Qamarī and Shamsī letters in Arabic (!?), but here he is on Youtube "teaching" lessons on 'aqeedah! In part 4 of a "lesson" conducted by "Abū Waleed" on "Nawabit al-Takfeer" (!?), after 19:55, Abū Waleed quotes a fabricated hadeeth and tries to

Salafiyyah. Their site is full of material by al-Qaeda leaders (such as Anwar al-Awlaki, Usama bin Ladin and Ayman Zawahiri), Abu Muhammad al-Maqdisi, Takfiris and Jihadis – **all of whom have not studied Islam, are not Salafi scholars, are not known to preach Salafiyyah, never claim to be Salafi and have never ever referred to themselves as Salafi.** So then why do they persist in using Salafiyyah, if it is not to just cause confusion? This evil development was identified by SalafiManhaj.com over four years yet they are still persisting. As a result, and in light of the Woolwich attack committed by youth who were influenced by al-Muhajiroun propaganda and teachings, a complete and systematic demolition of the ideas of this cult is necessary by Muslims who adhere to the Salafi tradition, so that the lines do not become blurred. Herein will be a comprehensive list of the differences between Salafis and the aalafimedia.com site which is a nothing but a website to promote al-Qaeda leaders such as Usama bin Ladin, Ayman Zawahiri and Anwar Awlaki, as well as Takfiris and Jihadis such Omar Bakri, , Abū Hamza al-Misri, Abū Qatada al-Filistini, 'Abdullah Faisal al-Jamayi and Abū Muhammad Maqdisi. They are deceptively using modern-day Khawarij who have been consistently refuted by the Salafis.

---

use this fabricated hadeeth to explain the correct belief in imān:  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HeidzKqhU10>

The hadeeth is in Ibn Mājah from 'Ali ibn Abī Tālib that Allāh's Messenger 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 hadeeth *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 (Manākeer) ahaadeeth 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-Matrūkeen*: **"More than one person accused him of lying."** Ad-Dāraquṭnī stated: **"He was a filthy Raafidī."** See *Tahdheeb 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'eefah wa'l-Mawdū'ah*, vol.6, p.519 that Yahyā Ibn Ma'een gave three different confusing statements on him, and only Ibn Ma'een and al-Hākim deemed him as trustworthy. Abu's-Salt AbdusSalām bin Sālih al-Harawī also narrated the fabricated narrations attributed to the Prophet: *"I am the city of knowledge and Ali is its door, so whoever wants knowledge should seek it from its door."*

In the same lecture "Abu Waleed" refers to Omar Bakri as "Sheikh Omar", and also refers to musicians such as Cutty Ranks and Grime musicians?! After 4 minutes into part 5 of "Nawabit al-Takfeer" (!?) he states that the Sharee'ah has not been implemented for over 80 years! Hereby referring to the Ottoman Caliphate as an example of Sharee'ah implementation, yet by their own standards it would have necessitated them to make takfeer of it in fact!

They refer to Abu Hamza as “a scholar of haqq [truth]”. Abū Hamza Mustafā ibn Kamāl ibn Mustafā al-Misrī, born in Alexandria in 1958 CE he arrived in the UK in 1979 CE and began practicing Islām in London in the mid-1980s after being a nightclub bouncer in the city of London. He assumed British citizenship in the mid-1980s and after divorcing his British wife. He later was to assume a heroic status after having both his arms blown off, some claim in Afghānistān, while others say during an industrial accident. Abū Hamza is not known to have studied at all with the people of knowledge and he did/does not have any teachers and did not study at any Islamic centre of learning or institution. He rose to notoriety in London, and the world in fact, due to featuring regularly on *al-Jazeera* and other Arabic TV channels and gained a band of followers after taking over a *masjid* in Finsbury Park by force with his blind-followers.

When one of the leading Salafī scholars of recent years died, Imām Bin Bāz (*rahimahullāh*), in 1999 CE the ruined Abū Hamza wrote an entire article on his ‘*Supporters of Sharee’ah*’ website entitled ‘*The Death of an Evil Scholar*’ wherein he poured scorn on Imām Bin Bāz. Clear mockery and abuse of the ‘Ulama, then people wonder why the likes of him are going through the difficulties they are facing! Al-Bukhārī reports on the authority of Abū Hurayrah (*radi Allāhu ‘anhu*) that the Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallām*) said that Allāh said: “*Whoever shows enmity to a Wali of mine then I have declared war against him.*”

Due to the constant pressure that the Salafis placed on Muhajiroun regarding the importance of calling to tawheed in the 1990s, this ultimately caused them to succumb to the primary obligation of calling to tawheed. However, still hell-bent on maintaining their political objectives they adopted an innovated concept of tawheed and its categories, which opposed the classical definition.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in their rhetoric related to tawheed it can be observed that in most cases they give reference to ‘*al-Hākimiyyah*’ (rulership and ‘sovereignty’),<sup>2</sup> which in itself is not a category, rather a facet of one of the main categories. This should provoke the question: why the need to extract a part of tawheed which is found in one of its main categories, and then promote it as one of its main categories? Their current talks and lectures therefore prove this point clearly, as can be seen in some of the lectures on tawheed that are available from the internet. Seeing the opportunity which lies within the force of tawheed, they cunningly recognised the political potential this term and concept has in recruiting the youth and the masses, cue their constant referral to the innovated category of Tawheed ul-Hākimiyyah and rulership. Thinking that by limiting tawheed to the misguidance of the Muslim leaders, this will somehow solve our woeful predicaments. Their adoption of tawheed therefore is nothing but a superficial one, as to appease Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, and to give the false impression that they are calling to the truth,

upon the truth, not forgetting, that it was actually the Salafis who initially placed pressure on them to give precedence and importance to tawheed.

So prior to this also, they never wore *thobes* or focused on the Sunnah, the documentary *Tottenham Ayatollah* is proof of this wherein Anjem Choudhary, Abū Izzaddeen and others can be seen with trimmed beards, *musbil* (*garments below their ankles*), wearing suits and resembling those who they never tire of reminding the Muslims about (i.e. disbelievers) in attire and appearance<sup>3</sup> and up until 2002 they only discussed:

- ✓ *Khilāfab*
- ✓ *Politics*
- ✓ *Removing the rulers, after making takfeer of the Muslim ones of them*
- ✓ *Khabr ul-Āhād should not be taken into 'aqeedah*
- ✓ *Allegiance to the kuffār*

The very fact that the movements and organisations of Omar Bakrī and his blind followers have undergone such metamorphosis indicates that they have no solid foundation or basis. For if they are truly upon the correct way, then why do they have to change every year or two?! So they emulate the Salafis only in matters which do not conflict or compromise their own political-Khawārij agenda, trying to emulate the da'wah Salafiyyah in many ways like a wolf in sheep's clothing. So they recognise what amounts to the truth but still stubbornly follow their desires, hence their adoption of the name "Salafi" and falsely calling to tawheed (when they only emphasise Hākimiyyah). The phenomenon observed in their compulsive, ritual name changing is the clearest example of their misguidance and falsehood. So what is the catalyst for such erratic behaviour? Does the truth need to conform, adapt and change like this? When medicated over, what becomes apparent is that such idiosyncrasy is actually a sign of falsehood – as it is falsehood alone that feels the need to evolve and adapt - ever trying to mimic the truth and go with the flow of the zeitgeist. But what is important to note here is the important Arabic saying which is replete in the writings of the Islamic scholars that:

«لسان الحال أبين من لسان المقال»

*A person's condition is clearer than verbal expression*

(Or as is said with the English expression: 'actions speak louder than words')

Or with the use of different elatives (*asmā ut-tafdeel*) such as:

«لسان الحال أصدق من لسان المقال»

Or:

«لسان الحال أبلغ من لسان المقال»

Or:

«لسان الحال أفصح من لسان المقال»

Or:

«لسان الحال أقوى من لسان المقال»

Another principle that is oft-repeated within the books of Usūl is:

«العبرة بالحقائق والمعاني لا بالألفاظ والمباني»

*“What are important are the realities and the meanings (that are applied), not terms and structures”  
(so if there is a contradiction between a term and the reality of what is being manifest then the reality and what it means is what is of importance, despite the use of a mere term)*

Another principle found in the books of Usūl is:

« ادعاء المُسميات لا يُلزم ثَبوت الـ صـ فـ ات »

*“Claiming names does not necessitate affirmation of the characteristics (of those names)”*

These profound expressions and principles are going to be primary for this study, for they indicate that despite what a person says, his true condition is always shown by his actions. Therefore, despite bold claims to Salafiyah and sayings and slogans about following the Salafi manhaj, these slogans mean nothing when one’s true condition and actions can tell us more as to whether a person is truly and sincerely following the correct Salafi understanding or not. Within the Usūl of Ahl us-Sunnah is the fact that:

**The main example (to follow) is the way of the Ahl ul-Hadeeth and their manhaj, so whoever says with his tongue “I am from Ahl ul-Hadeeth” and may have even studied hadeeth then he is not considered to be from the Ahl ul-Hadeeth until he traverses their way and manhaj, so what is of importance is that a person’s condition is more indicative than verbal expression (actions speak louder than words).<sup>4</sup>**

Indeed, of the characteristics of the Ahl ul-Bida’ (people of innovation) is that they formulate false principles and then scavenge the sources to justify such principles and give them credence. So Ahl ul-Bida’ take something from Islām which is sound and then stealthily annex to it a principle of *bātil* (falsehood). Imām Muhammad bin Sālih al-’Uthaymeen (*rahimabullāh*) stated in his commentary on *at-Tabdbeer min Fitnat it-Takfeer*, pp.68-69:

**Another matter is that can be appended to that is: evil intent necessitates evil understanding, because when a person wants and intends something this**

necessitates a person transmitting his understanding in accordance to what he wants and intends, and then he distorts the texts accordingly. From the well-known principles of the 'Ulama was that they used to say: deduce then believe, don't believe and then deduce and be misguided. The three reasons are:

- 1 – Lack of Shari' knowledge.
- 2 – Lack of fiqh of Shari' principles
- 3 – Evil understanding resulting from evil intent and desire.

