

THE KHĀRIJITES:

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE IDEOLOGY OF THE MUSLIM
BROTHERHOOD, ḤIZB AL-TAḤRĪR,
AL-QĀ'IDAH, AL-NUṢRAH
AND ISIS



Prophet Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, “There will appear at the end of time a people who are young of age, foolish-minded. They will speak with the best (and most-alluring) of speech (that is spoken) by people and will recite the Qur’ān but it will not go beyond their throats. They will pass out of Islām as the arrow passes through its game. Whoever meets them, let him kill them, for there is a reward for whoever kills them.”

THE KHĀRIJITES:

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE IDEOLOGY OF THE MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD, ḤIZB AL-TAḤRĪR, AL-QĀ'IDAH, AL-NUṢRAH AND ISIS

Prophet Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, “There will appear at the end of time a people who are young of age, foolish-minded. They will speak with the best (and most-alluring) of speech (that is spoken) by people and will recite the Qur’ān but it will not go beyond their throats. They will pass out of Islām as the arrow passes through its game. Whoever meets them, let him kill them, for there is a reward for whoever kills them.”

The Prophet’s Companion, **Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī** (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) said of the Khārijites, “The Dogs of the people of Hellfire, they used to be Muslims but turned disbelievers.” When Abū Umāmah was asked whether this was his own speech or something he heard from the Prophet, he said, “Rather, I heard it from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).”

Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728H, 14th century CE) said, “For they [the Khārijites] strived to kill every Muslim who did not agree with their view, declaring the blood of the Muslims, their wealth, and the slaying of their children to be lawful, while excommunicating them. And they considered this to be worship, due to their ignorance and their innovation which caused [them] to stray.”

1st Edition (2.00) Ramaḍān 1436H / June 2015CE.
This version 2.01.



© 2015 Abū Iyaḍ Amjad bin Muḥammad Rafiq

This is a **free** electronic publication originally published on **salafiebooks.com** (**www.salaf.com**). If you did not download this ebook from **salafiebooks.com** it may not be original, genuine or safe and may have been modified without permission. To ensure authenticity and security download the original from **salafiebooks.com** and discard all other copies.

You may print this ebook for your personal use. Commercial use is prohibited. If you wish to spread this ebook you can publicize its unique URL at **salafiebooks.com**.

Salafi Publications
472 Coventry Road
Small Heath
Birmingham B10 0UG
United Kingdom

t. 0121 773 0003
t. 0121 773 0033
f. 0121 773 4882

email: admin@spubs.com
web: www.spubs.com

Learn more: takfiris.com | ikhwanis.com | sayyidqutb.com | shariah.ws

Foreword

All praise is due to Allāh, the Lord of the worlds and may He make good mention of His Prophet in the highest company and grant him safety.

As prophesized by the Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ), the Khārijites (extremist renegades) were the first sect to break off from the main body of the Muslims and they appeared in two waves. First, as the revolutionary Saba'ite movement against the third caliph 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) and thereafter, as the Khārijites proper against the fourth caliph 'Alī (رضي الله عنه). They expel Muslims from Islām on account of major sins, revolt against the rulers with arms and incite the masses to fight against them. They are mostly young in age, appear as pious worshippers, have not acquired knowledge from the scholars of Islām, make use of secrecy, come to the people under the guise of enjoining the good and prohibiting the evil and employ faulty interpretations of Islāmic texts due largely to their ignorance. The Prophet (ﷺ) also explicitly stated that they will never cease to appear until the Dajjāl (the Anti-Christ) appears in the midst of their armies. This indicates that the Muslim will always be plagued by this disease throughout the passage of time and that their war is fundamentally a war against the people of Islām.

Speaking about the *relative ability* amongst the people to recognize opposition to the Sunnah (Prophetic tradition), Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah said, “Some factions are greater in their opposition to the Messenger than others, and others are more apparent in their opposition [than others]. However, the apparentness [of such opposition] is a relative matter. The opposition of the one who opposes the Sunnah will be clear to the one who knows the Sunnah. In some cases, the opposition of some of them to the Sunnah is apparent to some of the people due to their knowledge of the Sunnah as opposed to others who do not know of [the Sunnah] what those people know. And sometimes the Sunnah in that matter is known to all of the ummah and thus the opposition of the one who opposed it is readily apparent - just as the opposition of the

Rāfiḍah [Shī'ites] to the Sunnah has become apparent to the majority. In the view of the majority, they are opposers to the Sunnah, and thus it is said, 'Are you a Sunnī or a Rāfiḍī?' Likewise the **Khārijites**, when they were people of the sword and of fighting, their opposition to the jamā'ah (those united behind a ruler) became apparent when they would fight against the people, **but as for today, most people do not recognize them.**"¹

The last statement of Ibn Taymiyyah about the Khārijites and the fact that most people do not recognize them or their ideology is reflective of another wider reality, which is that most people do not understand the reality of the creed and methodology of the Righteous Salaf and what opposes it. Many of the contemporary Khārijite movements nowadays make an ascription to the way of the Salaf when they are the furthest away from it in their statements, actions and methodologies of reform. This should not be surprising since the very first Khārijites considered themselves to be superior to the Prophet's Companions, considering themselves to be the actual Salaf and the true representatives of Islām. This leads to three affairs:

Firstly, many naive, ill-informed, emotive Muslims who see oppression, bloodshed and war in Muslim lands are emotionally manipulated into believing that the loud, rhetorical voice of the Khārijites and their use of lofty slogans of "Sharī'ah", "Jihād", "Judging by Allāh's Law", "Enjoining Good and Forbidding Evil" are contextually valid, evidence-based, authentic voices when in reality they are nothing but the rantings of ignoramuses, ignorant of the basics of the Islāmic creed and ignorant of Allāh's laws in His creation. This is evidenced by their gross misdiagnosis of the causes of affliction (which they always return back to the rulers) but whose true roots are more foundational and lie elsewhere.

¹ *Kitāb al-Nubuwwāt* (Aḍwā' al-Salaf, 1420H) 1/564.

Secondly, it allows those with enmity from the non-Muslims to malign the religion of Islām and its noble, revered Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).

Thirdly and fallaciously, the Khārijites are treated by both non-Muslim academics and numerous groups who have sectarian bias and enmity towards the Salafī way as being amongst the ranks of the Salafīs. This fallacious claim of Salafīs being divided into the three groups of *apolitical quietists* (peaceful preaching), *the political activists* (activism) and the *jihādists* (violent extremism) has become mainstream and is the standard line in academia and journalism. In partial explanation of this development, many of these Khārijite groups have realized that in order to gain legitimacy, acquire a wider following and to spread their doubts more easily, they ought to make an ascription to the way of the Salaf and identify as Salafīs. This was avoided by them previously because it meant identifying with the prominent Salafī scholars such as Shaykh al-Albānī, Shaykh Ibn Baz, Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn and others whom they considered either misguided or apostates. Further, identifying with “Salafiyyah,” represented a manhaj (methodology) that stood in stark contrast to theirs. Many of the ideological figureheads behind the Khārijite movements were averse to the label of Salafiyyah and saw it as a barrier to recruitment. For that reason, some of them invented principles to undermine ascription to Salafiyyah and to incorporate other groups and orientations into a wider umbrella of “Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā‘ah” so they could draw from a larger recruitment base to help fulfil their agendas. However, due to the sustained efforts of the Salafī scholars and their followers over the past two decades in differentiating between the methodology of the Salaf and these Khārijite imposters and their false, deceptive principles, they have sought protection and camouflage by donning the outergarment of Salafiyyah to legitimize their actions. It also allowed them to deflect criticism from themselves as a readily identifiable extremist minority group to Salafiyyah and its adherents, thereby achieving more than one objective through this deception. A

clear example of this lies in the remnants of **Hizb al-Taḥrīr** in the UK who, after a series of transformations and different labels,² began to employ the label of Salafiyyah as a means of concealment, camouflage and deflection.

What follows in this treatise is a small effort in attempting to uncover the foundations of modern groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood, Ḥizb al-Taḥrīr, al-Qā'idah, ISIS and similar Khārijite groups whose ideologies and aspirations are behind the extremism and terrorism being witnessed today and oppressively ascribed to Islām and to Salafiyyah. The historical events behind the emergence of the very first Khārijites, the Prophetic traditions regarding them, the statements of Salafī scholars throughout history against them and the nature of their activities are presented in what is to follow.

Abū 'Iyaad

1st Ramaḍān 1436H / 18th June 2015

² Such as al-Muḥājirūn (the Emigrants), Al-Firqah al-Nājiyah (the Saved Sect), Al-Ghurabā' (the Strangers) Islām4Uk and so on.

The Khārijites: Historical Roots Of Modern-Day Extremism And Terrorism

The Prophet Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) informed of a group that would appear shortly after his death who would put the Muslims, their leaders and their societies to trial and tribulation. They are famously known as **the Khārijites (extremist renegades)**.³

When this group appeared, the Companions of the Prophet saw that numerous verses of the Qur’ān applied to them. These verses include the saying of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ), **“Say: Shall we inform you of the greatest losers as to [their] deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life while they thought that they were acquiring good by their deeds!”** (18:103-104).⁴ Also, the saying of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ), **“Some faces, that Day, will be humiliated. Labouring (hard in the worldly life), weary (in the Hereafter with humility and disgrace).”** (88:2-3).⁵ Also the saying of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ), **“And when they deviated, Allāh caused their hearts to deviate.”** (61:8).⁶ And also, **“Those who break Allāh’s Covenant after ratifying it, and sever what Allāh has ordered to be joined and do mischief on earth, it is they who are the losers.”** (2:27).⁷

³ These Khārijite terrorist renegades came in two waves. The first were a movement comprised of elements from Egypt and Irāq led by a group known as the Saba’iyyah and they assassinated the third caliph ‘Uthmān in the year 35H. They were behind the events that led to the appearance of the second wave who abandoned the fourth caliph, ‘Alī (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) during a period of civil strife, and he was eventually killed by them in the year 40H.

⁴ Imām al-Ṭabarī relates this application of the verse to the Khārijites from ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) in his exegesis as does Ibn Kathīr who relates it from Sa’d bin Abī Waqqās (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) regarding the assassins of ‘Uthmān in al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah (10/320).

⁵ This application of the verse is mentioned by Imām al-Qurṭubī in his exegesis and he relates it from ‘Alī (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ).

⁶ Refer to *al-I’tisām* of al-Shāṭibī (1/89).

⁷ Refer to *al-I’tisām* of al-Shāṭibī (1/90).

It is common knowledge to the scholars of the Muslims and their students that **ISIS, Boko Ḥarām, al-Qā'idah** and others are simply another manifestation of the recurring appearance of this group that was explicitly mentioned by the Prophet of Islām. They have killed exponentially more Muslims in the past 1400 years than they have killed non-Muslims in the past 20 years. In fact, if we were to say this the other way around, that they have killed more Muslims in the past 20 years than they have killed non-Muslims in the past 1400 years it would not be an exaggeration at all.⁸ Their appearance was prophesized by the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) in a large number of traditions and they indeed appeared less than 30 years after him in 36H, around the year 657CE. Because this faction was intended as a trial and tribulation for Muslims in various times and ages, the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) spoke extensively about them, their traits, activities and their great danger upon Islām and the Muslims. The traditions in this regard are well-known and famous and have come through large-scale transmission right from the dawn of Islām.

⁸ This is because the Khārijites revolt against Muslim authorities and their subjects. Their activities are primarily directed towards them and not non-Muslims in principle.

THEIR PRIMARY MOTIVATION LIES IN MATTERS OF THE WORLD AND THEY USE RELIGION AS A COVER

The primary motivations driving Khārijite extremists return back to worldly matters including wealth and how Muslim rulers dispose of it. They desire that wealth should come to them upon their belief that giving it to the rulers is unlawful because they do not distribute it justly and do not use it for its designated purposes.⁹ In other words, affairs pertaining to misuse of state capital and social, political and economic injustice. For this reason, there are strong parallels between the Khārijites who departed from Islām and the Jacobinist, Marxist, Bolshevik, Communist, Socialist movements originating in Europe¹⁰

⁹ This is revealed in a letter of advice given by the great Islāmic scholar, Wahb bin Munabbih (d. 110H, early 8th century CE) to a man affected by the ideology of the Khārijites, A group of Khārijites came to this man from Ṣan‘ā in Yemen and said to him that his zakāh (obligatory charity) given to the rulers does not fulfil his obligation because it is misused and thus, his wealth should be given directly to the Khārijites who will give it to the poor and needy as well as establishing the prescribed punishments. These are the same activities of the Khārijites of ISIS today whereby they collect wealth under the same pretences whilst using it to fortify their own position and power. Refer to *Munāṣahah Wahb bin Munabbih* (taḥqīq al-Burjis, 1423H), p. 19.

¹⁰ Shaykh Rabī bin Hadi said, “And this revolutionary ideology [of the modern Khārijites], we do not say it is ‘influenced by the ideology of the Khārijites’ but we say that it is influenced by the Communist, nationalist and secularist revolutions before it is influenced by the ideology of the Khārijites.” *Kashf al-Sitār* (pp. 32-33). And he also said, “These (demonstrations and revolutions) are from the methodology of Marx and Lenin and their likes, they are not from the methodologies of Islām. Revolutionism, shedding blood, tribulations, difficulties (all of this) is the way of Marx and Lenin. They combined it with the way of the Khārijites and they said ‘It is Islām’... Jihād itself has its subject areas and has its conditions and it is not these Marxist methods which they clothe with the garment of Islām. They have taken revolutionism, Socialism from Marx and Lenin.” *Kashf al-Sitār* (pp. 16). In an article titled, “How Marx Became Muslim” John Gray writes, “Islamic fundamentalism is not an indigenous growth. It is an exotic hybrid, bred from the encounter of sections of the Islamic intelligentsia with radical western ideologies. In *A Fury for God*, Malise Ruthven shows that Sayyid Quṭb, an Egyptian executed after imprisonment in 1966 and arguably the most

which, under the very same banners of social and economic injustice, launched an era of war and permanent revolution.¹¹

influential ideologue of radical Islam, incorporated many elements derived from European ideology into his thinking. For example, the idea of a revolutionary vanguard of militant believers does not have an Islamic pedigree. It is 'a concept imported from Europe, through a lineage that stretches back to the Jacobins, through the Bolsheviks and latter-day Marxist guerrillas such as the Baader-Meinhof gang.' In a brilliantly illuminating and arrestingly readable analysis, Ruthven demonstrates the close affinities between radical Islamist thought and the vanguard of modernist and postmodern thinking in the West. The inspiration for Qutb's thought is not so much the Koran, but the current of western philosophy embodied in thinkers such as Nietzsche, Kierkegaard and Heidegger. Qutb's thought - the blueprint for all subsequent radical Islamist political theology - is as much a response to 20th-century Europe's experience of 'the death of God' as to anything in the Islamic tradition. Qutbism is in no way traditional. Like all fundamentalist ideology, it is unmistakably modern." The Independent Newspaper (UK), 27th July 2002.

¹¹ The aims behind the instigation of these social revolutionary movements revolve around ten core objectives and they are: **One:** Abolition of all private property which is achieved through imposing a debt burden through heavy, punishing taxation. Gradually, property is confiscated through this method until it remains in the hands of the beneficiaries of this system. **Two:** Heavy progressive or graduated income tax to keep everyone at relatively similar levels of wealth and prevent any potential competing power that could challenge the system and its beneficiaries. **Three:** Abolition of all rights of inheritance to allow the beneficiaries of this system to gradually own all wealth and property. **Four:** Confiscation of property of all emigrants and rebels which refers to what happens when debts or taxes are not paid. **Five:** Centralization of all credit through a central bank which is fundamental to the running of the system and its core engine. **Six:** Centralization of the means of communication and transport to enable the monitoring and control of the activity of all subjects. **Seven:** Extension of factories and instruments of production which refers to taking lands from farmers and giving them to private corporations. This amounts to confiscation and privatization of land. **Eight:** Equal liability to labour, which means everyone must work in this collectivist system. **Nine:** Manufacturing and agriculture blended together whereby conglomerates and corporates take over farming and agriculture and city and country are blended together which effectively amounts to population control, moving all people out of rural areas into towns and cities. **Ten:** Free education for all children in public schools which means compulsory indoctrination of children to be good citizens within this

The ideological grandfather of all Khārijite renegade movements in Islāmic history is a man known as **Dhul-Khuwaiṣarah al-Tamīmī**. The Qurʾān judged this individual to be from the disbelieving hypocrites, **“Amongst them (the Hypocrites) is one who criticizes you concerning the [distribution of] charities. If they are given from them, they approve but if they are not given from them, at once they become angry.”** (9:58). This man and his few followers challenged the integrity of the Prophet (ﷺ) in a famous incident which is documented in numerous Prophetic traditions. As the Prophet (ﷺ) was distributing wealth to a number of tribes for certain benefits he had in mind for them, this man appeared and said, “Be just O Muḥammad” and “We are more worthy of this than them” and also, “This is a division by which the pleasure of Allāh is not sought.”¹² The Prophet (ﷺ) had to prevent his Companions from striking this audacious man and as the man walked away, the Prophet (ﷺ) said, “From this man will appear a people who recite the Qurʾān but it will not go beyond their throats.” He went to describe in other reports that they will separate from the main body of Muslims, turn against them and fight them. He also prophesized that they would be killed and “Amongst them will be a black man on whose upper arm will appear [a feature] as if like the breast of a woman.”¹³ This incident is evidence that the entire issue with the Khārijites is a worldly one. Religion is merely used as a cloak to legitimize their activities and serve as a means of recruiting the ignorant and unsuspecting. Thereafter, it is used as a vehicle to help them attain their worldly objectives. Ibn Kathīr, the Qurʾān commentator said, “For the first innovation to occur in Islām was the tribulation of the Khārijites and their (ideological) starting point was

collectivist system. These are the ten planks of Communism laid out by Karl Marx which were a refinement of the ideology of the Jacobins involved in the French Revolution in the late 18th century. Today, many aspects of this system can be readily identified in developed nations.

¹² Refer to al-Bukhārī (nos. 3610 and 4351).

¹³ Related by Muslim (no. 1066). The ḥadīth was reported by Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī who also bore witness that he was present when this man was identified at al-Nahrawān where ʿAlī fought and killed the Khārijites.

due to [a matter] of the world.”¹⁴ The matter being referred to was the distribution of wealth, they consider the ruling authorities to be unjust and astray in their disposal of wealth. Ibn Taymiyyah said, “The foundation of the misguidance of these [Khārijites] is their belief regarding the leaders of guidance and the body of the Muslims that they have departed from justice and are misguided.”¹⁵ As we shall see in what follows, the Khārijites employed texts of the Qur’ān which they did not understand and built their ideology upon gross misinterpretations. By revolting against the authorities, they create civil strife and bring chaos, ruin and destruction.¹⁶ Not a single Companion of the Prophet was amongst the Khārijites which demonstrates their departure from Islām, its scholarly tradition and its main body.

¹⁴ *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-Azīm* (2/10).

¹⁵ *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā* (28/497).

¹⁶ One can see here the parallels between the ideology of the Khārijites and the Marxist, Communist movements calling for social justice. Refer to the section at the end of the book which connects Sayyid Quṭb, founder of 20th century takfīrī jihādi movements with Leninist methodology.

THEY FIRST APPEARED IN IRĀQ DURING A PERIOD OF CIVIL STRIFE

The Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ) prophesized that this group would appear during a period of conflict and splitting between the Muslims. The Companion Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī (رضي الله عنه) relates that the Prophet said, “*They [the Khārijites] will depart from the religion like an arrow passes through its game ... and they will appear during a period wherein the people will be in a state of division.*”¹⁷ In another tradition related by Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, the Prophet (ﷺ) said, “*There will appear a people from the East, they will recite the Qurʾān and it will not pass beyond their throats...*”¹⁸ And in the tradition related by Yaṣīr bin ʿĀmr who said that he asked Sahl bin Ḥunayf, “*Did you hear the Prophet (ﷺ) say anything about the Khārijites?*” Sahl said that he heard the Prophet saying - and whilst narrating, Sahl pointed his hand towards Irāq - “*There will appear from there a people who recite the Qurʾān, it will not pass beyond their throats, and they will depart from Islām like the arrow passes through the game.*”¹⁹ We find another prophecy in the tradition related by Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī who said that he heard the Prophet (ﷺ) said, “*My nation will split into two parties and from their midst there will depart a renegade group, the closest of the two parties to the truth will kill them.*”²⁰ This was mentioned by the Prophet at least two and a half decades before it actually happened. It is worthwhile therefore, to look in some detail into the background and circumstances leading to the emergence of this group as it contains many lessons and benefits. One can refer to the works of famous historians such as Ibn Kathīr’s *al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah*, al-Ṭabarī’s *Tārīkh* and Ibn ʿAsākir’s *Tārīkh Dimashq* during the events of 34H-38H for a detailed elaboration on these events. A condensed summary of the main events follows below.

¹⁷ Related by Muslim (no. 1064).

¹⁸ Related by al-Bukhārī (no. 7652).

¹⁹ Related by al-Bukhārī (no. 6934).

²⁰ Related by Muslim (no. 1064), Aḥmad and others.

THE HISTORICAL EVENTS PRECEDING THE APPEARANCE OF THE KHĀRIJITE REVOLUTIONARY TERRORISTS IN THE LANDS OF IRĀQ AND SYRIA

The appearance of the first two sects in Islām, the **Khārijites** and the **Rāfiḍites** (Shī'ites) is tightly interwoven and cannot be separated from each other. The activities of a particular subversive movement known as the **Saba'iyyah** led to the creation of these two sects. The Companion Ḥudhayfah bin al-Yamān (رضي الله عنه) used to ask the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) about evil out of fear that it may befall him and he would be in gatherings in which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) mentioned the various tribulations to befall the Muslim nation following his death. Ḥudhayfah stated, "By Allāh, I am the most-knowledgeable amongst the people of every tribulation to occur between my presence and the Final Hour."²¹ Ibn Kathīr, the famous historian and Qur'anic commentary, relates the statement of Ḥudhayfah, "**The first of the tribulations is the killing of 'Uthmān and the last of them is the appearance of the Dajjāl (Anti-Christ).**"²² Thus, the first significant event having major consequences for the Muslim nation was the revolution against the third caliph, 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) which culminated in his assassination. This was executed by a group of renegade hypocrites led by a man known as '**Abdullāh bin Saba**.'²³ His followers became known

²¹ Related by Imām Muslim (no. 2891).

²² *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (Dār Hajar, 1418H) 10/330.

²³ His existence, presence and subversive activities are documented and reported by dozens of Sunnī and Shī'ite scholarly authorities right until the end of the 19th century. After that some of the Orientalists, followed by Muslim 'thinkers,' began to propagate the claim that 'Abdullāh bin Saba' is a figment of the imagination and that he was invented in order to malign the Shī'ites. The following is a brief list of works accepted by Shī'ite authorities affirming his existence, activities and doctrines: *Risālah al-Irjā'* by al-Ḥasan bin Muḥammad bin al-Ḥanafīyyah (d. 100H) - who is a grandson of 'Ali bin Abī Ṭalīb (رضي الله عنه). This small treatise was written by him and was read out openly in Kūfah. It covered the tribulations that had taken place, and a statement of deferment (suspension) about his position regarding 'Uthman (رضي الله عنه) and his grandfather Ali (رضي الله عنه). He also announced his clear allegiance to Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه). He also spoke of the tribulations which had occurred and spoke of the Saba'ites (followers of

as the **Saba'iyyah** and they had been recruited and mobilized against 'Uthmān on alleged grounds of social injustice, class separation and despotism in addition to a range of what were claimed to be erroneous mistakes in jurisprudence and personal conduct.²⁴ Their slogan against 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) was the same as the slogan of the hypocrite, Dhul-Khuwayṣarah al-Tamīmī against the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) - *the absence of social justice in matters of wealth* - the same slogan of Marxist, Communist revolutionary movements of the 19th and 20th centuries. This is a crucial point to note as it helps to explain the circumstances behind the emergence of the Khārijite terrorists during both the dawn of Islām and modern history in the 19th and 20th centuries. Four figures are of special

'Abdullāh bin Saba') and their doctrines. The Irjā' (deferment) referred to here is not the doctrine of the well-known Murji'ite sect who expelled actions from faith. *Kitāb al-Ghārāt* of Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm bin Muḥammad Sa'īd bin Hiāl al-Thaqafī al-Asfahānī (d. ~283H), this book has been published in Irān. *Kitāb al-Maqālaat wal-Firaq* of Sa'd bini 'Abdullāh al-Ash'arī al-Qummī (d. 301H), this book was also published in Iran in 1963CE. *Kitāb Firaq al-Shī'ah* of Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan bin Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (d. before 300H). This has been published numerous times and has an Orientalist print which was done in Istanbul in 1931CE. This contains a good section on 'Abdullāh bin Saba' and his doctrines. *Rijāl al-Kashī* of Abū 'Amr Muḥammad bin 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Kashi, (d. ~370H). This book has been published in Kerbala, Irāq. *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* by their shaykh, Abu Ja'far Muḥammad bin al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460H). First edition published in al-Najaf in 1961CE distributed by Muḥammad Kadhīm al-Kutbī. *Sharḥ Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd li Najh al-Balāghah* of Abī Ḥamid 'Abd al-Ḥamīd bin Hibatullāh al-Madā'inī. known as Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, (d. 656H). First edition published in 1326H. *Al-Rijāl* by al-Ḥasan bin Yūsuf al-Ḥillī (d. 726H), printed in Tehran (1311H) and al-Najaf (1961CE). *Rawdāt al-Jannāt* of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Khawānsārī (d. 1315H), it was published in Irān (1307H). Tanqīh al-Maqāl Fee Ahwāl al-Rijāl by 'Abdullāh al-Māmqa'nī (d. 1351H), printed in al-Najaf (1350H). *Qāmūs al-Rijāl* of Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, printed in Tehran (1382H). *Rawdat al-Ṣafā'*, a book of history relied upon by the Shī'ah in Persian (2/292), printed in Tehran. *Al-Kunā wal-Alqāb* of 'Abbās bin Muḥammad Riḍā al-Qummī (d. 1359H), printed in 1359H.

²⁴ The Mālikī jurist, Muḥammad bin 'Abdullāh, Abu Bakr bin al-'Arabī (d. 543H, 12th century CE) wrote his famous work titled, *al-'Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, which contains a powerful and robust response to each and every allegation raised against 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه).

note here. **Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī**, a Bāṭinī (gnostic, esoteric), concealed Shīʿite revolutionary who is spuriously claimed to be the founder of modern Salafism.²⁵ He was the first to revive and spread this claim in the modern era. He launched a Marxist, Communist diatribe against ʿUthmān, accusing him of hoarding capital, nepotism, despotism and class separation.²⁶ After him **Sayyid Qutb** developed this poison in more detail in a number of his writings dealing with social justice and capitalism and he also praised the revolution of ʿAbdullāh bin Sabaʾ against ʿUthmān and maligned Muʿāwiyah, his parents and the Banū Umayyah in the severest of ways, even negating their Islām. At the end of his life spread doctrines of excommunication and hatred against all contemporary Muslim societies whom he charged with apostasy and advocated worldwide revolutions to topple rulers and governments.²⁷

Abū Aʿlā Mawdūdī also made insinuations against ʿUthmān (رضي الله عنه) and Muʿāwiyah (رضي الله عنه) upon the same grounds²⁸ alongside his spurious claim

²⁵ Linking Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī and his student Muḥammad ʿAbduh to modern Salafiyyah is found in the writings of cheap, shoddy academics and journalist. Well established Orientalist scholars, such as Bernard Lewis, do not fall into such a mistake and distinguish between the Salafiyyah spoken of throughout Salafi literature in the history of Islām and the *modernist* movement of al-Afghānī and ʿAbduh who called for a return to an era of ijtihād (jurisprudence), breaking free from the rigidity of blind-following of schools of jurisprudence and assimilation with European civilization, culture and science as a means of worldly progress.

²⁶ Refer to *al-Aʿmāl al-Kāmilah li Jamāl al-Dīn* (pp. 111-112) and *al-Radd ʿalā al-Dahriyyīn* of al-Afghānī himself (pp. 200-201) and also Mustafa Ghazāl’s *Daʿwah Jamāl al-Dīn* (pp. 264-265). For a citation from al-Afghānī in this regard refer to the document available at <http://ikhwanis.com/?oqxcoo>.

²⁷ Refer to <http://ikhwanis.com/?fkwuwpd> for a detailed treatment of Sayyid Qutb’s history and subversive ideology.

²⁸ In his book *ʿKhilāfat wa Mulūkiyat* (written in 1386/1966CE) lays charges of nepotism against ʿUthmān (رضي الله عنه) and of transforming the nature and structure of the khilāfah into a kingship. He also attacks Muʿāwiyah (رضي الله عنه) and the Banū Umayyah in general. This is the foundation of Sabaʾite and Shīʿite revolutionary poison against the Companions. It should come as no surprise that Mawdūdī was an extremely close friend of the kāfir and mushrik, “Āyatollāh” al-Khomeinī and

that the primary goal of the Prophets was to ‘overthrow the thrones of the tyrants.’ **Taqī al-Dīn al-Nabahānī** - the founder of Ḥizb al-Taḥrīr - was a former Ba’thist Communist who shared in some of this poison (particularly against Mu’āwiyah)²⁹ and also advocated a revolutionary approach to establishing economic, social and political justice.

It is important from the beginning for us to understand that anyone who wished to speak ill of the Companions by concealment did so, not by attacking them directly, but by attacking **Mu’āwiyah** (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) who was the first of the kings of Islām.³⁰ Under his authority, the Muslims conquered

described his 1979 revolution as a genuine “Islāmic revolution” which should be supported by Muslims, groups and movements from all over the world.

²⁹ Refer to “*al-Shakḥṣiyyah al-Islāmiyyah*” in which al-Nabahānī denies that Mu’āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) was a Companion and in his other book “*Nizām al-Ḥukm fil-Islām*” he attacks Mu’āwiyah further from the same angle as the Saba’ite hypocrites of old, the Rāfiḍī Shī’ites, Sayyid Qutb and Mawdūdī.