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SALAFIS AND THE DECEPTIVELY-TITLED **‘SALAFIMEDIA.COM’ WEBSITE**

[ALL REFERENCES ARE AT END OF DOCUMENT IN THE FORM OF ENDNOTES]

TOPIC (below)	Omar Bakrī, Anjem Choudhary, Abu Waleed (salafimedia.com) and their Cult Followers  [some issues are also shared with other neo-Khawārij cults and new-age Takfīrīs]	Salafiyyah
<b>Tawheed</b>	<p><i>Tawbeed</i> is referred to due to its status in Islām, yet its meaning is confined to the innovated matter of <i>al-Hākimiyyah</i>.<sup>5</sup> Slight referral to the statements of Imām Muhammad bin ‘AbdulWahhāb in regards to <i>tawbeed</i>, but not in detail. Emphasis on <i>al-Hākimiyyah</i> as a separate category, in keeping with the <i>Harakī-Takfīrī</i> fascination of this issue as inherited from Sayyid Qutb. <i>Tawbeed</i> is understood without the need of having to refer to those specialised in the field, rather Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq is the primary reference point in these matters and not those who have more knowledge of the works of</p>	<p><i>Al-Hākimiyyah</i> is not a separate category; rather, it is an integral part of the category <i>Rubūbiyyah</i> and <i>Ulūbiyyah</i>. There is no difference of opinion amongst the contemporary Imāms - such as Imām ‘Abdul’Azeez bin Bāz, Imām Muhammad bin Sālih al-‘Uthaymeen, Imām Nāsir ad-Dīn al-Albānī, Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān, Shaykh Sālih Āli Shaykh and other heads of the salafī da’wah - regarding the innovated call to <i>al-Hākimiyyah</i> as an independent category. Shaykh ‘Uthaymeen said about this <i>Hākimiyyah</i>’ concept: <b>“This statement is a newly-invented, innovated, evil saying, making the one who uses it repugnant...and it is indeed a</b></p>

	<p>Imām Muhammad bin ‘AbdulWahhāb.</p>	<p><b>misguided innovation.”<sup>6</sup></b></p> <p>Based on the well-known principle of the <i>Usūliyyin</i>, <b>‘there is no harm in technical terminology/ classification as long as it does not contain any corruption’</b>, <i>Hākimiyyah</i> as an independent category is rejected for two reasons: (1) <i>Hākimiyyah</i> is an integral part of <i>Rubūbiyyah</i> and <i>Ulūhiyyah</i>, and thus removal of this integral part from its main category would result in a classification fallacy. An example of this would be if we were to remove black men from the broad class of men and make them an independent category of men. Not only would this result in a false classification, it would also leave a deficit in the broad classification of men. (2) Isolating <i>Hākimiyyah</i> and rendering it in to an independent category is a political ploy used by the takfiris to provoke the people into rebelling against the rulers. Due to these two reasons, the well-known principle of <b>‘there is no harm in technical terminology/ classification as long as it does not contain any corruption’</b> is brought into effect and as a result, <i>Hākimiyyah</i>, as an independent category, is rejected because it is a</p>
--	--	---

		<i>mafsadah</i> (corruption).
<p><b>Dealing with the Rulers [a]</b></p>	<p>Blanket <i>takfeer</i> is to be made of the rulers, without looking into the matters of <i>istihlāl</i>, <i>ibāha</i> or what actually constitutes <i>kufr</i>. All the rulers in the Muslim world are apostates, as seen in their petite article ‘Six Reasons Why all the Rulers Are Apostates’<sup>7</sup> and their article ‘Apostasy of the Rulers’.<sup>8</sup></p> <p>Omar Bakrī in a book which is available Online entitled <i>The Islamic Verdict on Jihad and the Method to Establish the Khlilafah</i>, and written during the <i>al-Muhajiroun</i> phase, states in his definition of “<b>Dār ul-Kufr</b>” that this also includes “<b>Muslim countries where Muslims have authority</b>” and cites Pakistan, Malaysia and Saudi Arabia as examples! Refer to: page 13 of the following:</p> <p><a href="http://osolihin.files.wordpress.com/2007/03/jihad-and-methodology.pdf">http://osolihin.files.wordpress.com/2007/03/jihad-and-methodology.pdf</a></p> <p>In the above document pp.11-15 Bakrī also makes up his own categories of the abodes with no</p>	<p><i>Takfeer</i> has preventative factors which have to be safeguarded before a ruling can be made. <i>Takfeer</i> firstly is an exclusive matter which is performed only by the scholars and not any layman, let alone by ignoramuses. In the Two Saheehs from Ibn ‘Umar (<i>radi Allāhu ‘anhu</i>) who said: the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam</i>) said:</p> <p>روي ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: إذا قال الرجل لصاحبه "يا كافر" فإنها تجب على أحدهما. فإن كان الذي قيل له كافر فهو كافر. وإلا رجع إليه ما قال.</p> <p>“Whenever a man says to his brother: “O <i>kāfir!</i>” then it applies to one of them or it returns to the one who actually said it first.”<sup>11</sup></p>

	<p>source referencing whatsoever!</p> <p>In a video on youtube Omar Bakrī praises a cult of death and makes <i>takfeer</i> of Saudi Arabia.<sup>9</sup></p> <p>Anjem Choudhary stated in an interview with Press TV Channel on 20 March 2009: <b>“I think that the whole world today is governed by non-Islāmic law.”</b><sup>10</sup></p>	
<p><b>Dealing with the Rulers [b]</b></p>	<p>The rulers are the cause of the problems in the Muslim world today. Recently, in a lecture entitled <i>‘The Tanāgheet of Saudi Arabia’</i> found on the Islam4uk website, the speaker, an unknown and uncouth youth who goes by the fake name of ‘Abū Turāb’ for this lecture, says after 40 minutes and 50 seconds that: <b>“Saudi Arabia is the leading country of shirk, kufr and bida’.”</b></p>	<p>The rulers are a mere reflection of the people themselves.<sup>12</sup> It has been authenticated in <i>musnad</i> of Imām Ahmad and the <i>sunan</i> of Abū Dāwūd from Thawbān (<i>radi Allāhu ‘anhu</i>) who said that the messenger of Allāh said: <i>“The nations will soon invite each other to attack you, just as people invite each other to eat from a dish.”</i> Someone asked: <i>“Will that be because of our small numbers at that time?”</i></p> <p>He (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam</i>) replied, <i>“No, you will be numerous at that time, but you will be like scum, like the scum and filth carried by a torrent, and Allāh will take fear from the hearts of your enemy and will place wahn into your hearts.”</i> Someone asked, <i>“What is ‘wahn’ O messenger of Allāh?”</i> He (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam</i>) replied,</p>

		<p><i>“Love of the dunya and hatred for death.”</i></p>
<p><b>Dealings with the Kuffār [a]</b></p>	<p>No sort of dealings with <i>kuffār</i> are allowed whatsoever and are <i>kufr</i>.<sup>13</sup> But it is allowed to take welfare state benefits from them every two weeks as is in the process in the UK, along with utilising the <i>National Health Service</i> and seeking council housing. In the 1996 documentary shown on Channel 4 entitled <i>Tottenham Ayatollah</i>, which Omar Bakrī freely and openly participated in, Bakrī on national TV (<i>Thursday Night Live</i>) openly admitted to being receipt of £150 per week in welfare state handouts, see 31 minutes into the documentary.<sup>14</sup></p> <p>Bakrī also says about the documentary-maker who is of Jewish background and his team that they are: <b>“his friends now and friends help each other out”</b>.<sup>15</sup></p> <p>This in itself would nullify the other extreme position concerning <i>al-Walā wa'l-Barā'</i> but this is not to be questioned whatsoever. The bark is to be</p>	<p>Dealings with the <i>kuffār</i> are allowed in certain circumstances with conditions which do not go against the Book of Allāh.<sup>16</sup> The Prophet Muhammad (<i>sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i>) said: <i>“What is the condition of men who make conditions based on conditions which are not based on the Book of Allāh? Every condition which is not based on the Book of Allāh is invalid even if there are a hundred conditions. The book of Allāh is truer and the stipulation of Allāh is firmer.”</i> Refer to Sunan Ibn Mājah, vol.2, pp.842-843, no.2521.</p>

	worse than the actual bite.	
<b>Dealings with the Kuffār [b]</b>	There can be no relationship whatsoever with the <i>kuffār</i> . However, since 2007 Omar Bakrī came to the realisation, based on what he took from the likes of Abū Baseer at-Tartūsī, that there is a “covenant” between Muslims and the non-Muslims. <sup>17</sup>	Some relations with the <i>kuffār</i> are <i>kufr</i> , some are <i>harām</i> and some are <i>wājib</i> , some are permissible. For example, it is <i>kufr</i> to love a disbeliever on account of his <i>deen</i> and aid him in manifesting his <i>deen</i> over Muslims. It is allowed to love a disbeliever for a reason other than his <i>deen</i> and <i>'aqeedah</i> , such as when a Muslim man marries a chaste woman from the Jews or Christians, there is going to be some natural love involved in such a relationship. So when Allāh allowed this, this indicates that this type of love of a non-Muslim is allowed. See Shaykh, Dr Muhammad bin 'Umar bin Sālim al-Bāzmūl (College of Da'wah and Usūl ud-Deen, Qur'ān and Sunnah Department, Umm ul-Qura University), <i>al-Walā' wa'l-Barā'</i> (Cairo: Dār ul-Istiqāmah, 1427 AH/2006 CE), p.13.  It is also allowed to co-operate with <i>kuffār</i> in worldly affairs and in mutually exchanges such as buying, selling, trade, business, benefitting from their expertise, employing them and the likes. Rather this has a benefit for the Muslims and serves the <i>deen</i> . We treat them well the

		<p><i>kuffār</i> who are good to us and there is also no problem in a Muslim man marrying a chaste Jewish or Christian woman. Likewise, a Muslim child has to treat his non-Muslim parents well and give them their rights and within these examples (of marriage and parents) there is natural love involved. It is prohibited for a Muslim to resemble the <i>kuffār</i>. Refer to Shaykh, Dr Sālih bin Fawzān bin 'Abdullāh al-Fawzān, <i>Sbarh Risālat ud-Dalā'il fī Hukm Muwalāt Ahl Asbrāk li'sh-Shaykh Sulaymān bin 'Abdullāh Muhammad 'AbdulWabbāb</i> (n.p., 1428 AH/2007 CE)</p>
<p><b>Dealings with the Kuffār [c]</b></p>	<p>All <i>kuffār</i> are against the <i>deen</i> and thus there can be no agreements and the like with them, unless Omar Bakrī Muhammad realises that there can be some dealings with them.</p>	<p>The <i>kuffār</i> are of different types and thus are to be treated accordingly. Ibn ul-Qayyim stated: <b>“The kuffār are either: Ahl ul-Harb, Ahl ul-'Ahd or Ahl ul-Amān. Three categories: Ahl udh-Dhimmah, Ahl ul-Hudnah and Ahl ul-Amān.”</b> Refer to Ibn ul-Qayyim, <i>Abkām Ahl udh-Dhimmah</i>, vol.2, p.873.</p>
<p><b>Isti'ānah bi'l-Kuffār (Seeking assistance from non-Muslims)</b></p>	<p>Not allowed at any time whatsoever and is <i>kufr</i>. Inherited from the post-<i>Hiẓb ut-Tabreer</i> and early '<i>al-Mubajiroun</i>' phase. Indeed, it is the “worst sin” as stated by some former</p>	<p>Is allowed at certain times with conditions, as the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i>) enlisted the help of 'Abdullāh bin 'Uraqit al-Laythī, while he was a disbeliever. So help from them is</p>

	<p>and current followers of Omar Bakrī up to this day. Recently in London, an <i>al-Muhajrioun</i> defector, former Omar Bakrī Muhammad cult member and now philosophy student at <i>Birkbeck University</i>,<sup>18</sup> stated in a dialogue with some Salafis in London that allowing the US troops into Saudi Arabia was “the biggest sin”?! There is no doubt therefore that even after his defection from Bakrī’s <i>al-Muhajiroun</i> the individual has still retained some of Omar Bakrī Muhammad’s teachings.</p>	<p>also allowed at times.<sup>19</sup></p>
<p><b>Jihad</b></p>	<p><b>Anyone who fights the Kuffār is regarded instantly as a “Mujāhid”</b> and is supported regardless of who they are as long as they claim they are waging jihad. Jihad is generally not to be actually waged but support is to be given to whomsoever claims to be doing it around the world.<sup>20</sup> The issue of Ahd ul-Amān [Covenant of Safety] is one wherein “there is a difference of opinion”. Omar Bakri justifies the Woolwich attack and the actions of Michael Adebolajo, a student of Bakri. Bakri stated that</p>	<p>Jihad has core principles and types. The Divinely Legislated Jihad is legislated due to other corroborating factors, which is establishing the <i>deen</i> of Allāh in the earth. Before calling to it (Jihad) there must be the presence of the Divinely Legislated detailed <i>fiqh</i> along with deep and lengthy analysis. From the particular affairs in comprehending the condition of the Muslims is that if they are weak due to their numbers, or due to their lack of preparation in relation to their enemies, it is not correct for them to tread the path of armed jihad against the enemy due to their</p>

	<p>Adebolajo is a “hero” and “courageous” for attacking a military target.<sup>21</sup></p>	<p>condition of weakness. What makes this apparent is the fact that Allāh did not instruct His Messenger (<i>sallallāhu alayhi wassallam</i>) and the Companions (<i>radi Allāhu ‘anhum</i>) to fight the <i>kuffār</i> when they were in Makkah due to their weakness in number and in readiness in relation to their enemies.<sup>22</sup></p> <p>Ibn Taymiyyah said:</p> <p><b>“It was instructed to abstain from fighting them due to his inability and the inability of the Muslims. Then when they migrated to Madeenah and gained assistance, Allāh permitted him to make (armed) jihad and then when they grew in strength Allāh prescribed fighting for them. Yet Allāh did not prescribe fighting beforehand for their own safety as they were not able to fight all of the kuffār. But when Allāh opened up Makkah for them and halted fighting against the Quraysh and the kings of the Arabs and a delegation of Arabs came into Islām, Allāh instructed the Prophet (<i>sallallāhu alayhi wassallam</i>) with fighting all of the kuffār except those who had a temporal bond of agreement</b></p>
--	---	--

		<p>and Allāh instructed him to annul those absolute agreements and that which annulled it was leaving fighting.”</p> <p>Refer to: Ibn Taymiyyah, <i>al-Jawāb as-Saheeh</i>, vol.1, p.237.</p> <p>There is a Covenant of Safety and Security in the form of a passport of other documentation which take the ruling of the covenant. If any Muslim wants to free themselves then they must hand this back openly and clearly and clearly announce their enmity as Allaah says:</p> <p>﴿وَأَمَّا تَخَافَنَّ مِنْ قَوْمٍ خِيَانَةً فَانْبِذْ إِلَيْهِمْ عَلَى سَوَاءٍ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْخَائِنِينَ﴾</p> <p>“If you [have reason to] fear from a people betrayal, throw [their treaty] back to them, [putting you] on equal terms. Indeed, Allāh does not like traitors.”</p> <p>{<i>al-Anfaal</i> (8): 58}</p> <p>Ibn Katheer stated in the tafseer of this noble ayah:</p> <p>أي : أعلمهم بأنك قد نقضت عهدهم حتى يبقى علمك وعلمهم بأنك حرب لهم ، وهم حرب لك ، وأنه لا عهد بينك وبينهم على</p>
--	--	--

		<p>السواء ، أي : تستوي أنت وهم في ذلك</p> <p><b>Meaning:</b> informing them that you are severing the treaty. This way, you will be on equal terms, in that, you and they will be aware that a state of war exists between you and that the bilateral peace treaty is null and void...</p> <p>وعن الوليد بن مسلم أنه قال في قوله : {</p> <p>فَأَنْبِذْ إِلَيْهِمْ عَلَى سَوَاءٍ { أي : على مهل ، }</p> <p>إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْخَائِنِينَ { أي : حتى ولو في</p> <p>حق الكفارين ، لا يجها أيضاً.</p> <p>From al-Waleed bin Muslim that he said in regards to Allaah saying:</p> <p>﴿ فَأَنْبِذْ إِلَيْهِمْ عَلَى سَوَاءٍ ﴾</p> <p><b>That it means: “prepared”. And in regards to Allah’s saying</b></p> <p>﴿ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْخَائِنِينَ ﴾</p> <p><b>“Certainly Allah likes not the treacherous”</b></p> <p><b>Meaning:</b> “even if it is in regards to the right of the disbelievers, Allah does not love that.”</p> <p>Ibn Katheer continues:</p> <p><b>This even includes treachery against the disbelievers. Imaam Ahmad recorded that Salim bin</b></p>
--	--	---

	<p>'Amir said, "Mu'aawiyah was leading an army in Roman lands, at a time the bilateral peace treaty was valid. He wanted to go closer to their forces so that when the treaty of peace ended, he could invade them. An old man riding on his animal said, "Allahu Akbar (Allah is the Great), Allahu Akbar! Be honest and stay away from betrayal."</p> <p>The Messenger of Allah said,</p> <p>«وَمَنْ كَانَ بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ قَوْمٍ عَهْدٌ فَلَا يَحُلُّنَّ عَهْدَهُ وَلَا يَشُدُّهَا حَتَّى يَنْقَضِيَ أَجَلُهَا، أَوْ يَنْبُدَّ إِلَيْهِمْ عَلَى سَوَاءٍ»</p> <p><i>"Whoever has a treaty of peace with a people, then he should not untie any part of it or tie it harder until the treaty reaches its appointed term. Or, he should declare the treaty null and void so that they are both on equal terms."</i></p> <p>When Mu'āwiyah was informed of the Prophet's statement, he retreated. They found that man to be 'Amr bin 'Anbasah, may Allāh be pleased with him." This Hadith was also collected by Abu Dawud At-Tayālīsī, Abu Dawud, at-Tirmidhī, an-Nasā'ī and Ibn Hibbān in his Saheeh. At-Tirmidhī said: "Hasan Saheeh."</p> <p>Ibn ul-Munāsif (563-620 AH/1168-</p>
--	--

		<p>1223 CE) states in his magnum opus on jihad fiqh <i>Kitāb ul-Injād fī Abwāb il-Jihād</i>:</p> <p>As for writing and the indications and the likes that it contains, then all of that are terms and understandings which are no different to spoken words.<sup>23</sup> The ruling of this takes into account meanings and understandings not mere words. What affirms this is that the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallāllāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i>) wrote to the kings of <i>kufr</i> calling them to Islām and signalled to his companions. Also the signal that was given in regards to the Jewish person who hit a girl with two stones. She signalled with her head (i.e. nodded) when she was asked as to who the culprit was and when the name of the culprit was mentioned a third time she said: yes and nodded with her head...The hadeeth was reported by Muslim in his Saheeh.<sup>24</sup> All of this is clear evidence and a lucid proof of the Divine Legislation fulfilling acting upon understandings. <b>If a Muslim</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p>does not intend to grant the covenant of security that the [non-Muslim combatant thinks he has due to what the Muslim done which appears to be a covenant, yet the combatant is assured [that he has a covenant of security] – then the sanctity of a covenant of security is granted to the combatant. As for fulfilling what the combatant thinks [is a covenant of security] or granting him safe passage without attacking him, after he thought that he has a covenant of assurance and security anyway which insured that he would not killed or imprisoned, then Allāh says,</p> <p>﴿وَأَمَّا نَحْوَانَ مِّن قَوْمٍ حَيَّانَةً فَانْبِذْ﴾</p> <p>﴿إِلَيْهِمْ عَلَى سَوَاءٍ﴾</p> <p>“If you [have reason to] fear from a people betrayal, throw [their treaty] back to them, [putting you] on equal terms.”</p> <p>{<i>al-Anfāl</i> (8): 58}</p> <p>Allāh instructs to inform them of any rejection of</p>
--	--	---

		<p>what they thought they had agreed to which insured their security and trust. It is not permissible to attack them until they know with insight what their affair is and they are warned, this was the origin for everything that the people of kufr felt was a covenant and a trust from the Muslims.</p> <p>As for the one who indicates in a way in which a covenant of security is sensed or does something which apparently establishes a covenant of security yet does not intend to give [a trust of covenant], then he falls into one of two conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Either he was inattentive and did not intend to grant a trust, or covenant of security thus did not adhere to the assurance at all, <b>in which case he was still a cause for assuring [the combatant].</b> As a result, the Muslim has to maintain this trust as he was the cause for (the combatant thinking) that he had a trust.</li> <li>❖ Or he pretended to give a</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<p>covenant and trust on purpose knowing that he does not intend to grant security whatsoever. All he wishes to do is delude the person in order to gain power over the person, this is the basis of treachery and betrayal is harām according to the consensus. For this reason, 'Umar bin al-Khattāb (radi Allāhu 'anhu) promised what he did<sup>25</sup> and there is no known difference among the Muslims in regards to the prohibition of treachery and betrayal. We will clarify inshā'Allāh the difference between the deception which is allowed during warfare and the treachery which is not allowed in regards to the trust and covenant of security.<sup>26</sup></p> <p>Ibn ul-Munaasif, in his magnum opus on jihad fiqh, therefore states clearly that “there is no difference of opinion” in regards to betrayal of covenants and agreements. Any enmity has to be clearly stated and any fighting openly and clearly announced – while they know. Opposing this is ruling by other</p>
--	--	---

		than what Allāh has revealed.
<b>Terrorists</b>	<p>Terrorists are good and they should be supported and protected according to Omar Bakrī.<sup>27</sup></p> <p>The attackers on 9/11 are the <b>“magnificent 19”</b> and should be referred to as such, as stated on national British TV for example by Abū ’Uzayr of Leyton, East London.</p>	<p>Terrorists are motivated by emotions and haste which as a result leads them to extreme acts of violence wherein Muslims and non-Muslims are killed in the process of them trying to achieve their aims. They are misguided and ignorant of jihad and its principles. Allāh says</p> <p><b>“Fight in the way of Allāh those who fight you but do not transgress. Indeed. Allāh does not like transgressors.”</b></p> <p>{<i>Baqara (2): 190</i>}</p>
<b>Targeting Innocent People in Warfare</b>	<p>Indiscriminate suicide bombings, which target innocent people, are not to be condemned as there are proofs for this, refer to words of Anjem Choudhary here in his BBC <i>Hard Talk</i> interview in 2003 with Tim Sebastian: <a href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/hardtalk/3014703.stm">http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/hardtalk/3014703.stm</a> Non-Muslim children are not innocent according to Omar Bakrī.<sup>28</sup></p> <p>“Martyrdom operations” are <b>“completely praiseworthy”</b> as</p>	<p>Non-Muslim civilians are not to be targeted in warfare. From Buraydah (<i>radi Allāhu ’anhu</i>) that the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam</i>) used to say<sup>30</sup>: “<i>Fight in the way of Allāh and fight those who disbelieve in Allāh. Do battle and do not exceed the limits, do not depart (from the battle), do not mutilate and do not kill children or those in monasteries (i.e. places of worship).</i>”<sup>31</sup></p> <p>Abū Bakr as-Siddeeq (<i>radi Allāhu ’anhu</i>) said to Yazeed bin Abī Sufyān (<i>radi Allāhu ’anhu</i>) when he sent him to Shām, “<i>You will surely find a people</i></p>