³⁰ **Mu’āwiyah bin Abī Sufyān** was amongst the Muslims who accepted Islām prior to the conquest of Makkah but concealed his faith from his father, Abū Sufyān. Ibn ‘Asākir relates the saying of Mu’āwiyah, “I accepted Islām on the day of the affair [referring to events surrounding the treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah in 7AH] but concealed my faith out of the fear of my father” *Tārīkh Dimashq*, (5/19). He participated in the battle of Ḥunayn with the Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). Ibn Taymiyyah mentions in *al-Fatāwā* (4/458) that he and others such as Suhayl bin ‘Amr, al-Ḥārith bin Hishām were from those upon whom Allāh sent down tranquility (sakīnah) during the battle, as occurs in the verse, “**He is the one who sent down His tranquility upon His Messenger and upon the Believers...**” (9:26). Likewise the verse (Ḥadīd 57:10) which promises goodness for those who spent and fought after the conquest of Makkah includes Mu’āwiyah as also indicated by Ibn Taymiyyah in *al-Fatāwā* (4/459). Further, the Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) made supplication for him, “O Allāh make him a guide (for others), guided (in himself) and guides others through him.” Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan al-Tirmidhī of al-Albānī (3/326). Likewise in *al-Bukhārī*, from the ḥadīth of Umm Ḥarām that she heard the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) say, “[Paradise, forgiveness] will become obligatory for the first army from my ummah to makes a sea expedition..” So Umm Ḥarām said, “O Messenger of Allāh, am I from them?” He said, “You are from them.” Mu’āwiyah was the first to make a sea expedition to Cyprus. Mu’āwiyah was also a writer of revelation, Ibn Taymiyyah said, “For it has been established through large-scale transmission that the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) commanded him as he commanded

vast regions of the Earth and he was also the first to launch a successful sea expedition. Thus, anyone who desired to attack Islām and its people but desired to conceal their hatred towards its carriers and conveyers (the Companions) would target speech towards Mu‘āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) in particular. This was simply another approach in the Bāṭinī ideology which intended harm for Islām and its people. However, the Righteous Salaf, wise to this, on the basis of what they understood from revealed texts, consolidated and protected the fortress of Islām by making it clear that Mu‘āwiyah is the veil, the cover for the rest of the Companions, and

others, and he made jihād alongside him and he was trustworthy to him, writing the revelation for him, the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) did not suspect him at all in the writing of revelation.” Al-Fatāwā (4/472). Mu‘āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) also related 163 ḥadīths from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) some of which are found in al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Mu‘āwiyah is also **“the Uncle of the Believers”** because he is the brother of Umm Ḥabībah bint Abū Sufyān, who is the Prophet’s wife. As for his rulership, then he was appointed by ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb to rule over Shām, and ‘Umar was most knowledgeable and informed about men and would only appoint them due to his trust in them and his knowledge of their capabilities. He became the first king of Islām as he said, “I am the first of the kings of Islām” as related in the Muṣannaf of Ibn Abī Shaybah (6/207). The Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) explained that after the Prophetic Khilāfah there would be a kingship of mercy, and this was another praise of the rule of Mu‘āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ). He (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, “The first of this affair (of Islām) is nubuwwah (prophethood) and mercy. Then there will be khilāfah (succession) and mercy. Then there will be mulk (kingship) and mercy.” Reported by al-Ṭayālīsī and Aḥmad, declared **ṣaḥīḥ** by al-Albānī (al-Ṣaḥīḥah no. 3270). Al-Dhahabī said, “Chief of the Believers, the King of Islām, Abu ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qurashī, al-Amawī, al-Makkī.” al-Siyar (5/116). Ibn Abī al-‘Izz said, “Mu‘āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) is the first of the kings of the Muslims and he is the best of the kings of the Muslims.” Sharḥ al-Tahāwīyyah (p. 722). Ibn Taymiyyah said, “The scholars are agreed that Mu‘āwiyah is the best of the kings of this ummah. For the four that were before him were the caliphs of nubuwwah (prophethood) and he was the first of the kings, his kingship was one of mercy as has come in the ḥadīth... and there was in his kingship such mercy, gentleness and benefit for the Muslims that nothing better was known about the kingship of others besides him.” Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (4/478). Al-Khallāl relates that Mu‘āfi bin ‘Imrān was asked whether Mu‘āwiyah or ‘Umar bin ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was superior and he replied “Mu‘āwiyah was six-hundred times the likes of ‘Umar bin ‘Abd al-Azīz.” As-Sunnah (2/435).

that whoever attacked Mu‘āwiyah has lifted that veil and made the rest of the Companions vulnerable to attack and thus intends evil for Islām and its adherents.

Ibn Kathīr brings the following statement of al-Rabī bin Nāfi‘ al-Ḥalabī, “Mu‘āwiyah is the veil (covering) for the Companions of Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). So when a man removes the covering he will transgress against what lies beyond it (meaning the Companions).”³¹ And Ibn Kathīr also brings the statement of ‘Abdullāh bin al-Mubārak, “Mu‘āwiyah is a test (trial) for us. Whomever we see looking at him suspiciously then we suspect him in relation to those people (the Companions).” What we learn from these statements is that Mu‘āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) has been made a fitnah (trial) and miḥnah (test, examination). A person’s attitude towards the Companions and his intentions towards them is known from his intentions and attitude towards Mu‘āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ). For this reason when the Salaf saw a man belittling Mu‘āwiyah (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) they suspected him of harbouring ill-will and malice towards the Companions as a whole, and hence to Islām itself. Ibn Kathīr relates from al-Faḍl bin Ziyād who said, “I heard Abū ‘Abdullāh (Imām Aḥmad) being asked about a man who reviled Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Amr bin al-‘Āṣ and whether he should be labelled a Rāfiḍī and he said, ‘He did not venture into transgressing against them except that he was secretly harbouring evil. No one ever belittled any of the Companions except that he has an evil intent’.”³²

It should come as no surprise that the writings and idease of these thinkers (al-Afghānī, Sayyid Quṭb, al-Nabahānī, Mawdūdī) became the inspiration behind the ideologies of excommunication (takfīr) and revolution, leading to hatred and desertion of Muslim societies, eventually culminating in terrorism. The foundations of 20th century extremism and terrorism do not lie with Salafīs or the so-called

³¹ In al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah (8/139).

³² In al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah (8/148).

‘Wahhābīs’ but with Ash‘arī, Māturīdī, Šūfī, Shī‘ite, Mu‘tazilite thinkers inspired by European revolutionary movements.

The “Marxist” Social Revolution Against ‘Uthmān

Al-Ṭabarī, the historian and Qur’ānic commentator, relates that in the year 30H (around 652CE) ‘**Abdullāh bin Saba**’ travelled to Syria where he met the Companion Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī. He began to complain against Mu‘āwiyah (رضي الله عنه), the governor of Syria appointed by ‘Uthmān, saying, “O Abū Dharr, are you not surprised at Mu‘āwiyah? He says that wealth is Allāh’s wealth, but everything belongs to Allāh, as if he wishes to hoard it exclusive to the Muslims and to remove the name of the Muslims from this [wealth].”³³ Attempting to arouse discontent, he went to another Companion, Abū al-Dardā’ and also began to hang around ‘Ubādah bin al-Šāmit, though he was unsuccessful in these endeavours.³⁴ This was part of a wider strategy since his presence is also documented in the Ḥijāz (the Arabian peninsula), Baṣrah, Kūfah (Irāq) and finally Egypt from where the revolutionary activities were planned during 34H (655CE) through written correspondence between supporters in Egypt, Baṣrah and Kūfah.³⁵ In the month of Shawwāl of 35H (656CE) the revolutionaries descended into Madīnah from the various townships and surrounded the house of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه). Due to their large numbers, they effectively

³³ This is the ideology of Marxist Socialism and Communism, a full 1200 years before the Communist Manifesto was written by Marx and Engels. From 1848 onwards, this ideology coincided with a spate of revolutions against monarchies and governments in Europe and beyond. These revolutions were intended to overturn the existing order in those nations for the benefit of private interests.

³⁴ Refer to *Ṭārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/283).

³⁵ Refer to Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Tārīkh Dimashq* and Ibn al-Jawzī’s *al-Muntaẓam fil-Tārīkh* for further details. See also *Ṭārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/340) which mentions how Ibn Saba’ convinced his followers in Egypt of the doctrines that laid the elementary foundations for Shī‘ism, claiming that ‘Uthmān has usurped authority, that a movement should be mobilised against him, starting with revilements upon the rulers (deputised by ‘Uthmān) under the guise of commanding the good and forbidding the evil, and that they should also call people to do the same, using written communications between various cities to stir up dissension.

controlled the city and were unchallenged. The siege had been planned to coincide with the Ḥajj season in the month of Dhul-Ḥijjah 35H (around June 656CE) with their knowledge that the major Companions would have travelled to Makkah. They were demanding that ‘Uthmān step down from his leadership.³⁶ After forty days they burst into the house of ‘Uthmān, an eighty-year old frail man who was fasting and reciting the Qur’ān. They subdued him and repeatedly and violently stabbed him to death. They then proceeded to raid the state treasury.³⁷ After the assassination, the main leaders of this large group of around two thousand people kept a low profile and concealed themselves within the

³⁶ The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had informed ‘Uthmān that a group of hypocrites would attempt to “pull off his shirt” and that he would be killed unjustly. The scholars have explained this to mean that they will demand him to renounce his leadership. There occurs in the ḥadīth of ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Umar who said that the Prophet said “A tribulation will occur in which this man” - and ‘Uthmān passed by - “will be killed unjustly on that day.” Related by al-Tirmidhī, Aḥmad and others, al-Albānī declared it ṣaḥīḥ. And in the ḥadīth related by ‘Ā’ishah that the Prophet summoned ‘Uthmān to speak to him and when he finished, he struck his shoulder and said, “O ‘Uthmān, perhaps Allāh will clothe you with a shirt and if the hypocrites attempt to remove it from you, do not remove it until you meet me (in the Hereafter).” Related by Imām Aḥmad, al-Tirmidhī, Ibn Mājah and others and Shaykh Muqbil bin Hādī said, “This tradition is authentic upon the requirements of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.” Refer to Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musnad (5/501-502). And Abū Bakr al-Khallāl also narrated that Imām Aḥmad (d. 241H) used this tradition as evidence and said, “They (the hypocrites who killed him) indeed desired to do that.” *Al-Sunnah* of al-Khallāl (no. 407). These traditions provide two of many, abundant examples of foreknowledge indicating the veracity of the prophethood of Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

³⁷ Ibn Kathīr wrote: “Then they called out: Proceed to the state treasury and do not be beaten to it. The guards of the treasury heard them and said: ‘O people, deliverance, deliverance’ [asking for support].’ Indeed these people were not truthful when they said that their intent is to establish the truth, enjoin the good, prohibit the evil and other than that from what they claimed to be motivated by. They lied, their intent was the world. But the [guards] were overwhelmed and the Khārijites proceed to take the wealth from the treasury.” Refer to *al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (10/316). Ibn Kathīr repeatedly refers to this group as ‘Khārijites’, indicating his view that these are the first of those Khārijites mentioned in the Prophetic traditions to appear.

army of ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib (رضي الله عنه). Some of them had escaped to Baṣrah. Meanwhile, Mu‘āwiyah who was the appointed ruler of Syria demanded that the killers of ‘Uthmān be apprehended before the new caliph is chosen. But ‘Alī had by then become the fourth caliph by agreement of the major Companions who held authority and standing. ‘Alī was resolved to pursue and identify the perpetrators and bring them to justice, however his immediate goal was to establish political stability and unify the Muslims following this great calamity and the immediate danger posed by the large number of revolutionaries.

Activities of the Revolutionaries Post-Assassination

The Saba’iyyah who had descended upon Madīnah outnumbered the inhabitants of Madīnah rendering ‘Alī powerless and having to tread with care. For this very same reason, a group of those from the clan of ‘Uthmān, the Banū Umayyah, departed to Makkah to the wives of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to inform them of what had transpired and to discuss the next steps to seek justice. In a gathering of the senior Companions and the wives of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), ‘Ā’ishah (رضي الله عنها) encouraged them to establish justice for the murder of ‘Uthmān before settling the issue of leadership. The people responded to her call and some of them said that they should proceed to Madīnah to demand the killers and others said they should go to Baṣrah to make military preparations to pursue the perpetrators some of whom had alighted there. They eventually decided to go to al-Baṣrah.³⁸

Prior to reaching Baṣrah, the party of ‘Ā’ishah was attacked by a band led by Ḥukaym bin Jablah al-‘Abdī who was from the Saba’iyyah³⁹ and their intent was to prevent the reconciliation that was about to take place

³⁸ Refer to *al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (10/432-433).

³⁹ He was a leader of one of the four factions that came from Baṣrah to al-Madīnah which led to the siege and assassination of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه). Refer to *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* of Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālikī (Maktabah al-Sunnah, 1412H) p. 124.

between ‘Alī and ‘Ā’ishah. However, they were successfully repelled.⁴⁰ This indicates the extent to which the Saba’iyyah were resolved to prevent unity amongst the Companions. As the journey to Baṣrah continued, an incident took place⁴¹ which changed the mind of ‘Ā’ishah (رضي الله عنها) and she expressed her desire to return back to Makkah. However, news reached that the army of ‘Alī had reached Baṣrah before them so they made their way to Baṣrah with the intent of catching the perpetrators and resolving the matter with ‘Alī, who had also arrived at Baṣrah for reconciliation.⁴² Neither party had any intention of fighting with each other.

The Saba’ites and the Battle of the Jamal (Camel)

Upon arrival of both parties at Baṣrah, discussions took place between ‘Alī and ‘Ā’ishah (رضي الله عنها) through a messenger. Eventually, a truce was reached and it was agreed that both parties would disengage peacefully and return to their homes. This was unwelcome to the Saba’iyyah concealed within ‘Alī’s army.⁴³ Whilst it was known they were present and lurking around, their specific identities were not which made it difficult for ‘Alī to take the appropriate course of action. ‘Alī ordered his people to depart and return. Similarly, the party of ‘Ā’ishah (رضي الله عنها), Ṭalḥah and al-Zubayr also made plans to depart. Fearing that they were soon to be apprehended due to the combined efforts of both parties who had come to an agreement, the Sab’iyyah conspired with each other for

⁴⁰ Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/466) and also *al-Kāmil Fil-Tārīkh* of Ibn al-Athīr (3/107).

⁴¹ On the journey to Baṣrah, they passed by an oasis called al-Hawa’b whereupon some dogs began to bark at them. When ‘Ā’ishah heard this she asked, “What is the name of this oasis?” When she was told it was called al-Hawa’b, she struck one hand with the other and said, “To Allāh we belong and to Him shall we return. I do not see except that I should turn back.” When asked why, she said that she had heard the Prophet say to his wives, “*If only I knew which one of you will be barked at by the dogs of al-Hawa’b.*” Related by Aḥmad in *al-Musnad* (6/52). This became a fulfilled prophecy of the Prophet Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

⁴² Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/505).

⁴³ Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/513).

their survival. Al-Ṭabarī relates that after discussing their options, their leader, ‘Abdullāh bin Saba’, suggested that they split into two parties, with each party positioning itself in strategic positions on the side of ‘Alī and ‘Ā’ishah. Then at the appropriate time during the night, they would both initiate an attack to make it appear to each side that the other party had acted treacherously and initiated war despite the truce.⁴⁴ They implemented their evil plot and each party fought as the aggrieved oppressed party, believing it their religious duty to establish justice. The resulting turmoil led to the death of ten thousand Muslims. This sad event took place in 36H (November 656CE) and after it, both parties were remorseful at what had taken place of chaos and loss of life which had in fact been instigated by subversive Saba’iyyah element within their ranks. None of the Companions involved in this incident had any intention to fight against each other at all.

The Battle of Ṣiffīn

Six months later and still resolved to achieve political unity, ‘Alī turned to address Mu‘āwiyah (رضي الله عنه) in Syria who had not yet come under the authority of ‘Alī’s leadership and demanded vengeance for ‘Uthmān. But ‘Alī insisted on unity and for everyone to come under his authority before pursuing justice for ‘Uthmān.⁴⁵ Despite sustained diplomatic efforts to come to a resolution, the armies of the two parties met at a place called Ṣiffīn near the Euphrates (present-day Raqqa in Syria). This

⁴⁴ Refer to *al-Kāmil Fil-Tārīkh* of Ibn al-Athīr (3/125).

⁴⁵ What complicated matters was that it was known that the perpetrators had taken cover within the ranks of ‘Alī. This was to the consternation of Mu‘āwiyah and those with him who demanded the perpetrators be turned over. However, ‘Alī’s position (of establishing leadership and stability) was judged by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to be closer to the truth in his prophecy that civil war would break out between two parties and the one that was closer to the truth would fight and kill the Khārijite renegades when they appeared, and that was ‘Alī. Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī reported that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, “My nation will split into two parties and from their midst will split a renegade group, the closest of the two parties to the truth will kill them.” Related by Muslim (no. 1064).

was in Dhul-Ḥijjah, the last month of the Islāmic calendar, in the year 36H (May 657CE) Fighting broke out, and continued for just over two months and very large numbers were killed.⁴⁶ The Companion ‘Ammār bin Yāsir who was on the side of ‘Alī was killed in this battle. Just prior to his death, he took a drink of milk, fulfilling two more prophecies.⁴⁷ Over the passing of time, ‘Alī gained the upper hand and the army of Mu‘āwiyah began to signal their desire for arbitration by placing copies of the Qur‘ān on their spears and raising them up.

The Saba’ites, Arbitration and Separation of the Khārijite Movement

The faction of the Saba’iyyah in the army of ‘Alī coerced him to accept an arbitration and even threatened to kill him. One of them, **Zayd bin Ḥusayn al-Ṭā’ī**, said, “If you do not accept [arbitration] we will kill you just as we killed ‘Uthmān, for when he abandoned acting by the Book of Allāh we killed him and by Allāh we will do to you what we did to him.”⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Abū Hurayrah related that the Prophet (ﷺ) said, “*The Final Hour will not come to pass until two great armies fight and great killing will take place between them, whilst the claim of both is one [and the same].*” Related by al-Bukhārī (no. 3609) and Muslim. Both parties claimed to be upon the truth, refer to *Fath al-Bārī* (6/616) and there were tens of thousands of casualties on both sides.