	<p>Abū Izzaddeen stated in his interview on <i>Newsnight</i> with Richard Watson in September 2006.<sup>29</sup></p> <p>Asif Mohammed Hanif, along with Omar Khan Sharif, who blew himself up at a Cafe in Tel Aviv, was a member of “al-Muhajiroun.” Those guilty of the “Crevice plot” to use fertiliser bombs to blow up the Bluewater Shopping Centre and Ministry of Sound nightclub in central London were linked to the cult of Omar Bakrī Muhammad. Muhammad Junaid Babar of Queens (New York), was a cult follower of Omar Bakrī Muhammad and then turned Supergrass and informant for the FBI and gave the full details of the links, being a “star witness” for the prosecution. Muhammad Junaid Babar was given immunity from prosecution in regards to the charges against the British <i>al-Muhajiroun</i> cult followers involved.</p> <p>Due to these events however, the line is that innocents within the UK are not to be attack as there is a “covenant” between</p>	<p><i>who claim to have secluded themselves for Allāh, so leave them to what they claim they have secluded themselves for and I advise you with ten matters: do not kill women, children, the elderly and infirm. Do not chop down the fruit-bearing trees. Do not destroy inhabited places. Do not slaughter sheep or camels except for food. Do not burn bees and do not scatter them. Do not steal from the booty and do not be cowardly.”</i><sup>32</sup></p> <p>See: Shaykh Hamad bin Ibrāheem al-’Uthmān, <i>Jihād: Anwā’ahu wa Abkāmuhu, wa’l-Hadd al-Fāsil Baynahu wa Bayna’l-Fawda</i> (’Ammān: Dār ul-Athariyyah, 1428 AH/2007 CE), pp.220-28.</p> <p>The story of the people of Tā’if being attacked with <i>manjaneeq</i> is not relayed with an authentic <i>sanad</i>.<sup>33</sup></p>
--	--	--

	the country and Muslims.	
<b>Non-Muslim Governments</b>	Enmity is to be shown towards this country without having to make <i>hijrah</i> from it and without necessarily having to target UK citizens on their shores. One can still sit here claiming the <i>DHSS</i> from non-Muslim governments and receiving financial support from them. Condemnation and political agitation does not impede the “covenant” between the UK and cult followers.	The Western non-Muslim government are disbelievers and as a result do things which are against the <i>deen</i> . If a Muslim freely chooses to live under a non-Muslim government he should maintain good relations with his neighbours and give them <i>da'wab</i> . Furthermore, the Muslim has an agreement of safety and trust (‘Ahd ul-Amān) with such non-Muslims which he cannot renege upon. If a Muslim does not like living under the non-Muslim government then he should leave it immediately, get out and go to live in a Muslim country. A Muslim should not sit there taking welfare state benefit handouts every two weeks and council houses from the non-Muslim government and at the same time complain about it. Speaking about any government is <i>haram</i> if it will bring about harm. No benefit is gained by merely saying any ridiculous thing just for the sake of “speaking out”. Refer to audio lectures by Shaykh, Dr Khālid al-Anbaree on <i>Politics in Light of Islām</i> at <a href="http://www.salafimanhaj.com">www.salafimanhaj.com</a>

<p><b>Politics</b></p>	<p>Extremism in dealing with the foreign policies of the British government and manipulation of this in order to whip the Muslims up into a frenzy, as inherited from <i>Hiżb ut-Tabreer</i>. The <i>deen</i> is used excessively in order to put forward political aims.</p>	<p>Those in authority over the Muslims are in charge of the political arena primarily. Political discussion is not given precedence over <i>tanbeed</i> and it is never used to rally the Muslims.<sup>34</sup> As for extremism in this regard then the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam</i>) said on the authority of Ibn ’Abbās (<i>radi Allāhu ’anhu</i>): “Beware of extremism in the religion! For the people before you were destroyed due to extremism in the religion.” Recorded by Ibn Mājah,<sup>35</sup> an-Nasā’ī,<sup>36</sup> Ibn Khuzaymah authenticated the hadeeth<sup>37</sup> as did Ibn Hibbān<sup>38</sup> and al-Hākim and adh-Dhahabī agreed.<sup>39</sup></p>
<p><b>Demonstrations, Protests and Rallies: “The Public Da’wah” [a]</b></p>	<p>Allowed and part of commanding the good in London and the wider UK, regardless of the consequences and the negative image they give over, as inherited from <i>Hiżb ut-Tabreer</i>. Also regardless of the fact that no credible scholar of the Sunnah has deduced that demonstrations, protests and rallies are a Divinely Legislated means for rectification. ’Umar and Hamza (<i>radi Allāhu ’anhum</i>) “marched” as reported in some</p>	<p>Allāh says,          ﴿ادْعُ إِلَى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحُكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ          وَجَادِهِمْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَنْ          ضَلَّ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ﴾  <b>“Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good instruction, and argue with them in a way that is best. Indeed, your Lord is most knowing of who has strayed from His way, and He is most knowing of who</b></p>

	<p>narrations and this is proof that marches, rallies, protests and demonstrations are allowed.</p> <p>After our published 2009 book on <i>al-Mubajiroun</i> however, they ditched referring to this story as a proof – yet still continued with their protests, marches and demonstrations! This shows that they pursued following their desires even though there is no proof from the Sunnah or Salaf for such a method – in fact demonstrations were methods used to bring down the Rightly-Guided Caliphs and their Islamic states.</p> <p>Moreover, protests and rallies are good publicity stunts for the cult.</p> <p>Demonstrations can involve any slogan that attracts attention and rabble-rouses. Therefore, banners and slogans which state the following are allowed: <b>“behead those who insult Islām”, “be prepared for the real holocaust”, “slay those who insult Islām” and “O Muslims be with the terrorists”, “Europe Europe you will pay, the fantastic four</b></p>	<p><b>is [rightly] guided.”</b></p> <p>{<i>an-Nahl (16): 125</i>}</p> <p>Allāh also instructed Mūsā in regards to the Pharaoh, the leader of <i>kufr</i>, <i>shirk</i>, <i>dhulm</i> and <i>tughyān</i> of his day:</p> <p>﴿فَقُولَا لَهُ قَوْلًا لَّيْسًا لَّعَلَّهُ يَتَذَكَّرُ أَوْ يَخْشَى﴾</p> <p><b>“And speak to him with gentle speech that perhaps he may be reminded or fear [Allāh].”</b></p> <p>{<i>TāHā (20): 44</i>}</p> <p>Demonstrations are an innovation which have no basis and are not from the methodology of the <i>Salaf</i> in calling to Allāh, hence none of the ’Ulama of Ahl us-Sunnah sanction them. The Companions (<i>radī Allāhu ’anhum</i>) did not march or protest in the streets screaming words of political incitement directed at those in authority, their enemies and others who were antagonistic to the <i>deen</i>.</p> <p>The narrations which state that ’Umar and Hamza “marched” are <i>da’eef</i> (weak) due to the presence of Ishāq bin Abī Farwah in the <i>isnad</i> and he is Matrook. See Ibn Hajr, <i>at-Taqreeb</i>, p.102 and <i>al-Isābah</i>, vol.4,</p>
--	--	--

	<p><b>are on their way”</b>. See:  <a href="http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/4700976.stm">http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/4700976.stm</a></p> <p>Dressing up as suicide bombers and flag-burning, in order to enrage the <i>kuffār</i>, are also totally legitimate and part of the <b>“public da’wah”</b>. As done by Omar Khayam of Bedford, a convicted crack cocaine dealer who was out on parole and attended a Bakrī-inspired demonstration in London in 2006 dressed in this way.</p> <p>Slogans such as <b>“Khaybar, Khaybar yā Yahood”</b> were utilized at a demonstration by Omar Bakrī’s cult followers in New York from the so-called <i>Islamic Thinkers Society</i>’ in May 2008.<sup>40</sup></p>	<p>p.280.</p> <p>Demonstrations are based on the futile methodologies of non-believing socialists and anarchists. Since when has a demonstration benefitted any political party or group? The Salafī Imām ‘Abdul’Azeez bin Bāz (<i>rahimahullāh</i>) stated:</p> <p><b>“A good method is of the greatest means for acceptance of the truth. While a bad and violent method is of the most dangerous means for rejection of the truth and for a lack of accepting it, it can cause unrest, oppression, enmity and tension.</b></p> <p><b>The demonstrations that some people do are connected to this as they cause serious evils for the preachers (du’āt), as do protests in the streets. Demonstrations are not the way to rectify situations and give da’wah.</b></p> <p><b>Rather the correct way is to visit and write in a way that is better and advise the leader, ruler or tribal Shaykh without violence and demonstrating.</b></p> <p><b>The Prophet (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam) remained in Makkah</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p>for thirteen years and neither demonstrated or protested nor threatened to destroy people's properties or assassinate people.”<sup>41</sup></p> <p>Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān stated in regards to a question that was posed to him about staging protests and demonstrations and if they are to be considered Jihād:</p> <p>There is no benefit in demonstrations – it is just commotion. They are a type of disorder. How will it cause harm to the enemy if the people go out and demonstrate in one of the streets raising their voices? Rather, this is from the things that will only make the enemy pleased and happy. Thus he (the enemy) will say: “This has harmed and hurt them.” So the enemy will rejoice. Islām is a religion of tranquility and calmness; it is a religion of knowledge. It is not a religion of clamor and commotion. It is a religion that strives to achieve tranquility and calmness, while at the same time, (encourages) doing deeds that are of benefit and praise, such as providing support for the Muslims,</p>
--	--	---

		<p>supplicating for them and providing them with money and weapons. This is praiseworthy. And also (what is beneficial is) arguing on their behalf to the various countries that the oppression they are in be uplifted and requesting from these countries, which claim to have democracy, that these Muslims be given their due rights. And humanitarian rights are what these people boast so much about. However, according to them the only human is the disbeliever, whereas the Muslim in their eyes is not a human being – he is a terrorist! They call the Muslims terrorists! And the human being that has (humanitarian) rights, according to them, is the disbeliever! So the Muslims must follow and adhere to the methodology Islām has prescribed with regard to these occurrences and other situations. Islām did not come with demonstrations, shouting and raising voices. It did not prescribe destroying property or committing violations. Yes, all of this is neither part of Islām nor does this bring about any benefit. This only causes harm to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>the Muslims and it does not harm the enemy. This only harms the Muslims and it does not harm their enemy. In fact, their enemy rejoices at this and says (to himself): “I have affected them”, “I have made them angry” and “I have influenced them.”<sup>42</sup></p>
<p><b>Khilāfah</b></p>	<p>The Prophetic Khilāfah ended on March 3<sup>rd</sup> 1924 CE. This has been mentioned by cult followers such as “Abū Farruq” of Luton, in a recent lecture entitled <i>‘The Devil’s Deception of the Reformist’</i>.<sup>43</sup> It was also mentioned by “Abū Waleed” after 4 minutes into his “lesson” (!?) on “Nawabit al-Takfeer” (!?).</p> <p>Apparently, a day before this dismantling there was a Prophetic Khilāfah, the belief as inherited from <i>Hiẓb ut-Tabreer</i>. It was also stated by another ignorant cult follower.<sup>44</sup></p> <p>After our published 2009 book on <i>al-Muhajiroun</i> they then mainly began to brush this under the carpet, due to the revelations about the legal and civil codes of the Ottoman Empire which, by their own</p>	<p>Ahmad bin Muneeh’ah narrated from Suraij bin Nu’mān who narrated from Hashraj bin Nubātah on the authority of Sa’eed bin Jamhān who said: Safeenah said: the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassalam</i>) said, <i>“The Khilāfah in my Ummah will be thirty (30) years, and then after it there will be kingship.”</i> Refer to <i>Saheeh Sunan at-Tirmidhī</i>, vol.2, p.486 no.2226 and Imām al-Albānī said the hadeeth is Saheeh.<sup>45</sup> As for the Ottoman “Caliphate” then it was an empire which by Omar Bakrī’s own <i>takefīrī</i> standards would have easily qualified as an apostate state due to its seeking help and assistance from disbelieving states during the Crimean war, not to mention its involvement in grave-worship! Refer to Shaykh, Dr Sālīh bin Fawzān bin ‘Abdullāh al-Fawzān, <i>Sharh Risālat ud-Dalā’il fee Hukm Muwalāt Abl Ashrak li’sb-Shaykh</i></p>