⁴⁷ Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī related that during the Battle of the Trench in 5AH (627CE), whilst ‘Ammār bin Yāsir was participating in digging, the Prophet (ﷺ) said to him, “*A transgressing faction will kill you.*” Reported by Muslim (no. 2915). This is evidence that ‘Alī was correct in his position and that the other party had erred and Ibn Kathīr indicated that this prophecy is from the evidences for the prophethood of Muḥammad. Abū al-Bukhtarī relates that some milk was brought to ‘Ammār (in the Battle of Ṣiffīn before he died) and he laughed and said, “The Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) said to me, *The last drink you will have when you die will be a drink of milk.*” Related by Aḥmad in al-Musnad (4/319).

⁴⁸ Refer to *al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (10/546). And Imām al-Dhahabī said, “And from the heads of the Khārijites was Zayd bin Ḥusayn al-Ṭā’ī...” *Al-Siyar* (2/536). This is evidence of the link between the Saba’ites and the Khārijites. The peak of the heirarchy of both movements were made up of the same instigators which is why any study of the emergence of the first two sects in Islām cannot be separated.

‘Ali was not happy with accepting an arbitration because he saw it as a mere tactic of war by the opposing faction to avoid impending defeat. Under pressure and threat of assassination by the Saba’iyyah who had managed to manoeuvre themselves into a position of strength within his army he unwillingly accepted the request. An arbitration ensued with each side delegating a representative to settle the matter and end hostilities. However, no sooner had the arbitration taken place and reconciliation made between the two warring parties of Muslims but objections began to be raised.

It is related that the first who raised the issue of the arbitration was ‘**Abdullāh bin Wahb al-Rāsibī**.⁴⁹ Then some of the Qur’ānic reciters who were associates of ‘Alī took this saying and began to chant, in their compound ignorance, “*The judgement is for none but Allāh.*” This was the beginning of the emergence of the Khārijite renegades mentioned in the Prophetic traditions. The army of ‘Alī returned to Kūfah in early 37_H (July 657CE). As they approached the city, twelve-thousand men separated from him and refused to inhabit the city with him. They settled in a place called Ḥarūrā’.⁵⁰ It appears that the Saba’ite faction stirred up discontentment towards ‘Alī during the return journey and a large number had been affected. They raised a number of objections against ‘Alī’s conduct so he sent Ibn ‘Abbās, the scholar of the Qur’ān, to debate them on those issues. Ibn ‘Abbās refuted their arguments and a third of them returned from their error but the remainder persisted upon their misguidance.⁵¹ They claimed ‘Alī had disobeyed Allāh, that the truce was unlawful and that everyone who accepted the arbitration had become disbelievers including ‘Alī, Mu‘āwiyah and both of their armies.

These were the Khārijite renegades intended by the saying of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), “*A renegade faction will appear during an era of civil strife amongst*

⁴⁹ Refer to *al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (10/560).

⁵⁰ This is why they were also labelled the Ḥarūrites (Ḥarūriyyah).

⁵¹ Refer to *al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (10/567).

the Muslims and the closest of the two [contending] parties will kill them."⁵² In this tradition is a clear judgement that despite the contention and war between the two parties of 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah, both remained Muslims. One was correct ('Alī) in his decision that political unity and stability was the first priority and the other (Mu'āwiyah) had erred in his judgement of demanding that 'Uthmān should be avenged before 'Alī took power. This is the belief of orthodox Muslims and it is prohibited to harbour any ill-feeling towards the Companions who had been put to trial with each party pursuing what they knew to be truth and justice.

⁵² Related by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

The Breakaway “Islāmic State” of the Khārijites and “Enjoining the Good and Forbidding the Evil”

When the Khārijites split away from the Muslims, they began to entice each other to ‘*enjoin the good and forbid the evil*’⁵³ and to rectify the people because they had become misguided in their view.⁵⁴ From Ḥarūrā’, the Khārijites made their way to a place called **al-Nahrawān**, twelve miles from Baghdād. This became their Islāmic State which they considered the abode of Islām upon the belief that the rest of the Muslims had forsaken Islām and their lands were lands of disbelief and war. This was in early 37H (July 657CE) and over the next two years, the Khārijite ideology began to develop more fully and take shape. They also began recruiting people and obliging them to emigrate to their alleged Islāmic state so that they could launch jihād against the Muslims as is explicit in their words.⁵⁵ They also began to take the ambiguous verses of the Qur’ān and interpret them with false interpretations, using them against the Muslims. As a result, the learned scholars of the Qur’ān of the time such as Qatādah (d. 118H, early 8th century CE), a direct student of the Prophet’s Companions, commented on the Qur’ānic verse, **“As for those in whose hearts is a disease, they pursue what is ambiguous therein, seeking tribulation...”**

⁵³ Refer to the statements of the Saba’ite Khārijites later in this treatise in this regard after they had broken away and set up their state - point 8 in the section which relates to their activities and methods.

⁵⁴ This was the very same foundation upon which Ḥasan al-Bannā founded his Brotherhood (al-Ikhwān al-Muslimūn). They saw themselves as an elite band who stood to *enjoin good and prohibit evil* and whoever did not join them was deficient if not suspect in his faith. Similarly, the movement of Hizb al-Taḥrīr largely operates upon the claim of enjoining good and forbidding evil. To them, it is practically encompassed in mobilizing people against the ruling authorities whom they consider disbelievers and apostates and as the root of all problems faced by Muslims. Islām and the Sharīah did not come with revolutions and coups, these are the ways of the disbelievers under whose influence the 20th century political “jamā’ah” appeared, founded upon ḥizbiyyah (partisanship and loyalty to the party and its goals).

⁵⁵ These are documented in a later section on the activities of the Saba’iyyah and Khārijites during this entire four year period, until they assassinated ‘Alī.

(3:7) by saying, “If they are not the Ḥarūrīyah [Khārijites] or the Saba’ites, then I do not know who they are.”⁵⁶ The first leader of the Khārijites was ‘**Abdullāh bin Wahb al-Rāsibī** and he and some of the main instigators with him have been identified as Saba’iyyah, followers of ‘Abdullāh bin Saba’. He had strong marks of prostration on his forehead due to striving hard in worship which indicates that outward piety does not equate to guidance and doctrinal authenticity. Regarding this appellation (al-Saba’, referring to the region in Yemen) the historian known as al-Sam‘ānī (d. 562H) wrote, “And ‘Abdullāh bin Wahb al-Saba’ī, leader of the Khārijites, and it is my belief that this Ibn Wahb is ascribed to ‘Abdullāh bin Saba’, for he (the latter) is from the Rāfiḍah [Shī’ites], and a group amongst them ascribe to him and they are called Saba’ites.”⁵⁷ Imām al-Dhahabī, the famous encyclopedic biographer, wrote, “In this year [38H, 659CE] was the occurrence of al-Nahrawān between ‘Alī and the Khārijites. The head of the Khārijites, ‘Abdullāh bin Wahb [al-Rāsibī] al-Saba’ī was killed and most of his associates were killed.”⁵⁸ Al-Dhahabī also said, “And from the heads of the Khārijites was **Zayd bin Ḥuṣayn al-Ṭā’ī**...”⁵⁹ and he was the individual who said to ‘Alī that unless he accepts the arbitration with Mu‘āwiyah, they will kill him as they killed ‘Uthmān.⁶⁰ Al-Fasawī relates from Abū al-Walīd who narrated that Sālim bin ‘Abd Allāh bin ‘Umar said to him, after informing him he was from Kūfah, “What an evil people, comprising of either a Saba’ite or a Ḥarūrīte.”⁶¹

⁵⁶ Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī*.

⁵⁷ *Al-Ansāb* (Dār al-Janān, 1408H) p. 209.

⁵⁸ *Al-‘Ibar Fī Khabar Man Ghabar* (Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah) 1/32, authored by ‘Abd al-Karīm bin Muḥammad al-Sam‘ānī.

⁵⁹ *Al-Siyar* (2/536).

⁶⁰ Those who later revolted against the leaders of Banī Umayyah, the first ruling dynasty after the four righteous Caliphs, were also from the Saba’iyyah. The poet al-A’shā (d. 84H) said about the revolutionary, al-Mukhtār bin Abī ‘Ubayd al-Thaqafī and his followers, “I bear witness against you, that you are Saba’iyyah and that I am acquainted with you O agents of disbelief.” Refer to al-A’shā’s *Dīwān* (p. 148) and *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 2nd edition) 6/83.

⁶¹ *Al-Ma‘rifah wal-Tārīkh* (2/757).

Short of two years later, ‘Alī finally fought against the Khārijites at al-Nahrawān in 38H (659CE), fulfilling the prophecy in the speech of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), “A renegade faction will appear during a time of civil strife and the closest of the two parties to the truth will kill them.” ‘Alī was closer to the truth than Mu‘āwiyah in this tribulation and he fought and killed the Khārijites. When ‘Alī defeated them at al-Nahrawān, he ordered that the black man mentioned by the Prophet on whose upper arm would be a mark should be looked for. After a few attempts, he was finally found on the battlefield and identified with a mark exactly as the Prophet mentioned. Al-Ḥaytham bin ‘Adī (d. 207H) in his work titled “*al-Khāwārij*” relates through Nāfi’ bin Maslamah who said, “The man who was (found), Dhul-Thudayyah (possessor of the breast-like mark on his upper arm) was from ‘Uraynah, from Bajīlah, and he was intensely black in complexion. He had a vile stench that was known within the army and [during the battle] he would be in our proximity. He would fight us and we would fight him.”⁶² When his lacerated body was found and came to the attention of ‘Alī, he prostrated for a lengthy time, recognizing the fulfilment of the prophecy made by the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).⁶³ Following the defeat of the Khārijites the people began to say to ‘Alī, “All praise is due to Allāh, O chief of the believers, who has cut them off.” ‘Alī responded, “No by Allāh, they remain in the loins of men and wombs of women and when they appear, hardly do they fight anyone except that they overwhelm him.”⁶⁴ ‘Alī knew that the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) had prophesized their continued appearance till the end of time and that they will not go extinct after their defeat at al-Nahrawān.

Once this historical background has been put in place, we can now look in more detail about the traits of the Khārijites mentioned in the Prophetic traditions, some of their early terrorist activities, how the Muslim scholars spoke of them through every generation and the nature

⁶² Refer to *al-Bidāyah* of Ibn Kathīr (10/590).

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ Refer to *al-Bidāyah* of Ibn Kathīr (10/590-591).

of their activities during the time they broke of from ‘Alī’s army and were eventually fought and killed by him almost two years later.

THE ACTIVITIES AND TECHNIQUES OF THE SABA'ITE AND KHĀRIJITE TERRORISTS

Many of the ideas and activities of this early subversive current which put Islām and the Muslims to trial can be found today amongst the Khārijite terrorists of al-Qā'idah and ISIS in the land of Shām (Syria) and Irāq - **the very place** from which the Prophet of Islām indicated, over 1400 years ago, that these people would first emerge and then continue to emerge. The famous historian and Qur'ān commentator, Ibn Kathīr (d.774H, 14th century CE), compiled the activities of the early Saba'ites and Khārijites in some detail and it is worthwhile to mention them here to see the striking parallels between them and the Khārijites of today in the form of ISIS, al-Qā'idah, Boko Hāram and others. When the statements of the leaders and spokesmen of ISIS and videos of the activities of their members are compared with those of the first Khārijites, it becomes clear with absolute certainty that they are the *Khārijite Dogs of Hellfire* intended in the Prophetic traditions. This prophecy about the Khārijites is one of many serving as proof for the truthfulness of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).

1. Forging documents against the Companions. The Saba'ite Khārijite terrorists distributed a document in the name of 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) in which there was a command authorizing the killing of the conspirators behind the planned uprising against 'Uthmān during 35H (656CE). They had forged this document and the seal of 'Uthmān with which they stamped the document to give it the appearance of authenticity. 'Uthmān would have had no knowledge about these conspirators and their intentions at the time and he expressly denied he wrote this document.⁶⁵ They also

⁶⁵ *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (taḥqīq by 'Abdullāh bin 'Abd al-Muhsin al-Turkī, 1418H) 10/280-281. In a similar way, the terrorists of today fabricate affairs against the rulers of the Muslims and accuse them with what they are innocent of as a means of rousing the people against them. That is not to say that the Muslim rulers do not have shortcomings, mistakes and oppositions - but this is a tactic used by the terrorists to achieve their goals.

fabricated documents against the Companions such as ‘Alī, Ṭalḥah and Zubayr in which they allegedly called the people to fight against ‘Uthmān in order to aid the religion, and they wrote in these fabricated documents that fighting against ‘Uthmān was the greatest form of jihād and support of the religion.⁶⁶ They also fabricated a document against ‘Ā’ishah (رضي الله عنها) in which she allegedly called the people to revolt against ‘Uthmān and to kill him. In one of these forged letters it was stated “Kill Na‘thal, for he has disbelieved”.⁶⁷ While these events were unfolding ‘Ā’ishah (رضي الله عنها) was actually in Makkah performing the Ḥajj rites. After mentioning narrations from Masrūq and al-A‘mash in this regard, Ibn Kathīr comments, “And in this and its likes is plain evidence that those Khārijites, may Allāh disfigure them, would fabricate documents upon the tongues of the Companions and spread them in the horizons, inciting the people to fight against ‘Uthmān.”⁶⁸

2. Addressing the rulers with Jewish names. The Khārijite terrorists would address ‘Uthmān with names of Jewish leaders to imply his disbelief and that he was like them⁶⁹ and they would refer to ‘Alī with derogatory names such as jāḥid (denier, rejector).⁷⁰ During their revolt against ‘Uthmān in Madīnah, one of them stood up whilst ‘Uthmān was delivering a sermon and said to him, “Stand O Na‘thal and come down from this pulpit.” Na‘thal was the name of one of the Jewish leaders in

⁶⁶ *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (taḥqīq of al-Turkī, 1418H) 10/277. In a like fashion, the Khārijites of al-Qā’idah and ISIS claim that fighting against the rulers is the greatest form of jihād and they fabricate statements upon the scholars of the Muslims such as Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and Ibn Taymiyyah, ascribing to them and their statements what they did not say or intend. This is to deceive the people to make it appear that they are justified and supported in their evil activities when the reality is that in the speech of those scholars is the very opposite and what actually condemns them, their ideology and their activities.

⁶⁷ Refer to al-Kāmil of Ibn Athīr (3/100).

⁶⁸ *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (taḥqīq of al-Turkī, 1418H) 10/339-340.

⁶⁹ *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah*, 10/282,284.

⁷⁰ *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (taḥqīq of al-Turkī, 1418H) 10/591. ‘Abdullāh bin Wahb al-Rāsibī would refuse to call ‘Alī with any name or title except this one, jāḥid (denier, rejector).

Madīnah.⁷¹ One of them, Jabalah bin ‘Amr al-Sā‘idī passed by ‘Uthmān and said: “O Na’tal, by Allāh I will kill you and carry you on a scabby she-camel and through you into the heat of fire.”⁷² And when the murderers eventually broke into his house they said to him, “Which religion are you upon O Na’tal?” ‘Uthmān replied, “Upon the religion of Islām and I am not Na’tal, but I am the Chief of the Believers (*amīr al-mu’minīn*).”⁷³ Ibn Kathīr relates that after ‘Uthmān was assassinate and the Companions had washed and shrouded him and one of them prayed over him the janāzah prayer, “the Khārijites objected to him and desired to stone [‘Uthmān’s body], fling him off his burial crib and were resolute that he should be buried in the Jewish graveyard by Dayr Sal’.”⁷⁴

3. Stealing property and wealth. The first Khārijite terrorists would steal the property and possessions of the rulers whom they declared apostates as they did with ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) after killing him. They left nothing in his house and took all of his possessions and also raided the state treasury. Ibn Kathīr states: “And the Khārijites came and took the wealth in the state treasury, and it had a great deal of it”⁷⁵

4. Spilling blood and cutting off routes of travel. The Khārijite terrorists who opposed ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) would shed blood, cut off the routes of travel and would violate the inviolable⁷⁶ such as their murder of ‘Abdullāh bin al-Khabbāb and killing women and even an unborn child.⁷⁷

⁷¹ In Tāj al-‘Urūs of al-Zubaydī (Kuwait, 1407H) there occurs: “Al-Layth said: ‘Al-Na’tal: A foolish old man’ and Na’tal: A Jew who was in Madīnah, ‘Uthmān was resembled with him as occurs in al-Tabṣīr and it is said that Na’tal refers to a man with a long beard from Egypt.” 31/14.

⁷² Refer to *al-Bidāyah* 10/284.

⁷³ Refer to *al-Bidāyah* 10/307.

⁷⁴ Refer to *al-Bidāyah* 10/326-327.

⁷⁵ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/307, 316. In a similar fashion today, the Khārijites refer to some of the Muslim rulers as the slaves of the Jews and Christians or agents of the Jews and as hypocrites and enemies of the Muslims.

⁷⁶ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/584.

⁷⁷ The Khārijites of ISIS and al-Qā’idah slaughter men, women and children without distinction as they were doing in the streets and mosques of Baghdād

5. Motivated by personal reasons. The Khārijite terrorists of old made it clear that they were motivated primarily for personal, worldly reasons. One of the assassins of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) called ‘Amr bin al-Ḥamiq sat on his chest after he had already been stabbed by another and proceeded to stab him nine times in the chest, after which he said, “Three of them were for Allāh and six of them were for what I held in my chest.”⁷⁸ In reality, none of them were for Allāh at all, for these individuals were disbelieving hypocrites by judgement of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

6. Divided in their pursuit of overall leadership. Ibn Kathīr writes, “So when they revolted in the era of ‘Uthmān, the people rallied behind them [the Khārijites], and everyone had an associate [leading them in the revolution], and each group of people desired that their associate would take the overall leadership after ‘Uthmān.”⁷⁹ Many factions came to Madīnah from the various cities and each had a leader. Their anticipation would be that following the removal of ‘Uthmān, their leader would be the one to take power. This undercurrent of rivalry and pursuit of ultimate authority expresses itself today in the rivalry between the factions of ISIS, al-Nuṣrah and al-Qā’idah.

7. Recruitment by stealth and encouraging emigration from Muslim lands. After splitting from the main body of Muslims under the leadership of ‘Alī, ‘Abdullāh bin Wahb al-Rāsibī - who was the first leader

years ago with horrendous bombings - terrorizing the people and cutting off the routes of travel.

⁷⁸ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/309. In a like fashion, the Khārijites in all their varying factions today, whether those engaged in violence and terrorism or those who just support the underlying ideology, they all have grievances against the Muslim rulers in matters of wealth and employment.

⁷⁹ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/397. In a like fashion, the Khārijites of today are divided into factions (al-Qā’idah, al-Nuṣrah, ISIS and others), each of them desiring that they will be the ones to take over general leadership. This has led them to fight and kill each other and declare each other apostates indicating the nature and extent of their misguidance, founded upon matters of the world.

of the Khārijites and member of the Saba'iyyah subversive movement - began to meet with his associates and started recruiting people by encouraging them to abandon their families and to travel to them by stealth. He said, "Come out with us O our brothers from this city whose inhabitants are oppressive to this outskirts near the mountainous rural district or to some of these cities, in rejection of these oppressive rulings (al-aḥkām al-jā'irah)."⁸⁰ Similarly, **Zayd bin Ḥuṣayn al-Ṭā'ī** - the one who threatened to kill 'Alī just as his group had previously killed 'Uthmān - advised those who were upon this Khārijite ideology in various cities. He informed them when they desire to leave Kūfah to come to their meeting place, they should not leave in groups, but in isolation so as not to create suspicion. They would write letters to their followers in Baṣrah and other locations giving them advice on how and where to meet. Youths began to leave, abandoning their mothers, fathers, aunties and uncles and all other relatives. Ibn Kathīr commented, "Due to their ignorance and paucity of knowledge and intellect, they thought this matter pleases the Lord of the Heavens and Earth. They did not know that it is from the greatest of major sins, vices, destructive affairs, mighty transgressions and errors and that it is from what Iblīs (Satan) has beautified for them and for their souls which command them with evil."⁸¹

8. Waging jihād against Muslims and encouraging their slaughter. These Khārijites considered the Muslims to have strayed and abandoned Islām, despairing of bringing them back and thus they enjoined jihād against them. When the heads of this movement gathered in a house, each one of them of was presented with leadership and they all refused except 'Abdullāh bin Wahb al-Rāsibī who said, "By Allāh, I do not accept [leadership] desiring the world and nor do I abandon it out of aversion of death." When he had been made leader, they gathered together in the house of Zayd bin Ḥuṣayn al-Ṭā'ī who gave them a sermon. He

⁸⁰ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/578. Similarly, the Khārijites of ISIS use propaganda via social media to entice the young, ignorant and foolish to abandon their families and travel to them in the lands occupied by them.

⁸¹ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/581.

encouraged them to *enjoin the good and forbid the evil* and he recited verses from the Qurʾān to them such as, “**O David, we have made you the vicegerent upon the Earth, so judge between the people with truth and do not follow desire lest it misguide you from Allāh’s path.**” (38:26) and also “**And whoever does not judge by what Allāh revealed, they are the disbelievers.**” (5:44)⁸² and “**...they are the oppressors.**” (5:45) and “**... they are the sinners.**” (5:47). Then he said, “So bear witness against the people subjected to our call from the people of our *qiblah* (direction of prayer) that they followed desire, shunned the judgement of the Book, have transgressed in speech and deed and that waging jihād against them is a duty upon the believers.” Then a man among them called ‘Abd Allāh bin Shajarah al-Sullamī wept and encouraged them to attack the people and in his speech he said, “Strike their faces and foreheads with swords until the Most-Gracious, Most Merciful (al-Raḥmān, al-Raḥīm) is obeyed.” Ibn Kathīr commented upon this, “These type of people are from the strangest of species amongst the offspring of Ādam, and sublime is Allāh who created variations in His creation as He desired... The intent here is that they are misguided ignoramuses, wretched (despicable) in both statements and deeds.”⁸³ One should note that though the Khārijites split and became into many sects, acquiring other deviant beliefs, what is common between them and unites them all is the issue of takfīr in

⁸² This verse is the foundation of all Khārijite movements without exception and the central affair that unites them all. Thereafter, the Khārijites have differences. Some of them do not not excommunicate Muslims on account of sins at all. Others excommunicate Muslims on account of some sins exclusive to others. And yet others excommunicate Muslims on account of every sin, large or small. This is a refutation of the terrorist sympathizers who say that the likes of ISIS, al-Qāʾidah and other Khārijites do not excommunicate Muslims on account of drinking, fornication, gambling and other major sins. The reality is that neither did the very first Khārijites.

⁸³ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/578-581. In a like fashion today, the Khārijites of ISIS, Boko Haram, al-Qāʾidah and others wage jihād against Muslims after first excommunicating those who do not agree with them, or criticize them. The Khārijite ideology is clothed with lofty slogans such as “Sharīʿah” and “Khilāfah” and “social justice” and the claim of “enjoining the good and forbidding the evil” and what is similar to that.

relation to rulership and judgement by Allāh’s law. This is the foundational basis of all revolutionary political movements taking form in the innovated “Islāmic political jamā‘ah.”

9. Judging Muslims with disbelief on account of matters that do not constitute it. The ignorant Khārijites excommunicated ‘Alī and accused him of being a polytheist because he deferred judgement to men, a reference to the arbitration between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah during the battle at Şiffīn. They said, “O Alī, you have ascribed partners to Allāh in His religion, judgement belongs only to Allāh.”⁸⁴ This is despite the fact that arbitration - such as in marital disputes and in reconciliation between contending or warring parties - is permitted in the Qur’ān, and this is how Ibn ‘Abbās, the Qur’ānic scholar, refuted those Khārijites. Thus, they accuse Muslims with disbelief through matters that are not even considered sins in the Islāmic Sharī‘ah, let alone disbelief itself, but rather commended.⁸⁵

10. Their opponents condemned to Hellfire if killed by them. The Khārijites of old also believed that whomever was killed by them was automatically in the Hellfire. The companion of the Prophet, Abu Ayyūb al-Anṣārī (رضي الله عنه) said, “I pushed a spear into a man from the Khārijites and pushed it through till it came out from his back and I said to him, ‘Glad tidings O enemy of Allāh of the Fire.’ So he replied, ‘You will soon come to know which of us is more worthy of being burned therein’.”⁸⁶ This is keeping in mind that the Companions of the Prophet are guaranteed Paradise by the testimony of the Qur’ān and the Khārijite

⁸⁴ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/570.

⁸⁵ Similarly today, the Khārijites treat affairs permitted in the Islāmic Sharī‘ah, such as trade and diplomatic relations with non-Muslim states and showing benevolence and kindness to them, to constitute disbelief.

⁸⁶ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/588. Today, the Khārijites of ISIS claim that anyone who fights them and is killed by them is automatically an apostate and is condemned to the Hellfire - as can be seen in numerous videos that have been surfacing over the last couple of years.

dogs are condemned to the Hellfire by testimony of the Qur’ān and the Prophetic traditions.

11. Claiming Paradise for their dead. When ‘Alī came to them at al-Nahrawān, admonished them and warned them severely and they intended battle, they began chanting, “Judgement is for Allāh, departure, departure to Paradise!”⁸⁷ Thus, they claimed automatic entry to Paradise for their dead, whereas the Prophet (ﷺ) had judged them Khārijite dogs of Hellfire who exit from Islām as an arrow passes through its game.⁸⁸

11. Violating the rights of the people under protection. The Khārijites violate the rights of the non-Muslims who are under guarantee of protection from the Muslims. ‘Alī had sent Ibn ‘Abbās, the most knowledgeable companion of the Prophet of the Qur’ān, to debate the Khārijites and as a result one third of them returned.⁸⁹ To the remaining two-thirds ‘Alī announced that there is “an agreement between us and you that you will not spill inviolable blood, you will not cut off the pathways and you will not oppress [the non-Muslims] under protection.” Later, when ‘Alī had fought them, ‘Ā’ishah said to Ibn Shaddād, “He killed them” and he replied, “By Allāh, he did not dispatch [his army] to them until they cut off the pathways, spilled blood and made lawful [the killing] of the [non-Muslims] under guarantee of protection.”⁹⁰

12. They comprised the ruffians, hooligans, the dregs of society and the young and foolish of age. Those who were mobilized against ‘Uthmān by

⁸⁷ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/587.

⁸⁸ The same rhetoric is found today with the Khārijite dogs of ISIS, al-Qā’idah and others, their slogans being, “The judgement is for Allāh alone,” and their enticement to the ignorant and foolish to seek Paradise through martyrdom and slaughtering other Muslims.

⁸⁹ It is said they numbered six thousand and it is also said twelve thousand.

⁹⁰ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/588. In a similar way, the treacherous Khārijites of ISIS and al-Qā’idah violate the sanctity of the Sharī’ah by taking lives which the Sharī’ah has protected.

the Saba'iyyah were the dregs of society and the young and foolish.⁹¹ Just the Prophet (ﷺ) described them, “*young of age, foolish-mind.*” Historians Ibn Sa’d, al-Dhahabī, Ibn Kathīr and others recount from earlier authorities that those the revolutionaries mobilized against ‘Uthmān were the dregs of society, ruffians, brainless savages and that the Khārijites comprised of ignorant masses.⁹²

13. Find fault with scholars in irrelevant matters. When ‘Alī sent Ibn Abbās (رضي الله عنه) to debate with the Khārijites after they abandoned his army and camped at Ḥarūrā’, he was wearing a fine garment. They began to debate with him about it and he replied with the Qur’ān, “**Say: Who has forbidden the adornment [of clothing] given by Allāh which He has produced for His servants and the good lawful things of provision?**” (7:32). This indicates their resentment against both the rulers and the scholars for the good things Allāh has bestowed upon them and that these underlying currents of jealousy are what drive the instigators amongst them.⁹³

⁹¹ Refer to *al-Kāmil* of Ibn al-Athīr (3/101).

⁹² Similarly today, the young and foolish who know hardly a thing about the foundations and principles of Islām are recruited by ISIS, and many of them have barely left street-life thuggery, drugs or a teenage life engrossed in popular culture and music, and then all of a sudden, they are off to the alleged Islāmic state to wage jihād. This phenomenon is not new and it is not surprising to those who know history and understand the reality of the religion of the Khārijites, it was the very same thing taking place between 36H and 38H when the first Khārijites set up their alleged Islāmic state in al-Nahrawān and began to use propaganda to recruit the young and foolish to their cause.

⁹³ Similarly today the Khārijites of al-Qā’idah, ISIS and others resent what they see of affluence with the rulers of the Muslims, despite the fact that the Prophet informed and taught his nation that there will come leaders who will give preference to their own interests above and beyond those of the subjects and that some of them would not follow his guidance and would have the hearts of devils in the bodies of men, but despite that, he enjoined patience upon the subjects even if oppressed.

14. Fault-picking against the rulers and twisting everything that they do in their statements, activities and decisions. During the 2 year period between 36H and 38H before ‘Alī eventually fought the Khārijites, they would find fault with ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) in every issue possible, criticize him and twist his words to present them in the worst possible light. Ibn Kathīr relates through al-Ṭabarī that the Khārijites, “began to confront him regarding his statements, make him hear their slurs (revilements) and making all sorts of interpretations of his statements.”⁹⁴ Similarly, ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) made some personal judgements in matters of jurisprudence and these issues were raised against him by the Saba’iyyah as part of a wider agenda to stir up revolution. Likewise, when they fabricated a letter upon ‘Uthmān in which he allegedly gave orders to have them killed and ‘Uthmān stated his complete innocence, they responded by saying, “If you did write it you are treacherous and if you did not write it, it shows you are powerless and the likes of you therefore are not fit for leadership due to either treachery or incapacity.”⁹⁵

15. Complaining and supplicating for change despite living in relative affluence and safety. From their ungratefulness is that despite living in sufficiency, affluence and safety, they supplicate for change. In the reign of ‘Uthmān, people would come to the Bayt al-Māl (the state treasury), take their portion, and then supplicate for a change in their circumstances for the better.⁹⁶ Many of those who are upon and promote the ideology of the Khārijites in the Muslim countries, particularly those of the Gulf countries, live in relative affluence, have jobs and live in security. This situation came about for them through the efforts of the rulers whom they resent and even judge with disbelief. This indicates the nature of the heart residing in the body of a Khārijite, vile and putrid, ungrateful and filled with scorn.

⁹⁴ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/569.

⁹⁵ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/311.

⁹⁶ Refer to *al-Bidāyah*, 10/336.

16. Doctrines of prominent early Khārijite sects. The heresiographers specializing in documenting the ideas and practices of the deviant sects note the following about the very early Khārijite splinter groups:⁹⁷ **The Azāriqites** declared the killing the wives and children of Muslims they considered apostates to be lawful. Some of them also made it lawful to violate contracts. They also held that whoever resides in the lands of disbelief is a disbeliever, keeping in mind that a land of disbelief is any land other than theirs. **The Najadites** made it lawful to kill non-Muslims under covenant with the Muslims and to take their wealth. Some of them also believe that dissimulation (*taqiya*) in speech and deed is permissible even in killing people. **The Bahaisites** asserted that when the ruler becomes a disbeliever (according to them), all of his subjects also become disbelievers. Another group, the **'Ajāridites** make secret assassinations lawful and they also make it permissible to enslave women and kill the children of the disbelievers (that includes Muslims).

From the above, which is but a glimpse of their activities one can clearly determine that these people are at war with Islām, its lands and its inhabitants, rulers and ruled. Anyone who equates the ideology of the modern Khārijites from the Qutbists, al-Qā'idah, al-Nuṣrah, ISIS and others with the Islām brought by Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) or with the Salafī scholars who have always been at the forefront of fighting against the Khārijites is a rank ignoramus or a paid shill who prostitutes his services for silver coins or a resentful hater and it is not impossible for him to be all three at the same time. This brings to question many of the “terrorism experts” that have appeared over the past decade or so to take advantage of the monetary rewards available in the terrorism industry, the goal of which is to maintain a particular perception towards the average Muslim living in non-Muslim countries who wishes to preserve his faith from

⁹⁷ Refer to al-Ash'arī's *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, al-Shahrastānī's *al-Milal wala-Niḥal*, Ibn Ḥazm's *al-Fiṣal fil-Milal* under the entry of Khārijites.

erosion. Well funded anti-Islāmic hate networks operate to spew propaganda against Islām, its Prophet and the Muslims at large.⁹⁸

⁹⁸ From the fraudulent, fallacious claims being made through media outlets is that Muslims are taking all over Europe and America, that the Sharī'ah is slowly replacing secular laws and democracy and that every Muslims is involved in a stealth jihād. News anchors, hosts and expert guests routinely appear to push this narrative onto millions, stoking fear and xenophobia.