	<p>Takfirī standards, would qualify for takfeer!</p>	<p><i>Sulaymān bin ‘Abdullāh Muhammad ‘AbdulWahhāb</i> (n.p., 1428 AH/2007 CE), pp.15, 41-46, 49.</p>
<p><b>Commanding the Good and Forbidding the Evil: “Public Da’wah” [b]</b></p>	<p>As inherited from <i>Hiżb ut-Tabreer</i>, the good has to be enjoined even if it may bring about potential harm. It is to be used as a slogan without fully implementing it correctly as the classical scholars have highlighted in their books. Ranting, raving and rabble-raising without knowledge, while lip-service is paid to knowledge preceding action,<sup>46</sup> and are all legitimate forms of enjoining the good and forbidding evil, regardless of whether such activities bring about any harm upon the entire Muslim community. There are no principles for commanding the good and forbidding the evil, the “good” is to be commanded no matter what. To not command the good due to harm is an excuse to leave an obligation. Refer to lecture entitled <i>Benefit and Harm</i> by “Abū Ibrahim” an Omar Bakrī follower.<sup>47</sup></p> <p>The false, revolutionary</p>	<p>Abū Sa’eed Al-Khudrī (<i>radi Allāhu ‘anhu</i>) said: I heard the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam</i>) say:</p> <p><i>“Whoever of you sees an evil action, let him change it with his hand; and if he is unable to do so, then with his tongue; and if he is unable to do so, then with his heart; and that is the weakest of īmān.”</i></p> <p>Recorded in Saheeh Muslim.</p> <p>Sufyan ath-Thawrī stated that:</p> <p><b>None is to command the ruler to good except for a man who has knowledge of what he is commanding to, has knowledge of what he is forbidding, is gentle when commanding, gentle when forbidding, just when commanding and just when forbidding.</b><sup>48</sup></p> <p>Forbidding the evil is always given precedence over its sister half of enjoining the good, unless the good, outweighs the evil. Furthermore, there is <i>fiqh</i> to this issue.<sup>49</sup> Attention has to be paid to the <i>fiqh</i> principle of: <i>dafa’ al-mafāsīd muqaddim ‘ala ijtilāb il-masālib</i> also referred to as</p>

	<p>principle of:</p> <p><b>الغاية تبرر الوسيلة</b></p> <p>“the ends justify the means”, inherited from other <i>Harakāt-Takfīrīs</i> applies.</p>	<p><i>dar' al-mafāsīd awlā min jalb ul-masālib</i> (averting harms take precedence over obtaining benefits). Along with taking into consideration the <i>fiqh</i> of <i>Ma'alat</i> (end results and consequences).</p> <p>Also from the conditions of commanding the good and forbidding the evil are: capability and security. Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah, <i>Majmū' al-Fatāwā</i>, vol.28, p.66.</p> <p>Al-Hāfidh Abū Bakr al-Khallāl (d. 311 AH/923 CE) reported that Imām Ahmed was asked about commanding good and forbidding evil when one is in a state of fear:</p> <p>أخبرنا حرب بن إسماعيل قال سمعت إسحاق بن راهويه حدثهم أن أبا عبد الله سئل: الأمر بالمعروف والنهي عن المنكر واجب على المسلم؟ قال: نعم قال: فإن خشي؟ قال هو واجب عليه حتى يخاف فإذا خشي على نفسه فلا يفعل</p> <p>“Harb bin Isma’il informed us: he said I heard Ishāq bin Rahawayh narrating to them that Abū ‘Abdillāh was asked: [is] commanding the good and forbidding the evil obligatory on the Muslim? He said yes. He said and if he fears?</p> <p>He said it is obligatory for him</p>
--	---	--

		<p>until he fears. If he fears for himself, he does not do it.”</p> <p>Refer to al-Hāfidh Abū Bakr Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Hāroon al-Khallāl (d. 234-311 AH/CE), eds. Mashhūr bin Hasan bin Mahmood Āl Salmān and Hishām bin Ismāʿīl as-Saqā, <i>Kitāb al-ʿAmr biʾl-Maʿroof waʾn-Nahy ʿan al-Munkar</i> (ʿAmman and Beirut: Dār ul-ʿAmmār and al-Maktab al-Islāmi, 1410 AH/1990 CE), p.25.<sup>50</sup></p> <p>Ibn ul-Qayyim said:</p> <p><b>“[Based on its effects] forbidding the evil has four levels:</b></p> <p>The first level is that the evil would end and be replaced by its opposite [i.e. good]. The second level is that it [the evil] will diminish without ending completely. The third is that the evil will be replaced by [an evil] equivalent to it and this is liable to ijtihād. The fourth level is that the evil will be replaced by an evil worse than it.</p> <p>The first two levels conform with the Shariah; the third is liable to ijtiḥad (scholarly judgement) and the fourth is prohibited.”</p> <p>See Ibn ul-Qayyim, <i>Iʿlam al-</i></p>
--	--	--

		<i>Muwaqqi'een</i> , pp.22-24
<b>Source References for Understanding the Deen [a]</b>	The Qur'an and Sunnah, in a restricted sense as in many instances they neither rule by what Allah has revealed nor encourage it in a holistic sense. <sup>51</sup> Interpretations of the Qur'aan and Sunnah are based on the understanding of Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq primarily and then based on snippets from the understanding of the neo-Khawārij.	The Qur'an and Sunnah, in its totality, in accordance with the understanding of the <i>Salaf us-Sālih</i> . The Messenger of Allāh ( <i>sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i> ) made clear that the best of people are his generation and then those who come after them, he said ( <i>sallallāhu alayhi wassallam</i> ): "The best of people are my generation, then those who come after them and then those come after them." <sup>52</sup>
<b>Source References for Understanding the Deen [b]: Understanding the Creed (which includes issues of how to deal with the rulers)</b>	Whatever Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq composes, this will change in accordance with the desires of Omar Bakrī.	The early books of creed such as: <i>Usūl us-Sunnah</i> of Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal; <i>Sharh us-Sunnah</i> of Imām al-Muzanī (d. 264 AH); <i>as-Sunnah</i> by Imām Abdullāh bin Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 290 AH); <i>Sareeh us-Sunnah</i> by Imām Ibn Jareer at-Tabaree (d. 310 AH); <i>Sharh us-Sunnah</i> by Imām al-Barbahārī (d. 329 AH); <i>ash-Sharee'ah</i> by Imām Abū Bakr al-Ājurrī (d. 360 AH); <i>I'tiqād Abl us-Sunnah</i> by Imām Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī (d. 371 AH); <i>Sharh Usūl I'tiqād Abl us-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah</i> by Imām al-Lālikā'ī (d.418H); <i>'Aqeedah us-Salaf wa As-hāb ul-Hadeeth</i> by Imām Abū Uthmān as-Sābūnī (449 AH).

<p><b>Source</b> <b>References for</b> <b>Understanding</b> <b>the Deen [c]:</b> <b>Ijtihād</b></p>	<p>Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq is a fully qualified scholar entirely capable of <i>ijtihād</i>, as inherited from <i>Hizb ut-Tabreer</i> misinformation.</p>	<p><i>Ijtihād</i> has conditions, so it is <i>haram</i> for a man to make <i>ijtihād</i> until the conditions of <i>ijtihād</i> have been maintained.<sup>53</sup> Some of the conditions for <i>ijtihād</i> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maturity and intelligence, as <i>ijtihād</i> is worship.</li> <li>- Strong understanding to be able to make <i>istinbāt</i> (deductions).</li> <li>- Strong memorisation of the intended issues along with memorisation of the <i>Shari'</i> texts, or at least strong understanding and familiarity with the source <i>Shari'</i> texts.</li> <li>- 'Ilm of what the sciences one is seeking to derive a ruling from is based upon. These sciences are knowledge of the Book of Allāh and of the <i>ayahs</i> related to the <i>abkām</i>; knowledge of the <i>nāsikh</i> and <i>mansookh</i> from the Book of Allāh; knowledge of the general and specific; knowledge of <i>al-Itlāq</i> and <i>at-Taqeed</i>; knowledge of <i>ahādeeth</i>, which explains the Qur'ān and what is <i>Sabeeh</i> and <i>da'eef</i> from them, along</li> </ul>
---	---	---

		<p>with knowledge of the <i>abad</i> narrations and the <i>mutawātir</i>; knowledge of <i>Usūl</i> and the <i>Qawā'id</i> of <i>fiqh</i>; knowledge of the Arabic language, grammar, morphology and <i>bayān</i>; knowledge of the <i>furū' fiqhīyyah</i>.</p> <p>- The above are the conditions for a Mujtahid Madhhab who has to know what those of his madhhab have concurred and outlined in accordance with the <i>Usūl</i> of the Imām of the madhhab.</p> <p>Refer to Imām Ibn 'Āsim al-Ghranāṭī al-Mālikī, ed. Fakhruddeen bin az-Zubayr bin 'Alī al-Mahasī, <i>Sharh Nudhum Murtaqā al-Wusūl ila 'Ilm il-Usūl</i> (ʿAmmān, Jordan: Dār ul-Athariyyah, 1428 AH/2007 CE), pp.772-774. also see az-Zarkashī, eds. Panel of Ulama from al-Azhar, <i>al-Babr ul-Mubeet</i> (Dār ul-Khānī, 1414 AH, 1<sup>st</sup> Edn.), vol.8, p.237</p> <p>The more correct opinion with the scholars of <i>Usūl</i> is that <i>ijtihād</i> has parts, so a person can make <i>ijtihād</i> in some issues but not in others as <i>ijtihād</i> has types.<sup>54</sup></p>
--	--	---

<p><b>Source References for Understanding the Deen [d]: Taqleed</b></p>	<p>Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq is to be followed and is the main source of reference to go back to for matters related to Islām. He refers his followers whom to listen to, take from and promote, as evidenced in the website ‘salfimedia.com’ which contains material which was originally in Arabic translated into English by others. He is to be followed uncritically primarily, followed but other Takfiri preachers who will be mentioned in the forthcoming sections. Their views are given primacy over the Qur’ān and Sunnah. In the issue of <i>Abd ul-Amān</i> [covenant of safety and security] whole verses of the Qur’ān will be bypassed in order to follow any <i>shādh</i> view from a preacher. However, publically it is to be asserted that <i>taqleed</i> is forbidden.<sup>55</sup></p>	<p>The Qur’ān and Sunnah are the main references to refer back to. A Muslim, if able, should research the evidences. The Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam</i>) stated: “<i>I have left two things among you which you will not be misguided after them, the Book of Allāh and my Sunnah.</i>” The hadeeth is reported by al-Hākim and is Saheeh. Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah said:</p> <p><b>“It has been verified in the Book, Sunnah and Ijmā’ that Allāh has obligated the creation to obey Him and His Messenger and He did not obligate this Ummah to obey anyone else specifically in all that he instructs and forbids, except for the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam). They also agreed that no one is infallible in all that he commands and forbids except for the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam). For this reason, more than one of the Imāms has said: ‘every person has their statement accepted or rejected except for the Messenger of Allāh.’”</b></p> <p>See Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, <i>Majmū’ al-Fatāwā</i>, vol.20, p.210.</p>
---	--	--