THE PROPHET’S DESCRIPTIONS OF THE KHĀRIJITE TERRORISTS

From the well-known, authentically related statements of the Prophet (ﷺ) about this group include his saying, “*They depart from the religion (Islām) like an arrow passes through its game and they do not return back to it until the arrow returns back to its bow-string*”⁹⁹ and “*Their faith does not pass beyond their throats*” and “*They recite the Qur’ān but it does not go beyond their collar-bones,*” indicating ignorance and false scholarship. He (ﷺ) also said, “*They speak with the best speech of the creation,*” meaning, beautified, alluring speech, and “*(They are) young of age, foolish of mind*” and “*Their speech is beautiful, alluring yet their actions are evil*” and “*They are the most evil of the creation*” and “*They call to the Book of Allāh, yet they have nothing to do with it.*” The Prophet (ﷺ) went further and also said “*They are the most evil of those killed beneath the canopy of the sky*” and “*They are the Dogs of Hellfire.*”¹⁰⁰

These very severe and harsh descriptions of the Khārijite extremists came alongside a mention of their devotion which would surpass and excel that of the Prophet’s Companions themselves. Despite this, the Prophet (ﷺ) signalled his intent to kill them should he have reached them.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ This indicates that the Khārijites rarely abandon their misguidance and do not return back to the truth due to a combination of ignorance about the rulings of Islām and strong religious fervour founded upon such ignorance.

¹⁰⁰ These reports can be found in the ḥadīth collections of al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, Ibn Mājah and others and are well known and famous to the Scholars of the Muslims, the students of knowledge and many of the common folk. It is great oppression therefore, that the actions of these terrorists are ascribed to Islām and its noble Prophet (ﷺ).

¹⁰¹ For documentation of these traditions refer to *Jāmi’ al-Uṣūl Fī Aḥādīth al-Rasūl* of Ibn al-Athīr (10/76-92) under the heading of “*The Khārijites.*”

THE TRAITS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE KHĀRIJITES

On the basis of the Prophetic traditions and the activities of the Khārijites the Salafī scholars have detailed their traits and characteristics, which are summarized below:¹⁰²

1. They display fake piety (wara’). A type of piety that led them to major innovations and deviation. Ibn Taymiyyah said, “This (display of overt) piety can lead a person to major innovations, for the (overt) piety (displayed) by the Khārijites, Rāfiḍites and Mu’tazilites is of this type. They avoided oppression and from what they believed to be oppression from mixing with the oppressors as they claimed until they abandoned the major obligations such as performing the jumu’ah (Friday) prayer and congregational prayers (with the Muslims), and Ḥajj and jihād (alongside the rulers) and giving advice to the Muslims and showing mercy to them. The people of this type of piety were shown rejection by the leading imāms, such as the Four Imāms, and this condition (of overt, fake piety) began to be mentioned amongst the (issues) within the doctrine of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā’ah.”¹⁰³ An illustration of their fake piety is that when they took the Prophet’s companion ‘Abdullāh bin Khabbāb captive and led him to his eventual slaughter, they passed by some date-palm trees owned by a Christian and one of them took a date and ate it. So they said to him, “You have (unlawfully) taken a date which belongs to the people of the covenant.” Another killed a pig that belonged to a Christian and they ordered him to pay compensation. Whilst observing these actions, ‘Abdullāh said to them, “Shall I not tell you who is a greater right upon you than this?” They said, “Who” and he replied, “Me, I have not abandoned a prayer nor have abandoned this nor that (form of worship).” However, they killed him.¹⁰⁴ So they showed overt piety and fear of Allāh in taking a date unlawfully and killing a pig which was the property of a Christian, however, it was a fake type of

¹⁰² Refer to *Alawiyat al-Naṣr Fī al-Radd ‘alā Khawārij al-Aṣr* of Sa‘ūd bin Ṣāliḥ al-Sa‘dī.

¹⁰³ *Majmu‘ al-Fatāwā* (20.140).

¹⁰⁴ *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* (7/560).

piety, because they paid no regard to human life, that of the Prophet's companion, whom they slaughtered by the banks of a river until his blood flowed into it.

2. They abandon the main body of the Muslims. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "The foundation of the misguidance of these [Khārijites] is their belief regarding the leaders of guidance and the body of the Muslims that they have departed from justice and are misguided."¹⁰⁵

3. They consider themselves to be more righteous and superior to the people of knowledge. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "The first of those who went astray in this regard are the renegade Khārijites when they judged that they (alone) are holding fast to the Book of Allāh and His (Prophet's) Sunnah."¹⁰⁶ Considering that the Khārijites have no genuine scholars amongst them, it is clear that they consider themselves more learned and superior to the scholars.

4. Treating what is not a sin to be a sin. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "They have two well-known traits by which they departed from the main body of the Muslims and their rulers. The first of them is their departure from the Sunnah and making what is not a sin to be a sin or what is not a good deed to be a good deed."¹⁰⁷

5. They declare Muslims disbelievers on account of sins and subsequently legalize their murder. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "[The second of their two well-known traits] that they declare Muslims to be disbelievers on account of sins and evils and built upon this takfīr they make lawful the shedding of the blood of the Muslims and taking their wealth and claim that the land of Islām is a land of war and that the land inhabited by them (alone) is a land of faith."¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* (28/497).

¹⁰⁶ *Al-Istiqāmah* (1/13).

¹⁰⁷ *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* (19/72).

¹⁰⁸ *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* (19/73).

6. They follow ambiguous passages of the Qur’ān. Ibn Taymiyyah said, “Likewise, [Imām] Aḥmad would explain (correctly) the ambiguous verses and ḥadīths which the deviants would utilize from amongst the Khārijites and others.”¹⁰⁹

7. Their raising the sword of violence and slaughter with the pretext of enjoining good and forbidding evil. Ibn al-Qayyim said, “The Khārijites appeared fighting against the rulers, revolting against them with the sword with the pretext of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil.”¹¹⁰

8. Considering something to be from the religion when it is alien to the religion. Ibn Taymiyyah said, “For the people of religiosity amongst those desire the attainment of what they consider to be religion but they err from two angles. The first is that what they consider to be religion is not religion, such as the view of the Khārijites¹¹¹ and other than them from the people of desires. For they believe and opinion which is erroneous and innovation and then fight the people over it. Rather, they declare their opponents to be disbelievers. Thus, they err in their view and in fighting those who oppose them or in declaring them disbelievers and cursing them. This is condition of the generality of the people of desires.”¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (17/414).

¹¹⁰ *Ighāthat al-Lahafān* (2/81).

¹¹¹ The religion of the Khārijites is revolting against the rulers in order to establish law and justice as they claim. This is alien to Islām, Islām never came with this and is the way of the Marxists, Socialists and Communists. Islām came with its opposite, which is to maintain civil order by having patience upon the ruler’s tyranny and injustice, and this is from the angle of bearing the least of two harms so as to avert a greater harm. To oppose this clear Sunnah, the Khārijites impute disbelief to the rulers to enable them to justify their activities, since it is easier to recruit others for this purpose when they are told that the rulers are apostates and enemies of Islām and the Muslims.

¹¹² *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/536).

9. Their gross ignorance of the religion and absence of scholars amongst them. This is manifest when Ibn ‘Abbās was sent to debate with them and to repel their doubts. It became clear that amongst the twelve or so thousand of them, there was not a single companion of the Prophet. In their debate they demonstrate their ignorance of the Qur’ān and its interpretation. They do not have the ability to make *istidlāl* (infer and deduce from the texts) and they rely upon generalizations and absolutions. Imām al-Shāṭibī said, “From following ambiguities is to take unqualified absolutions before looking at their qualifications and taking generalizations without reflecting as to whether they have specifications or not. Likewise, the opposite, to take a text which has been restricted and to generalize it.”¹¹³ There are no scholars to be found with the Khārijite terrorists of al-Qā‘idah, al-Nuṣrah and ISIS and certainly those who feign knowledge amongst them did not take knowledge from the well-known and famous Salafī scholars of this era. Rather, they were nurtured upon the books of Sayyid Quṭb and Mawdūdī and the books of ideology (*fikr*) and ḥarakah (political activism) that are circulated amongst the Quṭbiyyah, Surūriyyah, Ḥaddādiyyah - all factions of Takfīrīs who came from the direction of the Muslim Brotherhood (al-Ikhwān).

10. They subject the Qur’ān and Sunnah to faulty analogies and interpretations. Ibn al-Qayyim said, “Whoever subjected the Qur’ān and the Sunnah with a form of interpretation such as the use of analogy (*qiyās*) or ones taste (*dhawq*) or intellect (*‘aql*) or emotional state (*ḥāl*) then he has a resemblance to the Khārijites, the followers of Dhul-Khuwayṣarah.”¹¹⁴ Ibn Taymiyyah said, “The very first innovations such as the innovation of the Khārijites arose due to their evil understanding of the Qur’ān. They did not deliberately intend to oppose it, but they understood from it what it did not indicate.”¹¹⁵

¹¹³ *Al-I’tiṣām* (1/245).

¹¹⁴ *Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Mursalāh* (1/308).

¹¹⁵ *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (13/30).

11. Severity and exaggeration in worship. The Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) informed his companions, as occurs in a narration collected by al-Bukhārī, that, “*A people will depart from you and you will belittle your prayer compared to their prayer and your fasting compared to their fasting.*”

12. They split into groups, declare each other astray and make takfīr of each other. Ibn Taymiyyah said, “From the blameworthy characteristics of the people of innovation is that they make takfīr of each other.”¹¹⁶

13. If they gained power, they would behave with the Muslims as the leaders of Persia and Rome. ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib said in a sermon to the Muslims prior to fighting the Khārijites, “Fear Allāh and fight those who contend with Allāh and attempt to extinguish the light of Allāh, fight the erroneous, misguided, oppressive criminals. Those who are not (truly) reciters of the Qur’ān, nor jurists in religion, nor scholars in interpretation, nor do they have any precedence in worthiness in this affair within Islām. By Allāh, if they were appointed with authority over you, they have would have done with you the deeds of Chosroes and Heraclius.”¹¹⁷

14. When they gain strength they slaughter Muslims primarily and leave alone non-Muslims. Ibn Ḥajar said, “When the Khārijites judge with disbelief those (Muslims) who oppose them, they make lawful the shedding of their blood whilst leaving alone the people of the covenant. They say, ‘We shall fulfill their covenant with them.’¹¹⁸ And they abandon fighting the pagans and preoccupy themselves with fighting the Muslims. All of this is from the effects of the worship of the ignoramuses whose hearts have not been expanded with the light of knowledge. They did not hold fast to any firm rope of knowledge. Sufficient it is that their leader

¹¹⁶ *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (5/251).

¹¹⁷ *Tārikh al-Ṭabarī* (5/78).

¹¹⁸ As indicated elsewhere in this work, the Khārijites do not withhold from killing the people of the covenant either, even if they do not subject them to the same type of slaughter they unleash upon Muslims.

showed rejection against the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and accused him of oppression, we ask Allāh for safety.”¹¹⁹ This observation is true today when we see that the vast majority of those killed by the ISIS Khārijite terrorists, once they gained power, are Muslims. Likewise, the overwhelming majority of those killed by terrorist attacks are Muslims.¹²⁰

15. They are the worst of those killed beneath the canopy of the sky. This is textually stated in the Prophetic tradition related by Ibn Mājah, “They are the most evil of those killed beneath the canopy of the sky.”¹²¹

¹¹⁹ *Fath al-Bārī* (12/301).

¹²⁰ Refer to *The New Jihadism, A Global Snapshot* by Peter R. Neumann, International Centre for the Study of Radicalization at King’s College London. p. 14. Peter Neumann, the author of the report states, “This report, therefore, tells the story of a movement in the middle of a transformation – one whose final outcome is impossible to predict. The immediate focus, however, is jihadism’s human cost: with, on average, more than 20 attacks and nearly 170 deaths per day, jihadist groups destroy countless lives – most of them Muslim – in the name of an ideology that the vast majority of Muslims reject.” And he notes in the conclusion, “In just one month, jihadist groups killed 5,042 people – the equivalent of three attacks on the scale of the London bombings in July 2005 each day. Contrary to the often articulated complaint that jihadism is over-reported and that groups like the Islamic State get too much coverage, our survey seems to suggest that most of the victims receive practically no attention. Hardly any of the attacks that formed the basis for our analysis were reported in the Western media. Indeed, even the suicide bombings – of which there were 38 – made virtually no headlines except in the countries in which they took place. Yet most of the victims of jihadist violence continue to be non-combatants, and the vast majority is Muslim.” (p. 21). Refer also to a 2009 report by the Combating Terrorism Center (US) titled “*Deadly Vanguard: A Study of al-Qa’ida’s Violence Against Muslims*” by Scott Helfstein and others.

¹²¹ *Ibn Mājah* (no. 176).

THEIR CONTINUED APPEARANCE THROUGHOUT TIME

The Prophet (ﷺ) indicated that they will not cease to appear in every age and era by saying, “*There will emerge a people from my nation from the East who recite the Qur’ān but it does not go beyond their throats. Every time a faction amongst them emerges it will be cut off. Every time a faction amongst them emerges it will be cut off,*” until he said this ten times, (and then he said) “*Every time a faction amongst them emerges it will be cut off, until the Dajjāl (Anti-Christ) appears amongst their (later) remnants.*”¹²² The Salafī scholar, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Muḥṣīn al-‘Abbād commented on this tradition by saying, “He (Dajjāl) will be with them and they will be with him.”¹²³ In another more explicit narration, the Prophet (ﷺ) said, “*They will not cease to emerge until the last of them emerge with the Dajjāl.*”¹²⁴ An indication that the Khārijites, from their beginning to their end, are at war with the people of Islām.

¹²² Related by Ibn Mājah.

¹²³ In his recorded lessons of commentary upon *Sunan Ibn Mājah*.

¹²⁴ *Majma’ al-Zawā’id* of al-Haythamī (6/246).

THE COMMAND TO FIGHT AND KILL THEM

The Prophet (ﷺ) encouraged the Muslim rulers to fight them whenever they appear with their turmoil and bloodshed. He said, “Wherever you meet them, kill them, for there is a reward on the Day of Judgement for whoever kills them.” And he also said, “If I was to reach them, I would slaughter them, like the slaughtering of ‘Ād (a destroyed nation of the past),” meaning, every last one of them until not one of them remains as explained by the classical Scholar, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī in his commentary on this tradition.¹²⁵ For this reason, the Muslim rulers from the time of the fourth righteous Caliph ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib (رضي الله عنه) have never ceased to fight against them. When they appeared, the Companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) applied the following Qur’ānic verses upon them: **“Say: Shall we inform you of the greatest losers as to [their] deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life while they thought that they were acquiring good by their deeds!”** (18:103-104).¹²⁶ Also, the saying of Allāh (عز وجل), **“Some faces, that Day, will be humiliated. Labouring (hard in the worldly life), weary (in the Hereafter with humility and disgrace).”** (88:2-3).¹²⁷ Also the saying of Allāh (عز وجل), **“And when they deviated, Allāh caused their hearts to deviate.”** (61:8).¹²⁸ And also, **“Those who break Allāh’s Covenant after ratifying it, and sever what Allāh has ordered to be joined and do mischief on earth, it is they who are the losers.”** (2:27).¹²⁹ Misguided in this life and losers in the next because their deeds were vain whilst they deceived themselves into thinking they were doing good; toiling hard in this life, but weary and in humiliation in the next; their hearts caused to deviate because they chose deviation by breaking the covenant and causing mischief upon the Earth.

¹²⁵ Refer to *Faḥ al-Bārī* (6/435).

¹²⁶ Imām al-Ṭabarī relates this application of the verse to the Khārijites from ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib (رضي الله عنه) in his exegesis.

¹²⁷ This application of the verse is mentioned by Imām al-Qurṭubī in his exegesis and he relates it from ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه).

¹²⁸ Refer to *al-I’tiṣām* of al-Shāṭibī (1/89).

¹²⁹ Refer to *al-I’tiṣām* of al-Shāṭibī (1/90).

TERRORISM AGAINST THE PROPHET'S COMPANIONS

The first wave of Khārijites terrorists, the Saba'iyyah, revolted against the third caliph, 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه), and assassinated him in his own home whilst he was fasting and reciting the Qur'ān. This incident in the year 35H (around June 656CE) led to a series of events which brought about the circumstances for the emergence of the larger body of the Khārijites in the time of 'Alī bin Abī Ṭālib (رضي الله عنه) as has preceded. After they broke off from the army of 'Alī, their first act of terrorism was against the Companion of the Prophet called 'Abdullāh bin Khabbāb (رضي الله عنه) near Baṣrah in Irāq in the year 37H after they had split from 'Alī's army and set up their own state in al-Nahrawān.

Despite giving him 'Abdullāh an assurance of safety at the first encounter, they acted treacherously towards him. Because he did not agree with them that 'Alī (رضي الله عنه), the fourth caliph, was an apostate, they excommunicated him. Thereafter, they laid him on the ground and slaughtered him whilst his blood flowed into the nearby water stream. Then they murdered his woman who was at the peak of pregnancy. She pleaded for her life and that of her unborn child, but they sliced her open and spared not even her child. Then they killed numerous others who were present in his caravan.¹³⁰ It was here that the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet, 'Alī (رضي الله عنه) followed the Prophetic traditions ordering this group to be fought and killed.¹³¹

¹³⁰ This incident is related by numerous historians such as al-Ṭabarī and Ibn al-Athīr and others.

¹³¹ It should be noted that groups such as **ISIS, Boko Ḥarām and al-Qaidah** are the ideological descendants of those very first Khārijite terrorist renegades and had the noble, esteemed, lofty, honourable, merciful Prophet of Islām (صلى الله عليه وسلم) been alive to reach them and their likes, he would have slaughtered them until not a single one of the savages remained. The Khārijite terrorists are a trial for the Muslims before they are a trial for anyone else.

THEY MURDERED THE PROPHET’S COUSIN AND SON-IN-LAW

The Khārijites extremists accused ‘**Alī bin Abī Ṭālib** (رضي الله عنه) of becoming an apostate because he agreed to an arbitration by which reconciliation was intended between himself and Mu‘āwiyah (رضي الله عنه). Due to their severe ignorance and the absence of a single scholar amongst them, the Khārijites held this arbitration to be an act of disbelief because in their misguided view it entailed judging by other than Allāh’s law. Hence, they excommunicated the Companions and split away from the main body of Muslims. It was only after their murder of ‘Abdullāh bin Khabbāb that ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib (رضي الله عنه) recognized these were the very people spoken of by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) decades earlier and mobilized himself to fight them.¹³² A number of years after battling them, one of the extremist Khārijites called ‘Abd al-Raḥmān bin Muljam plotted to assassinate ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) and attained his evil objective in the year 40H (661CE). This was one of three assassination plots but the only one that was successful. The Khārijites had desired to kill the main leaders of the Muslim nation following their defeat at al-Nahrawān. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān bin Muljam agreed to assassinate ‘Alī in Kūfah, al-Barrāk bin ‘Abdullāh al-Tamīmī agreed to assassinate Mu‘āwiyah in Syria and ‘Amr bin Bakr agreed to assassinate ‘Amr bin al-‘Āṣ in Egypt. The latter two failed in their mission. One can see that the Khārijites were intending to destroy the Muslim nation by assassinating its rulers in the three major capital regions of the Islāmic caliphate after having split away from the main body of Muslims and established their own mini-state in al-Nahrawān close to Bagdhād.¹³³

¹³² Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (d. 1206H, 18th century CE) said, “When ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) reached Kūfah, the Khārijites revolted against him and declared him a disbeliever for being satisfied with the arbitration.” *Mukhtaṣar Ṣīrah al-Rasūl in Majmū’ Mu’allafāt al-Shaykh* (1/222).

¹³³ This is identical to what al-Qā’idah and ISIS have done today in which they claim to have established an Islāmic state, which to them is the land of Islām and all lands inhabited by Muslims are lands of disbelief and war because their rulers are apostates whose removal is of the most urgent priority.

This is the way of these people throughout the ages until this day of ours: To pursue wealth and power by undermining the Islāmic authorities and bringing chaos, destruction and bloodshed through murder, assassination, terror and chaos. In the Prophetic traditions, the Muslim rulers are commanded to fight these Khārijites whenever they appear because their evil ideology and terrorist mindset is the first of enemies to the religion of Islām and runs contrary to it from every angle. The Mufti of Saudi Arabia, Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Āl al-Shaykh remarked, “The terrorism of ISIS is the very first enemy of Islām.”¹³⁴

The leaders amongst them are motivated by wealth, land, power and politics and simply use Islām as a hijacked vehicle or a donned, beautified garment through which they pursue their interests. Through beautified speech, they recruit the young, ignorant and foolish. Whilst the noble, just, Prophet of Islām, Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) commanded that these evil and most harmful of people to Islām and its adherents be fought, killed and cut off we see on the other hand that they are most beneficial in serving the purposes of those who oppressively ascribe their destructive activities to the Prophet of Islām (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and satirize him upon falsehood. This is despite the historical record showing that the Prophet of Islām (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) was challenged by their ideological grandfather, Dhul Khuwayṣarah, that his Companions were slaughtered and murdered by them and that the Islāmic tradition throughout history is squarely against them. Despite being defeated by ‘Alī at al-Nahrawān, many of them escaped to various Islāmic lands and continued to sow the seeds for the Khārijite ideology which has continued to this day.

¹³⁴ This was covered in many leading Arabic newspapers in August 2014. Refer to <http://arabic.cnn.com/middleeast/2014/08/19/saudi-mufti-isis>.

THE SECT OF THE AZĀRIQAḤ: FORERUNNERS OF ISIS

Many early Islāmic scholars from the 3rd, 4th and 5th centuries of Islām who specialized in the study of deviant sects (heresiography) documented the beliefs and actions of one of the most extreme sects of the Khārijite terrorists known as **the AzāriqaḤ**. ISIS are reminiscent of this group.¹³⁵ Their founder was Abū Rāshid Nāfi' bin Azraq (d. 65H around 685CE). The AzāriqaḤ split off from the Khārijites and made their way to Baṣrah, taking control over it and other areas in Persia. Their evil doctrines included the belief that the excommunication of 'Alī (عَلِيٌّ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ) was valid and correct and that 'Alī's assassin, Ibn Muljam, was correct and praiseworthy in his action. In their view, all sinful Muslims are apostates who will reside in Hellfire for eternity should they die without having repented from their sins.¹³⁶ Whoever opposed their opinion was considered a polytheist and they threw the children of such people alongside them - all of them were considered disbelievers whom it was permissible to fight and kill. The land inhabited by those outside their group was considered to be land of war (*dār al-ḥarb*) and whatever was permitted with respect to a land of war was permitted to them against the Muslims inhabiting such a land. Anyone who did not join them by emigrating to them *even if he held their view* was considered a polytheist. They also held the necessity of eliminating every “disbeliever” from the Earth, and by “disbeliever” they mean every Muslim who does not agree with them. They would interrogate Muslims on their views towards the rulers and whoever did not agree with their excommunication of the Muslim rulers of the time would be killed. They would lie in wait for Muslims, slaughter them and also slaughter their children mercilessly, on the flimsiest of grounds until they instilled terror in the hearts of civilians who would be scared to leave their homes or embark on journeys.

¹³⁵ Refer to *al-Milal wal-Niḥal* of al-Shahrastānī (1/112).

¹³⁶ This clashes with the belief of orthodox Muslims who hold that the sinful amongst the Muslims who die without repentance will be eventually delivered due to their pure monotheism.

THE CENTRAL FOCUS OF ALL KHĀRIJITE MOVEMENTS IS THE ISSUE OF JUDGING BY ALLĀH'S LAW AND EXCOMMUNICATION (TAKFĪR) OF THE RULERS

From what has preceded, it is clear that the central focus of the Khārijites is around the issue of rulership and judgement by Allāh's law.¹³⁷ Their ignorance in this regard became manifest when they treated something permissible in the Sharī'ah - namely, arbitration between two warring parties as a means of conciliation - to be major disbelief. This same compound ignorance remains a trait with them to this day and indeed the Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) characterized them as "youthful" and "foolish-minded" and stated that "*the Qur'ān does not go beyond their throats,*" meaning, that whilst they recite it, they do not grasp and understand it. Today, the Khārijite movements, parties, groups and sects show their ignorance in this matter in their interpretation of the verses related to judgement and rulership in order to elicit generalized takfīr of the rulers without any detail or elaboration. This in turn allows them to justify their revolutionary methodology clothed with the lofty slogan of "*enjoining the good and forbidding the evil*" thereby mimicking the speech and action of the heads of the Saba'ite Khārijites such as Zayd bin Ḥusayn al-Ṭā'ī (see below). This is after our knowledge that due to their compound ignorance they have grossly misdiagnosed the actual causes of decline and deterioration in Muslim societies and nations which are not restricted just to the rulers alone. As for the centrality of their focus around this issue, Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Sam'ānī (d. 489H) said, "Know that the Khārijites seek evidence through this verse and say that whoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed is a disbeliever, but Ahl al-Sunnah do not make takfīr on account of abandonment of judging

¹³⁷ It is not the case that every group or sect of the Khārijites excommunicates Muslims on the basis of major sins - and that is not what unites them in doctrine. This is because some Khārijites make takfīr on the basis of all major sins, others only on the basis of some as opposed to others. However, what unites them all is the issue of rulership and judging by Allāh's law, they make unrestricted, generalized, unqualified takfīr in relation to this matter and it was on this very basis that their movement began.

alone.”¹³⁸ And Ibn Taymiyyah said regarding the verse, **“But no by your Lord, they do not have faith until they make you a judge in all disputes between them...”** (4:65), “This verse is from that which the Khārijites use to make takfīr of the rulers who do not judge by what Allāh has revealed.”¹³⁹ And Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said, “And a faction of the people of innovation from the Khārijites and Mu‘tazilites have strayed in this field and used as proof verses which are not to be taken apparently, such as His saying, the Mighty and Majestic, **‘And whosoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed, they are the disbelievers.’** (5:44).”¹⁴⁰ Ibn Taymiyyah said, “They (the Khārijites) said that ‘Uthmān and ‘Alī and whoever allied with them had judged by other than what Allāh revealed, **‘And whosoever does not judge by what Allāh has revealed, they are the disbelievers.’** (5:44). Thus, they declared Muslims to be disbelievers on account of this and other than it.”¹⁴¹

The misguided and ignorant Khārijites treat matters pertaining to trade relations with non-Muslim governments and bodies, matters of loyalty and disloyalty, tyranny and oppression, absence of fulfilment of the subjects’ rights, commission of major or minor sins to comprise major disbelief without any qualification and detail (tafṣīl) - but rather upon generalization and absolutism. Upon that basis, they stir up societies against rulers and governments, thereby causing instability, which in turn facilitates the beneficial interests of hostile enemies of Islām from the outside. In all these subject matters there are details and elaborations in the statements of the people of knowledge from the Companions and those after them from the scholars, such as Ibn Taymiyyah, Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and those after him, right until this day of ours - all of which the Khārijites either feign ignorance of or are ignorant of because they have no genuine scholars amongst them.

¹³⁸ *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* of al-Sam‘ānī (Dār al-Waṭān, 1418H) 2/42.

¹³⁹ *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (5/131).

¹⁴⁰ *Al-Tamhīd* of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (16/17).

¹⁴¹ *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (13/208).

“Wahhābism” And Takfīr

By way of example, the great grandson of Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, ‘**Abd al-Laṭīf bin ‘Abd al-Raḥmān bin Ḥasan** wrote a treatise to a person called ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Khaṭīb who had entered into matters of takfīr (excommunication) upon the way of the Khārijites and within which he wrote the following, “And in the year 1264H I saw two renegades from your likes at al-Aḥsā’. They had abandoned the Friday prayer and the congregational prayer (alongside the Muslims) and made takfīr (excommunication) of the Muslims who were in that land. Their proof was of the same type as yours. They say that the inhabitants of al-Aḥsā’ sit with Ibn Fayrūz and mix with him and his likes from those who have not rejected the ṭāghūt (false deities) and who did not make explicit the takfīr of his grandfather who had rejected the call of Shaykh Muḥammad (bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb), did not accept it and showed enmity towards it. They (the two men) said: Whoever does not explicitly announce the disbelief (of the aforementioned) is himself a disbeliever in Allāh, he has not genuinely rejected the tāghūt. And whoever sits with such a person is like him. They built upon these two false, astray principles what amounts to judgements of clear apostasy, until they abandoned returning the salutation of peace. Their affair was raised to me and I summoned them and threatened them and was very harsh in speech towards them. In response, they claimed firstly, that they are upon the creed of the Shaykh, Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, that his treatises are with them. So I uncovered their doubts and refuted their misguidance with what I could recall in the gathering. I informed them that the Shaykh (Mūhammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb) is innocent of this doctrine and creed, that he does not make takfīr except on account of (such actions) which all the Muslims are agreed upon, the doer of which is to be excommunicated. Actions such as major polytheism, disbelief in the signs of Allāh and His Messengers or something from them, after the establishment of the proof and it being conveyed sufficiently. Such as takfīr of the one who worshipped the righteous dead, invoked them alongside Allāh and made them partners with Him in what He alone deserves from His creation of worship and servitude (ilāhiyyah). This is

agreed upon by all the people of knowledge and faith and by every faction from the people of the blind-following schools. They single out this matter (in their works) with great treatment, mentioning its ruling and what necessitates apostasy, and they textually state that shirk (polytheism) is (from such affairs). Ibn Ḥajr [al-Haytāmī] has dedicated a book to this matter, calling it *al-I'lām bi-Qawāṭi' al-Islām* (Notification of the Decisive Affairs of Islām).¹⁴² These two aforementioned Persian men made an apparent repentance and showed remorse, claiming that the truth had become clear to them. But then they met together at the coastal region and returned back to that statement. It then reached us about them that they made takfīr of the rulers of the Muslims on the basis that they had made written communication with the Egyptian rulers. Rather, they even made takfīr of the one who mixed with the one who wrote to them from the scholars of the Muslims. We seek refuge from misguidance after guidance and a bad state after a good state. And it has reached us from you what is similar to this. You have delved in issues in this field such as speech about loyalty (muwālāt) and disloyalty (mu'ādāt), peace settlements, diplomatic writings, spending of wealth and offering gifts and what is similar to that of [discussions] about the statement of the people committing shirk with Allāh, misguidances, judging by other than what Allāh revealed from the customs of the bedouins and their likes. [Matters] in which none but the scholars who possess intelligence speak about, those whom Allāh has bestowed with understanding (fahm), who have been given wisdom (ḥikmah) and decisive speech. Any speech regarding this (field) is restricted to acquaintance of what we have mentioned, knowledge of general and universal principles. It is not permissible for the one who is ignorant of (these principles) to speak in this field or in others, or for the one who turns away from these principles or from their details. For indeed, generalization, absolution, absence of knowledge of the points of discourse and its details brings about confusion, error and absence of understanding bestowed by Allāh, all of which corrupts religion,

¹⁴² In this book the author mentions the statements, actions and inward beliefs and intentions that comprise disbelief.

separates the minds and comes between them and understanding the Sunnah and the Qur'ān. Ibn al-Qayyim (رحمته الله) said in his Kāfiyah, 'Upon you is detail (tafsīl) and clarity (tabyīn), for absolution (iṭlāq) and generalization (ijmāl) without clarification have corrupted this existence and have caused the minds and opinions of every age to stumble.' As for takfīr on account of these matters which you have claimed, of the matters constituting disbelief for the people of Islām (as you allege), then this is the doctrine of the Ḥarūrī renegades (the Khārijites), those who revolted against 'Alī bin Abī Ṭālib, the Chief of the Believers and whoever was with him amongst the Companions." End of quote from Shaykh 'Abd al-Laṭīf.¹⁴³

This enlightening passage indicates numerous affairs: **First**, there are to be found Khārijite renegades who spuriously ascribe their misguided doctrines to Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb and he is innocent of them. In a modern context, this refers to al-Qā'idah, al-Nuṣrah, ISIS also their sympathizers and supporters from various factions of the **Ḥaddādiyyah** who have appeared in recent times. They all claim ascription to Shaykh Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb and he is free and innocent of them. They are Quṭbiyyah, Surūriyyah, Khārijīyyah - offshoots of the Muslim Brotherhood and its evil destructive methodology and they are free of Salafiyyah and Salafiyyah is free of them.¹⁴⁴ **Second**, all the doubts indicated by Shaykh 'Abd al-Laṭīf by which those individuals in his time were making takfīr are the very same doubts used today by the various factions of Khārijite dogs who hound in every place and in cyberspace. They excommunicate the rulers due to their trade relations with non-Muslims, seeking assistance of the non-Muslims

¹⁴³ Refer to *al-Durar al-Saniyyah* (1/466 onwards).