		<p>Ibn Taymiyyah also said:</p> <p><b>“As for the obligation of following a speaker in every single thing that he says without mentioning the evidence for the accuracy of what he says, then this is not correct. Rather this level is only for the Messenger of Allāh which is only suitable for him (sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam).”</b> See Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn ‘Taymiyyah, <i>Majmū’ al-Fatāwā</i>, vol.35, p.121.</p>
<p><b>Manhaj</b></p>	<p>This changes as often as a baby changes its nappies, based on the political zeitgeist and also depending on whatever Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq and Anjem Choudary cook up whenever it tickles their fancy and desires.</p>	<p>Does not change with the times, rather is based on the Qur’ān, Sunnah and <i>Salaf us-Sālih</i>. The Prophet (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam</i>) instructed his followers to follow his Sunnah and the Sunnah of the Khulafā’ ar-Rāshideen and he (<i>sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam</i>) warned against opposing them, he said: <i>“Stick to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the Rightly guided Caliphs after me. Hold firm to it and bite onto it with the molars, and beware of newly invented matters for every newly-invented matter is an innovation and every innovation is misguidance.”</i><sup>56</sup></p> <p>Imām Ahmad (<i>rahimabullāh</i>) said:</p>

	<p>“The Foundations of the Sunnah with us are: Holding firm to what the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu alayhi wassallam) and following them and abandoning innovation.”<sup>57</sup></p> <p>Ibn ul-Qayyim said: Whoever spreads statements or forms principles based on his understanding and interpretation then it is not obligatory for the Ummah to follow this or to refer judgement to this (i.e. the man’s own principles and interpretations) until it is compared to what the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam) came with.</p> <p>If it agrees with it and its authenticity, and is authenticated, then at that time it (i.e. a person’s own principles and interpretations) will be accepted, but if it opposes what the Messenger of Allāh came with then it will be rejected and discarded. If none of these sides are clarified then the matter becomes deferred (and one should hesitate in making a definite decision). The best case is that it is allowed to accept</p>
--	--

		<p>such views and issue fatāwā based on them, or they can be rejected.<sup>58</sup></p>
<p><b>The 'Ulama [a]</b></p>	<p>The Muslim scholars are all <b>“scholars for dollars”</b> and <b>“government scholars”</b>, and as a result are not to be trusted. Therefore, only Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq is a trustworthy source along with other assorted speakers who agree with him and whom he refers his blind followers to listen to, which culminated in the ‘salafimedia.com’ website. Usama bin Ladin is a “Sheikh” and “man of jihad and knowledge”.<sup>59</sup> Ayman Zawahiri is a “Sheikh” who can criticize Imaam Bin Baaz and defame him.<sup>60</sup></p> <p>See next section.</p>	<p>The 'Ulama are to be respected and their guidance is important,<sup>61</sup> Narrated 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Amr Ibn al-'Ās (<i>radi Allāhu 'anhu</i>): “I heard Allāh’s Messenger (<i>sallallāhu alayhi wasallam</i>) saying: “<i>Allāh does not take away the knowledge by taking it away from (the hearts of) the people, but He takes it away by the death of the scholars till when none (of the scholars) remains. People will then take as their leaders ignorant people who when consulted will give their verdicts without knowledge. So, they will go astray and will lead others astray.</i>”<sup>62</sup></p> <p>Aboo Hurayrah (<i>radi Allāhu 'anhu</i>) narrated that the Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu alayhi wassallam</i>) said: “<i>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!</i>” Then it was asked: “<i>What are the Ruwaybidah?</i>” He (<i>sallallāhu alayhi wassallam</i>) replied: “<i>The foolish</i></p>

		<p><i>insignificant man who speaks about general affairs.</i><sup>63</sup></p>
<p><b>The 'Ulama [b]</b></p>	<p>The only scholars to be referred to include Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq, who is the primary source to be followed as he is a <i>Mufti</i> and <i>Mujtabid</i>, in keeping with what was inherited from <i>Hiżb ut-Tabreer UK</i> in the mid-1990s. Other options for knowledge are 'Abdullāh Faisal al-Jamaykī,<sup>64</sup> Abū Hamza al-Misrī, Anwar al-Awlakī,<sup>65</sup> Abū Qatādah<sup>66</sup> and Abū Baseer at-Tartūsī.<sup>67</sup></p>	<p>The Prophet (<i>sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i>) feared for his Ummah the Imāms of misguidance, he said (<i>sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i>): <i>“What I fear for my Ummah are the Imāms of misguidance.”</i><sup>68</sup> He warned about them in the context of the <i>hadeeth</i> about the Dajjāl when he (<i>sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i>) said: <i>“I fear for you other matters besides the Dajjāl.”</i><sup>69</sup></p> <p>The contemporary Salafi scholars of the Sunnah of the recent period are: Imām Muhammad Nāsīruddeen al-Albānī; Imām 'Abdul'Azeez bin Bāz; Imām Muhammad bin Sālih al-'Uthaymeen, Imām Muqbil ibn Hādī al-Wādī'ī, al-'Allāmah Sālih al-Fawzān, al-Ma'ālī Sālih Āli Shaykh, Shaykh al-Mufti 'Abdul'Azeez Āli Shaykh, Shaykh al-Qādī Sālih al-Luhaydān, Shaykh 'AbdulMuhsin al-'Abbād al-Badr, Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī al-Madkhalī, Shaykh Wasiullāh al-'Abbās, Shaykh al-Imām 'Abdullāh bin 'Abdul'Azeez al-'Aqeel, Shaykh Ihsān Ilahi Thaheer, Shaykh Badi'uddeen Shāh as-Sindī and many more which would be too many to list here.</p>

<p><b>Khābr ul-Āhād</b></p>	<p>It was denied initially by Omar Bakrī Muhammad, despite the heretical basis of such a denial. It included not taking <i>ahād</i> narrations into <i>'aqeedah</i> which would mean denying punishment in the grave and many other areas of creed. Acceptance of <i>ahād</i> narrations were then later included as a core aspect of <i>'aqeedah</i>, in keeping with Ahl us-Sunnah. The shakiness in this regard is not to be questioned.</p>	<p>The acceptance of Khābr ul-Ahad has been constant amongst the people of the Sunnah since the time of the Messenger, which itself is a conclusive evidence, since the people of the Sunnah will never unite upon a falsehood. The Messenger of Allāh (<i>sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam</i>) sent Mua'dh (<i>radi Allāhu 'anhu</i>) as a single conveyor to the people of the book with matters pertaining to creed.<sup>70</sup></p> <p>Khābr ul-Āhād is a proof in matters of <i>'aqeedah</i> and <i>ahkām</i> and there is no distinction. Ibn 'AbdulBarr stated:</p> <p><b>“Within the entire creed regarding Allāh’s Names and Attributes there is nothing except that which has been documented in the Book of Allāh, authenticated from the Messenger of Allāh, agreed upon by the Ummah and has been transmitted from Akhbār ul-Āhād. All of this has to be submitted to and accepted and not to be looked into (i.e. questioned).”</b> See Ibn 'AbdulBarr, <i>Jāmi' Bayān ul-'Ilm wa Fadlihi</i>, vol.2, p.96.</p>
-----------------------------	---	---

<p><b>Forming Partisan Political Groups and Parties</b></p>	<p>Omar Bakrī Muhammad sanctions this and it involves changing name as often as necessary in order to resurface under a different name yet still preach the same message of political agitation, <i>takfeer</i>, mayhem and chaos. All the while, total allegiance is to be given to Omar Bakrī Muhammad and then Anjem Choudhary.</p>	<p>One of the main causes of division and tribulation has been the existence of parties and groups which have partisan loyalties to innovators and desires which oppose the Sunnah and have biased and bigoted partisanship to personalities and groups. <i>Salafis</i> do not hold secret clandestine meetings in order to put into place a strategic political plan. Pledging allegiance to heads of organisations, groups and political parties is partisanship.</p> <p>Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah stated:</p> <p><b>“As for the “head of the hizb” then he is the lead of the group which forms partisanship, meaning: the group which becomes a party. If they are gathered upon what Allāh and His Messenger have instructed, without adding or subtracting anything, then they are believers and unto them is what is unto them and upon them what is upon them. Yet if they add or subtract, like for example by having biased bigotry in truth and falsehood, to whoever joins their hizb and turning away from whoever does not join their hizb, whether in truth or falsehood –</b></p>
---	--	---

		<p><b>then this is division that Allāh and His Messenger have censured.”</b></p> <p>See: Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, <i>Majmū’ al-Fatāwā</i>, vol.11, p.92.</p> <p>Also refer to:</p> <p>a. Sheikh Ali ibn Hasan Ali ibn Abdul Hameed, trans. Aboo Talhah Dawud Burbank, <i>Muslim Unity in the Light of Numerous Groups and Parties</i> (Birmingham: Salafi Publications).</p> <p>b. Shaykh ’AbdulMālik ar-Ramadānī, <i>Madarik un-Nadhr fi’s-Siyasah: Bayna’t-Tatbiqat ash-Shar’iyyah wa’l-Infia’lat al-Hamasiiyyah</i> [Perceptions of Viewing Politics: Between the Divinely Legislated Application and Enthusiastic Disturbances], (KSA: Dar Sabeel il-Mumineen, 1418 AH/1997 CE, 2nd Edn).</p>
<p><b>Tāghūt</b></p>	<p><i>Tawāgheet</i> are the rulers, as emphasised by Omar Bakrī and the Takfiri intelligentsia.<sup>71</sup> In the vastness of the issue of <i>tāghoot</i> and its types, attention is only given to discussing one type of <i>tāghūt</i>, that being the tyrannical <i>hākim</i> (ruler). Fundamental issues are left, in order to</p>	<p>All definitions are embraced and they remain faithful to all classical definitions of <i>tawāghīt</i> without restricting them or utilising them for political means. As Salafis do not hold that by removing the rulers by force this will alleviate the predicament in which Muslims have found themselves.</p>

	<p>emphasise a political definition. They indiscriminately charge every single Muslim ruler with being a <i>tāghoot</i> without taking into consideration <i>istiblāl</i>, <i>ibāba</i> and the impediments of <i>takfeer</i>.</p> <p>This conclusively proves that they are all about politics, revolution and rulers, as just as they have done with <i>tawbeed</i> by restricting it they have done with the definition of <i>tāghūt</i>.<sup>72</sup></p>	<p>Al-Qurtubī (<i>rahimabullāh</i>) stated in his <i>tafseer</i> of <i>ayah</i> 36 of Surat un-Nahl <b>“And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], “Worship Allāh and avoid tāghūt.””</b>:</p> <p><b>“Means: leave all that is worshipped other than Allāh like Shaytān, the fortune-teller, the idol and all who call to misguidance.”</b></p> <p>Al-Fayrūzabādī (<i>rahimabullāh</i>) stated in <i>al-Qāmūs</i> under the item ‘<i>taghā</i>’:</p> <p><b>“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.”</b></p> <p>Ar-Rāghib al-Asfahānī (<i>rahimabullāh</i>) stated in <i>Mufradāt Alfādh ul-Qur’ān</i>,<sup>73</sup> p.108 under the item ‘<i>tāghā</i>’:</p> <p><b>“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”.”</b></p>
--	---	---

		<p>Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb (<i>rahimabullāh</i>) stated in <i>ad-Durur</i>, vol.1, p.137:</p> <p><b>“The Tawāgheet 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.”</b></p> <p>Imām Ibn 'Uthaymeen (<i>rahimabullāh</i>) stated in <i>Sharh ul-Usūluth-Thalātha</i> (Riyadh: Dār uth-Tharayā, 1420 AH/2000 CE), p.151:</p> <p><b>“and the 'Ulama of evil are those who call to misguidance and kufr or call to bida' (innovation) or call to making halal what Allāh has made harām, or make harām what Allāh has made halāl - all are tawāghīt.”</b></p> <p>Therefore, a caller and leader of misguidance and innovation can also be rendered as a <i>tāghūt</i>.</p>
--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> These classical definitions have been emphasised by Imām Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb in *Kitāb ut-Tawheed* and *Thalathat ul-Usūl*, also refer to Shaykh Muhammad bin 'AbdulWahhāb al-Wassābī's *Qawl ul-Mufeed fī adillat it-Tawheed*, these works have been translated into English. For a book written in English and specifically directed to Western readers refer to *Fundamentals of Tawheed* by Dr Abu Ameenah Bilal Philips.

<sup>2</sup> See here for example: <http://www.salafimedia.com/aqeedah/tawheed/item/1754-tawheed-al-hakimiyyah.html>

<sup>3</sup> <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-2560493866437684563>

<sup>4</sup> Zakariyyā bin Ghulām Qādir al-Pākistānī, *Tawdeeh Usūl il-Fiqh 'ala Manhaj Ahl il-Hadeeth* [Elucidation of Legal Theory in Accordance with the Methodology of the People of Hadeeth] (Dammām, KSA: Dār Ibn ul-Jawzī), p.29.

<sup>5</sup> See here for example wherein there is an exaggerated emphasis on al-Hākimiyyah and excessiveness in calling to it in a way which is alien to the manhaj Ahl us-Sunnah: <http://www.salafimedia.com/aqeedah/tawheed.html>

<sup>6</sup> *Liqā' ul Maftūh* (no. 150) 20<sup>th</sup> Shawwāl 1417 AH

<sup>7</sup> See the article here: <http://www.salafimedia.com/aqeedah/kufr/item/101-6-reasons-why-all-the-rulers-are-murtad.html>

<sup>8</sup> See that article here: <http://www.salafimedia.com/aqeedah/kufr/item/100-apostasy-of-the-rulers.html>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zOv5X18SD9w>

<sup>10</sup> Part 3 of the Press TV interview on *youtube*.

<sup>11</sup> Al-Bukhārī, *as-Saheeh, hadeeth* no.5752; Muslim, *as-Saheeh, hadeeth* no. 60

<sup>12</sup> Allāh says,

﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُعَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتَّىٰ يُعَيِّرُوهُمَا بِأَنفُسِهِمْ﴾

**“Indeed, Allāh will not change the condition of a people until they change what is in themselves.”**

{*ar-Ra'd* (13): 11}

Allāh also says,

﴿وَكَذَٰلِكَ نُؤَيِّدُ بَعْضَ الظَّالِمِينَ بَعْضًا بِمَا كَانُوا يَكْسِبُونَ﴾

**“And thus will We make some of the wrongdoers allies of others for what they used to earn.”**

{*al-An'am* (6): 129}

And Allāh says,

﴿قُلْ هُوَ مِنْ عِنْدِ أَنْفُسِكُمْ﴾

“Say it is from yourselves (i.e. due to your sin)...”

{Āli-’Imrān (3): 165}

And Allāh says,

﴿ظَهَرَ الْفَسَادُ فِي الْبَرِّ وَالْبَحْرِ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ أَيْدِي النَّاسِ لِيُذِيقَهُمْ بَعْضَ الَّذِي عَمِلُوا لَعَلَّهُمْ  
يَرْجِعُونَ﴾

“Corruption has appeared throughout the land and sea by [reason of] what the hands of people have earned so He may let them taste part of [the consequence of] what they have done that perhaps they will return [to righteousness].”

{Room (30): 41}

<sup>13</sup> Refer to the pronouncements and statements of Omar Bakrī’s followers, such as what can be read here: <http://www.islam4uk.com/aqeedah/tawheed>

Their websites however change nearly every four months, but their views are still the same regardless.

<sup>14</sup> <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-2560493866437684563>

<sup>15</sup> <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-2560493866437684563>

<sup>16</sup> See Shaykh ’Ali bin Yahyā al-Hadādī’s research on this matter in his book *al-Ghulū wa Madhāhirahu fī Hayāt il-Mu’āsirah* (Cairo: Dār ul-Manhāj, 1426 AH/2005 CE), pp. 42-55. The book also has introductions from Shaykh Wasīullāh bin Muhammad ’Abbās (*hafidhahullāh*) and Shaykh Ahmad bin Yahyā an-Najmī (*rahimahullāh*).

here: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj\\_Extremism.pdf](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Extremism.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> See Abū Baseer’s article here: <http://www.salafimedia.com/izharuddeen/dawah/item/1740-covenants--security-in-islam.html>

<sup>18</sup> <http://adamdeen.blogspot.com/>

<sup>19</sup> Scholars of the past 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. Such as:

- Imām ash-Shāfi’ī (*rahimahullāh*)
- Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal (*rahimahullāh*)
- Imām Abu’l-Qāsim al-Khirqī (*rahimahullāh*)
- Imām Abu’l-Hasan as-Sindī (*rahimahullāh*)
- Imām Bin Bāz (*rahimahullāh*)
- Imām Ibn ’Uthaymeen (*rahimahullāh*)

Therefore, this shows that the issue of drafting *kuffār* forces is something which was said by scholars in the past and the scholars who also ruled this in the present era were thus preceded in their rulings. Ibn Qudāmāh al-Maqdisī (*rahimahullāh*) 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 said. There is present from Ahmad what indicates the permissibility of gaining assistance from them (i.e. mushrikeen) and the statements of al-Khirqī also indicate that, if there is a need and this is the school of thought of Shāfi’ī.**

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

**His saying (sallallāhu alayhi wassallam): “Go back, for I do not seek help from a mushrik; and it is mentioned in another hadeeth that the Prophet (sallallāhu alayhi wassallam) sought help from Safwān bin Umayyah before his Islām, as a result some scholars give the first hadeeth precedence over the second one. Imām Shāfi’ī and others said: If the disbeliever has good opinion of the Muslims and the need has come to utilize him, of not then he is disliked. So these two hadeeths are taken in light of two circumstances.**

Shaykh Abu’l-Hasan as-Sindī stated in his explanation of the *hadeeth* “I do not gain assistance from a mushrik”, from the *Sunan Ibn Mājah* (vol.3, p.376, under *hadeeth* no.2832):

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

From: Bandar bin Nā’if bin Sanahāt al-’Utaybī, *Wa Jādilhum Bilatī Hiya Ahsan, Munāqishatun ‘Ilmiyyatun Hādiyyatun li-19 Mas’alatin Muta’alaqatin bi-Hukkām il-Muslimeen* (Riyadh: Maktabah ‘AbdulMusawwir bin Muhammad bin ‘Abdullāh, 1427AH/2006 CE, Fourth Edition), pp.38-42.

<sup>20</sup> For example, in the following video Omar Bakrī Muhammad Fustuq praises Abu Mus’ab az-Zarqawī, makes *takfeer* of King Fahd and refers to the so-called “magnificent 19”: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=guQhWjm6do8>

<sup>21</sup> See Omar Bakrī’s statements in interviews which he conducted:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mYNIg4OEWM8>

Also an article here in the newspaper The Independent (of London), dated 2 May 2013:

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/exclusive-woolwich-killings-suspect-michael-adebolajo-was-inspired-by-cleric-banned-from-uk-after-urging-followers-to-behead-enemies-of-islam-8630125.html>

<sup>22</sup> Refer to pp.28-48 of: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj\\_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_TakfeerAndBombing.pdf)

Ibn Taymiyyah also said:

**This was the result of patience and consciousness of Allāh which Allāh instructed (the Muslims to have) at the very beginning of Islām and during that time the jizya was not taken from any of the Jewish community, or other non-Muslim communities, who were living in Madeenah. Those verses applicable to every Muslim in a state of weakness who is not able to aid Allāh and His messenger with his hand or via his tongue (i.e. by speaking), but could help by using what he was able to by his heart and the likes. The verses about subduing those non-Muslims who have contracts with Muslims are applicable to every strong believer who is able to help the deen of Allāh and His Messenger with his hand and tongue (i.e. via**

speaking). It is with these verses that the Muslims were applying during the last epoch of the Messenger of Allāh (sallallāhu alayhi wassallam) and during the epoch of his rightly guided caliphs. And thus it will be until the Day of Judgement as there will never cease to be a group from this ummah who are well established on the truth who help Allāh and His Messenger with complete help. So whoever from the believers is weak in the earth or is weak in the time in which he is living in, must apply those verses of the Qur’ān which mention patience and forgiveness against those who are seeking to harm Allāh and His Messenger from those who were given the scriptures prior and also from the polytheists. As for those people who are in a state of strength then they are to apply the verses regarding fighting the leaders of kufr who slander the deen. They are also to apply the Qur’anic verses regarding fighting those who were given the scriptures prior until they pay the jizya and are subjugated.

Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah, *as-Sārim al-Maslool*, vol.2, p.413.

<sup>23</sup> In the *Muwatta’* Imām Mālik (*rahimahullāh*), when asked whether safe conduct promised by gesture had the same status as that promised by speech, said:

**“Yes. I think that one can request an army not to kill someone by gesturing for safe conduct, because as far as I am concerned, gesture has the same status as speech.”**

<sup>24</sup> In *Kitāb ul-Qasāmah wa’l-Mahāribeen wa’l-Qisās wa’d-Deeyāt* [The Book of Oaths, Combatants, Retribution and Blood-Monies], (Bab Thabūt ul-Qisās fī Qatl bi’l-Hijārah wa Ghayruhu), vol.10, p.1672, on the authority of Anas bin Mālik (*radi Allāhu ’anhu*). Al-Bukhārī also reported the hadeeth in many instances within his Saheeh: hadeeth nos. 2413, 2746, 5295, 6876, 6877, 6879, 6884 and 6885.

The hadeeth is also reported by Imām Bukhārī in his *Saheeh* (Kitāb ud-Dīyāt) on the authority of Anas.

<sup>25</sup> The second rightly guided Khaleefah, the superb ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab (*radi Allaahu ’anhu*), under whom Islam spread and lands conquered, instructed that any Muslim who committed betrayal to non-Muslims should be executed. Any Muslim who betrayed a non-Muslim combatant, or any Muslim who deceived a non-Muslim combatant into thinking that he had an agreement or covenant with him. It is relayed in the *Muwatta’* of Imaam Maalik that: ‘Umar ibn al-Khattaab wrote to the army leader whom he had dispatched saying:

أن عمر بن الخطاب كتب إلى عامل جيش كان بعثه: إنه بلغني أن رجالاً منكم يطلبون العليج حتى إذا أسند في الجبل وامتنع، قال: رجل مطرس، يقول: لا تخف فإذا أدركه قتله، وإني والذي نفسي بيده لا أعلم مكان واحد فعل ذلك إلا ضربت عنقه.

**“I have heard that a man from you seeks out [to kill] the non-Arab disbelieving combatant who has fled to the mountains and refrained from**

**battle and says to him “do not be scared”, then when he gets close to him he kills him. By the One in Whose Hand is my soul, I have not found out about the one who did that except that I will strike his neck.”**

<sup>26</sup> *Kitāb ul-Injād*, vol.2, pp.309-310

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Eq7IkMKLAok>

<sup>28</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=guQhWjm6do8>

<sup>29</sup> <http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=uv7O4Bq3EZU&NR=1>

<sup>30</sup> Reported by Muslim in *Kitāb ul-Jihād* and within other chapters, vol.3, p.1356, *hadeeth* no.1731.

<sup>31</sup> The addition of “...and those in monasteries (or other places of worship)” is from the *Musnad* of Imām Ahmad, vol.5, p.352.

<sup>32</sup> Reported by Mālik in the *Muwatta’*, *Kitāb ul-Jihād* in the chapter of the prohibition of killing women and children during warfare, vol.2, p.447, the *hadeeth* is on the authority of Yahyā bin Sa’eed from Abū Bakr as-Siddeeq that he said the *hadeeth*. ‘AbdurRazzāq also reported the *hadeeth* in *Kitāb ul-Jihād* in the chapter of ‘destroying the trees within the land of the enemy’, vol.5, p.199, *hadeeth* no.9375 on the authority of Ibn Jurayj who said: Yahyā bin Sa’eed said that Abū Bakr said, then he mentioned the *hadeeth*. The *isnad* is *munqati’* (disconnected) but the ‘*Ulama* have utilised it and referred to it as the meaning is correct and in agreement with other authentic *marfoo’* narrations.

Shaykh Mashhūr Hasan Āl Salmān mentions that Yahyā bin Sa’eed did not hear directly from Abū Bakr as-Siddeeq. The *hadeeth* was also reported by Sa’eed bin Mansūr, *Sunan*, (no. 2284); al-Bayhaqee, *Sunan*, vol.9, p.86; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb ul-Ashrāf*, pp.108-09 via another route of transmission from Abū Bakr, see *al-Majālisah*, p.1535 and *Jāmi’ il-Usool*, vol.2, p.599.

In the *Sunan* of Abū Dawūd, *Kitāb ul-Jihād* is the following *hadeeth* on the authority of Anas bin Mālik (*radi Allāhu ’anhu*): The Prophet (*sallallāhu’alayhi wassallam*) said: “Go in Allāh’s name, trusting in Allāh, and adhering to the religion of Allāh’s Messenger. Do not kill a decrepit old man, or a young infant, or a child, or a woman; do not be dishonest about booty, but collect your spoils, do right and act well, for Allāh loves those who do well.”

Imām Ibn ul-Munāsif (563-620 AH) states in his *magnum opus* on jihad entitled *Kitāb ul-Injād fi Abwāb il-Jihād*:

As for the insane person then there should be no difference of opinion whatsoever over the issue of not killing them, even if the person has reached maturity, this is because the person is not responsible by agreement. The evidence that these types of people (are not to be fought against) is the saying of Allāh,

**“Fight in the way of Allāh against those who fight you and do not transgress the limits (set by Allāh). Indeed, Allāh does not love those who transgress. ”**

{*al-Baqarah (2): 190*}

From these types of people are those who are generally unable to fight such as the elderly, the decrepit, those who are secluded in worship, hired workers, mothers and the likes who are not to be transgressed against during fighting and Allāh gave them a special position in that it is prohibited to kill them due to His saying,

“...and do not transgress the limits (set by Allāh).”

{*al-Baqarah (2): 190*}

**Meaning: do not kill non-combatants such as women due to their inability to fight.**

From Imām al-Mujtahid Abū 'Abdullāh Muhammad bin 'Īsā bin Muhammad bin Asbagh al-Azdī al-Qurtubī (aka Ibn Munāsif), eds. Muhammad bin Zakariyyā Abū Ghāzī and Shaykh Mashhūr Hasan Āl Salmān, *Kitāb ul-Injād fī Abwāb il-Jihād* (Beirut: Mu'assasah ar-Rayān, 1425 AH/2005 CE), vol.1, p.228.

<sup>33</sup> See: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj\\_Fighting](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Fighting)

See pp.18-20 for further detailed study of the hadeeth of the attack on Tā'if with *manjaneeq*.

<sup>34</sup> Refer to lectures 'Politics in Light of Islam' by Shaykh, Dr Khālid al-Anbarī at salafimanhaj.com

<sup>35</sup> *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, vol.2, p.1008, hadeeth no.3029

<sup>36</sup> *Sunan an-Nasā'ī*, vol.5, p.268, hadeeth no.3057

<sup>37</sup> *Saheeh Ibn Khuzaymah*, vol.4, p.274, hadeeth no.2867

<sup>38</sup> *Saheeh Ibn Hibbān*, vol.9, p.183, hadeeth no.3871

<sup>39</sup> *Al-Mustadrak*, vol.1, p.466

<sup>40</sup> <http://www.islamicthinkers.com/index/index.php>

<sup>41</sup> *Majmoo' al-Fatāwā Ibn Bāz*, vol.6, p.525

<sup>42</sup> From a Q&A session dated Sunday 14 April 2002 and broadcast on Paltalk.

<sup>43</sup> <http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=ByCDp8TRKfI>

<sup>44</sup> <http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=XYWotvV7Qmk>

<sup>45</sup> Imām Tirmidhee adds, “**This hadeeth is hasan, it is narrated by more than one person from Sa'eed bin Jamhān...**” Refer to *Jāmi' at-Tirmidhī*, vol.4, p.436, 'Awn al-Ma'bood, vol.12, p.260.

<sup>46</sup> See an example of this lip-service to it here, yet they do not implement what they apparently claim to adhere to: <http://www.salafimedia.com/salafiyah/item/645-forbidden-to-speak-without-knowledge.html>

<sup>47</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZBKkKK9ZWu0>

<sup>48</sup> Abū Nu'aym, *Hilyat ul-Awliyā'*, vol.6, p.379

<sup>49</sup> Refer to this important *khutbah* on the *fiqh* of *al-Amr bi'l-Ma'roof wa'n-Nahy'an il-Munkar* by Shaykh Muhammad Sa'eed Raslān: [http://www.rslan.com/vad/items\\_details.php?id=667](http://www.rslan.com/vad/items_details.php?id=667)

<sup>50</sup> There is an edit of this by A.A. Atā (Cairo, 1975) and a Beirut reprint in 1986 CE.

<sup>51</sup> For example, see this article here wherein they apparently appear to exhort to referring back to the Qur'ān for disputes yet they themselves oppose the Qur'ān and Sunnah in a plethora of issues as this study shows: <http://www.salafimedia.com/salafiyah/item/655-it-is-obligatory-to-refer-to-the-quraan-and-sunnah-in-any-dispute-or-disagreement.html>

<sup>52</sup> Reported by al-Bukhārī in his *Saheeh*.

<sup>53</sup> The prerequisites of a *Mujtahid* have been discussed within some of the early works of *fuqahā* (jurists) such as Abū Husays al-Basrī (436 AH/1044 CE) in *al-Mu'tamad fī Usūl il-Fiqh*. Also within

the works of Sayfuddeen al-Āmidī in *al-Ihkām fī Usūl il-Ahkām* (Cairo: Subayh, 1968 CE), al-Ghazzālī, al-Isnawī, al-Baydāwī (685 AH/1286 CE) and Ibn ul-Humām (861 AH/1456 CE).

<sup>54</sup> This has been dealt with by Imām ash-Shātībī (d.790 AH) in his work *al-Muwāfaqāt*.

<sup>55</sup> See:

[http://www.islamicthinkers.com/index/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=629&Itemid=26](http://www.islamicthinkers.com/index/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=629&Itemid=26)

<sup>56</sup> Reported by Abū Dāwood, at-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah and it is *Saheeh*.

<sup>57</sup> Al-Lālikā'ī, *Sharh Usūl 'Itiqād Ahl us-Sunnah*, vol.1, p.156

<sup>58</sup> *Zād ul-Ma'ad*, vol.1, p.38

<sup>59</sup> See for example the article here which they relay from 'Ali al-Khudayr: <http://www.salafimedia.com/salafiyah/item/1658-what-is-your-opinion-regarding-shaykh-us%4%81mah-ibn-l%4%81din?.html>

<sup>60</sup> See for example their use of an article by al-Qaeda leader Zawahiri: <http://www.salafimedia.com/salafiyah/item/1619-ibn-baaz-between-reality-and-illusion.html>

<sup>61</sup> Allāh says:

﴿إِنَّمَا يَخْشَى اللَّهَ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ الْعُلَمَاءُ﴾

**“Those who only fear Allāh from among His servants, are the 'Ulama (those who have knowledge).”**

{*Fātir (35): 28*}

Allāh says,

﴿فَاسْأَلُوا أَهْلَ الدِّكْرِ إِن كُنتُمْ لَا تَعْلَمُونَ﴾

**“Ask the people of knowledge if you do not know”**

{*al-Anbiyā (16): 43*}

Allāh says:

﴿وَإِذَا جَاءَهُمْ أَمْرٌ مِّنَ الْأَمْنِ أَوْ الْخَوْفِ أَدَّعَوْا بِهِ وَلَوْ رَدُّوهُ إِلَى الرَّسُولِ وَإِلَى أُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْهُمْ لَعَلِمَهُ الَّذِينَ

يَسْتَبِطُونَهُ مِنْهُمْ وَلَوْلَا فَضْلُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ وَرَحْمَتُهُ لَاتَّبَعْتُمُ الشَّيْطَانَ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا﴾

**“And when there comes to them something (i.e. information) about (public) security or fear, they spread it around. But if they had only referred it back to the Messenger or to those of authority among them, then the ones who (can) draw correct conclusions from it would have known about it. And if not for the favour of Allāh upon you and His mercy, you would have followed Shaytān, except for a few of you.”**

{*an-Nisā (4): 83*}

<sup>62</sup> Saheeh Bukhārī and Muslim

<sup>63</sup> Ibn Mājah, Saheeh

<sup>64</sup> See: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj\\_Deception.pdf](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Deception.pdf)

<sup>65</sup> See: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj\\_Awlaki](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Awlaki)

<sup>66</sup> See: <http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhajQatadah.pdf>

<sup>67</sup> See: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj\\_Tartoosee.pdf](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_Tartoosee.pdf)

<sup>68</sup> Reported by Abū Dāwood , ad-Dārimī, at-Tirmidhī and Ahmad

<sup>69</sup> Saheeh Muslim

<sup>70</sup> The evidence for the obligation of accepting *Khabr ul-Wāhid* in matters of creed are evidences which necessitate acting by the *Khabr ul-Wāhid*, and these are absolute in the general sense. Also there is no differentiation to be made between one matter and another or between one issue and another. Furthermore, rejecting *Khabr ul-Wāhid* necessitates rejecting much of the correct Islamic 'aqedah. See Muhammad bin Husayn bin Hasan al-Jīzānī, *Ma'ālim Usūl ul-Fiqh 'inda Ahl is-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah* [Signposts of Islamic Legal Principles According to Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah] (Dammām, KSA: Dār Ibn ul-Jawzī, 1428 AH/2007 CE), p.144.

So if this is well affirmed in *Usūl ul-Fiqh* how on earth did Omar Bakrī Muhammad, manage to construe for so many years that *Khabr ul-Āhād* should not be taken into matters of 'aqedah? Where did he get this understanding from? Indeed, further study indicates that he inherited this notion from the Mu'tazilah who were the only sect to not take the *Khabr ul-Āhād* into 'aqedah. So when Omar Bakrī was told about this throughout the 1990s why did he totally reject and stay in line with Mu'tazilah, only to then reject it later when it was political viable for his movement to take shape in rejecting it?

<sup>71</sup> See here: <http://www.salafimedia.com/aqeedah/tawheed/item/705-taaghoot-false-deities.html>

<sup>72</sup> Refer the following article:

[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)

<sup>73</sup> This has been edited by Safwan 'Adnan Dawudi (Damascus: Dar al-Qalam, 1412 AH/1992 CE) and there are also: an edit in Damascus: Dar al-Qalam, 1997; an edit from Beirut: Dar al-Shamiyya, 1383 AH/1964 CE); Beirut: Dar al Ma'rifah, n.d.; an edit by Nadim Mar'ashli in 1984 printed by Dār ul-Kitāb il-Arabi in Beirut.