¹⁴⁴ This also helps to explain and uncover the spurious nature of the claim that 'Wahhābism' is the source of extremism and terrorism. The roots of this extremism and terrorism lies in the works of the Ṣūfī Ash'arī, Sayyid Quṭb which numerous prominent Saudi preachers were affected by. When they spread this doctrine, they attempted to justify it to a largely Salafī, 'Wahhābī' audience by trying to impose this doctrine onto the writings of both Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb - despite the fact that the refutation of this doctrine is plainly and readily apparent in the clear writings of these scholars.

in matters of trade, infrastructure or national security, giving gifts to non-Muslim rulers or nations, having diplomatic relations or engaging in discussions about peace settlements with them and so on. Today, the likes of al-Ikhwān, Hizb al-Taḥrīr, al-Qā'idah, al-Nuṣrah, ISIS propagate these doubts upon compound ignorance of the general, universal principles of the Sharī'ah and there is not to be found amongst them a single genuine scholar fit for making legal judgements. **Third**, the individuals he spoke about would make takfir of those Muslim rulers who sat with non-Muslim rulers and they would apply the same judgement upon anyone who did not openly label such ones as tawāghīṭ (false deities). It is from the ways of the Khārijites to demand that every Muslim do exactly what they do of hounding in every place that “so and so is a ṭāghūt” and “so and so is a ṭāghūt.” This is because their religion is founded entirely around the rulers and excommunication of them and a person's faith is not validated until he hounds alongside them with the same loudness and pitch of voice. **Fourth**, Shaykh 'Abd al-Laṭīf made reference to all the subject matters these Khārijites had delved in and from them was the subject of *ruling by other than what Allāh revealed*. As mentioned earlier, this is the greatest of what the Khārijites revolve around and they fail to make the tafṣīl (detail, distinction) found in the statements of the erudite scholars of Islām in this regard wherein they distinguish between this action being done due to *istiḥlāl* (deeming it lawful), *juḥūd* (denying its obligation), *tafḍīl* (believing it to be superior), *musāwāh* (believing it to be equal) and distinguishing between *tabdīl* (judging by other than what Allāh revealed and ascribing it to the Sharī'ah) and *istibdāl* (replacement with others laws, in part or whole, without ascribing them to the Sharī'ah), and when it is done due to desire or fear and so on, and the judgements upon each form as well as taking into account circumstantial reasons and so on. When one looks into the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah, Muḥammad Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb and the scholars right until this day such as Shaykh Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm, Shaykh al-Sa'dī, Shaykh al-Shanqīṭī, Shaykh al-Albānī, Shaykh Ibn Bāz, Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn, Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān, Shaykh 'Abdullāh al-Ghudayān and others, there can be found a detailed, thorough refutation of these Khārijites and their doubts. However, they remain clinging to

whatever ambiguous generalized speech they can find from these and other scholars to justify their falsehood.¹⁴⁵

Many ignoramuses have appeared ascribing to knowledge who impute mass takfīr (excommunication), irhāb (terrorism) and the way of Khārijites to the da‘wah (call) of Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and they include characters such as ‘Awaḍ al-Qarnī, Muḥsin al-‘Awājī, Ḥātīm al-‘Awnī and ‘Adil al-Kalbānī. All of them are ignoramuses and motivated by desires, a matter known through the simplest of reflections. By way of example, the book *al-Durar al-Saniyyah* - alleged to be a source of takfīr and irhāb - was compiled by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān bin Muḥammad bin Qāsim al-‘Āsimī al-Qaḥṭānī (d. 1392H) before the middle of the twentieth century. This work compiles the various letters and treatises of Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and his offspring and has been published numerous times and has been widespread amongst the scholars and students of knowledge. From the first time it was published till this day of ours, close to **eighty years** have passed and Saudi Arabia witnessed the kingships of Sa‘ūd, Faiṣal, Khālīd and Fahd. No one revolted against them or against the society after being affected by this book and what it is alleged to contain of mass excommunication and terrorism. In reality, the ideology of takfīr only entered Saudi Arabia and the Gulf when the people abandoned the books of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and were introduced to the books of *fikr* (ideology) and *ḥarakah* (political activism) by Egyptian renegades who fled Egypt and took residence in the Gulf countries. These are the books of **Sayyid Quṭb** in particular and also those of **Abū A‘lā Mawḍūdī** and **Ḥasan al-Bannā**. and **Taqī al-Dīn al-Nabahānī** and their likes. When these books spread in the 70s and 80s, the movements of takfīr emerged, the Quṭbiyyah and Surūriyyah appeared and terrorism shortly followed after they had influenced and brainwashed segments of the youth away from the rectifying methodologies of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb which invite to the Sharī‘ah rulings pertaining to

¹⁴⁵ It is beyond the scope and intent of this treatise to discuss the topic of ruling by other than Allāh’s law in detail.

dealings with the rulers - be they righteous or tyrannical - to the agitation, commotion, strife and revolution of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks.

In addition, when one looks at the writings of Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and his students, they spoke extensively about extremism in takfīr and warned against it abundantly. They listed only ten matters which are agreed upon amongst the scholars of the four schools of jurisprudence as nullifiers of Islām. In contrast, when one looks at the books authored by those who came before them, and especially the Ḥanafī jurists, one can see exaggeration in the matter of takfīr. By way of example, Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl bin Maḥmūd Badr al-Rashīd al-Ḥanafī (d. 768H) wrote a book, “Alfāḏ al-Kufr” in which he lists 700 nullifiers of Islām. This book was given an explanation by the well-known Ḥanafī jurist, Mullā ‘Alī al-Qārī al-Ḥanafī. Another scholar, Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Ḥajar al-Haytamī (d. 973H) wrote a book titled, “al-Īlām bi Qawāṭi’ al-Islām” in which mentions hundreds of nullifiers which comprise matters agreed upon, matters not agreed upon by the scholars, and things which are not even nullifiers to begin with. Another book, “Alfāḏ al-Kufr” by Qāsim bin Ṣalāh al-Dīn al-Khānī (d. 1109H) mentions about a hundred nullifiers, including those that are agreed upon and those that are not. Another book with the same title, “Alfāḏ al-Kufr” by Mas‘ūd bin Aḥmad Tāj al-Dīn Abū al-Mu‘ālī al-Ḥanafī mentions more than two-hundred nullifiers. Thus, the arena takfīr is much more expansive in the books of these madhāhib (schools of thought) whereas Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb restricted it only to those things unanimously agreed upon by all the schools, indicating that he restricted takfīr and did not take any liberties with it at all.

Responding to the spurious claims of his detractors Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (رحمته الله) said, “As for what the enemies have mentioned about me: That I make takfīr on the basis of presumption, and on the basis of loyalty, **or that I make takfir of the ignorant person upon whom the proof has not been established**, then this is a mighty slander. They desire to make the people flee from the

deen of Allāh and His Messenger by it.”¹⁴⁶ And he (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) also said, “And likewise, his distortion upon the common people that Ibn Abd al-Wahhāb says, ‘Whoever does not come under my obedience is a disbeliever.’ And we say: Sublime are you (O Lord), this is a mighty slander! Rather, we call Allāh to witness over what he knows from our hearts that whoever acts upon Tawhīd and frees himself from Shirk and its people, then he is a Muslim in whatever time and place (he maybe in). But we make takfīr of the one who associates partners with Allaah in His ilāhiyyah (sole right of worship), after we have made clear to him the proof for the futility of shirk.”¹⁴⁷ And he also said, “And as for the lie and slander, then it is like their saying that we make generalized takfīr (of the masses), and that we make emigration (hijrah) obligatory towards us for the one who is able to manifest his religion, and that we make takfīr of the one who does not make takfīr and who does not fight, and multiple times the likes of this (type of lying and slander). All of this is from lying and slander by which they hinder the people from the dīn of Allāh and His Messenger. And when it is the case that we do not make takfīr of the one who worships the idol (tomb) which is on the grave of ‘Abd al-Qādir, and the idol which is on the grave of Aḥmad al-Badawī and their likes, **due to their ignorance, and the absence of the one to notify them (of their opposition)**, then how could we make takfīr of the one who does not associate partners with Allāh, when he does not emigrate to us and who does not make takfīr (of us) and does not fight (against us)? ‘Glory be to you (O Lord), this is a mighty slander.’ (24:16)”¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ In *Majmū’ Mu‘allafāt al-Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahḥāb* (7/25) in his letter to Muḥammad bin ‘Īd.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid* (7/60).

¹⁴⁸ In the section *Fatāwā wa Masā’il* (4/11).

MAKING TAKFIR OF MUSLIMS DUE TO MAJOR SINS IS NOT A CONDITION FOR BEING A KHĀRIJITE

Worthy of mention at this point is that there are to be found today ignoramuses who sympathize with the Khārijite terrorists, making excuses for them and stipulating such conditions for considering someone to be a Khārijite that would exclude even the very first Khārijites mentioned by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from being Khārijites. The most common doubt in this regard is the claim that expelling a person from Islām on account of a major sin (such as lying, stealing, fornicating, drinking, gambling and the likes) is what identifies a Khārijite. This is incorrect because from the very first Khārijites, in fact from the heads of the very first Khārijites were those who would not expel a Muslim from Islām due to these actions. In *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, a famous early book on heresiography (dealing with deviant sects), Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī writes, “And they (the Khārijites) were upon agreement that every major sin constitutes disbelief except the Najadites for they do not speak with that. They were also agreed that Allāh will punish the major sinners with eternal punishment except the Najadites, the associates of Najdah (bin ‘Āmir).”¹⁴⁹ Thus, it is clear that not all of the factions of the Khārijites make takfīr by way of major sins. That which unites all the Khārijites is the issue of rulership and judging by what Allāh has revealed, utilizing that to make takfīr of the rulers and to contend with them for power, raising the sword and breaking off from the main body of the Muslims. The Khārijites, in their foundations, are two groups. Abū Bakr Ibn al-‘Arabī explains that the first are those who claimed ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, those participating in the Battle of the Camel and those pleased with the arbitration between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah are disbelievers. The second are those who claimed that whoever committed a sin will be in the Hellfire eternally.¹⁵⁰ There are many differences between this group on this point and it is not something upon which they are united.

¹⁴⁹ Refer to *Minhāj al-Sunnah* of Ibn Taymiyyah (3/461).

¹⁵⁰ ‘*Āriḍat al-Aḥwadhī* (9/38-39)

Abū Maṣṣūr al-Baghdādī writes in *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, “Our Shaykh, Abū al-Ḥasan said, ‘That which unites (all the sects of the Khārijites) is imputing disbelief to ‘Alī and Uthmān, those who participated in the Battle of the Camel, those who partook in the arbitration and those who were pleased with the arbitration and considered the two arbitrating parties to be correct (in their action) or just one of them, and revolting against the ruler.’ And he (Abū al-Ḥasan) was not pleased with what al-Ka’bī cited that they were united upon excommunicating the perpetrators of major sins. That which is correct is what our Shaykh Abū al-Ḥasan has cited from them (the Khārijites). Al-Ka’bī erred in his claim of their being a concensus of the Khārijites upon excommunicating the perpetrators of major sins. This is because the Najadites amongst the Khārijites do not expel from Islām those amongst them who commit major sins which have prescribed punishments associated with them.”¹⁵¹ Shaykh ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-‘Afīfī wrote, “And also from their doctrines is to make takfīr on account of major sins. Thus, whoever committed a major sin is a disbeliever. They would consider the major sinner to be in the Hellfire eternally except the Najadites in these last two points.”¹⁵² Shaykh ‘Abd al-Laṭīf, the great grandson of Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb wrote, after mentioning the story of the emergence of the Khārijites, “This is a summary of their affair and you have come to know their misconception on account of which they firmly held the disbelief of ‘Alī and his party and Mu‘āwiyah and his party. This belief remained present amongst those who had dispersed after this event. Thereafter, the extremists amongst them began to make takfīr by way of major sins. Then they gained strength and [acquired a] state after which they were fought by al-Mihlab bin Abī Ṣufrah, al-Ḥajjāj bin Yūsuf. And before that, they were fought by Ibn al-Zubayr during the era of his brother, ‘Abdullāh. It was then spread about them, that they make takfīr by way of sins, meaning those which are less than shirk.”¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ Refer to *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* (Maktabah Ibn Sīnah, Cairo) pp. 72-73.

¹⁵² *Mudhakkarah al-Tawhīd* (p. 121).

¹⁵³ *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah* (9/229).

From the above it is clear that expelling Muslims from Islām due to major sins was a later development in the doctrine of the Khārijites and even then, it is not the case that all factions of the Khārijites impute major disbelief to Muslims on account of major sins, there is considerable disagreement between them and a variety of sayings and elaborations. But that which all Khārijites are united upon is contending with the rulers upon the claims of injustice and judging by other than Allāh's law.

REPELLING A DOUBT REGARDING IBN TAYMIYYAH AND FIGHTING AGAINST THE MONGOL TARTARS

Whilst some academics exonerate Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb from the doctrines and activities of the Khārijite terrorists¹⁵⁴ they then proceed to claim that Ibn Taymiyyah is the source of modern Takfīrī ideology. This amounts to gross slander and indicates ignorance of Ibn Taymiyyah’s writings which are often too sophisticated for outsiders (or those with sectarian bias) to understand, let alone the Khārijites whose deficiency in intellect is textually stated in Prophetic traditions. From the numerous affairs relied upon to this end is Ibn Taymiyyah’s stance against the Mongol Tartars whose perspective and reality has been misunderstood. **Ibn Kathīr**, the famous Qur’ān exegete and student of Ibn Taymiyyah reveals, “The people had spoken about how to fight against those Tartars and from which angle (perspective) its performance is sanctioned. This is because they proclaim Islām and are not revolters (*bughāt*) against a ruler, because they were not originally under his obedience at any time after which they opposed him. So Shaykh Taqī al-Din (Ibn Taymiyyah) said, ‘They are from the genus of the Khārijites who revolted against ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah and held that they (themselves) were more worthy of the affair (of ruling) than them both. And these ones (the Tartars) believe they are more worthy of establishing the truth than the Muslims. They criticize the Muslims for the (various types of) sins and oppression that they are entangled with yet they themselves are entangled with what is greater than that by many times.’ So the scholars became wise to this and likewise the common folk. And He (Ibn Taymiyyah) would said, ‘If you see me in that direction with a copy of the Qur’ān on my head, then kill me.’ So he emboldened the people to fight against the Tartars, and their hearts and intentions became strengthened, and all praise is due to Allāh.”¹⁵⁵ From this quote a number of affairs are clear: **First**, that the scholars of the Muslims

¹⁵⁴ For example, Natana J. DeLong-Bas in *Wahhābi Islām* (Oxford University Press, 2008).

¹⁵⁵ *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1431H) 16/23.

discussed and disputed about the legislative angle through which the Tartars were to be fought. They proclaimed Islām and thus were not strictly like a non-Muslim invader. At the same time, they had not been under the authority of any Muslim ruler, so it would be incorrect to categorise them as *bughāt*, referring to those who revolt against a ruler after having been under his authority. **Secondly**, Ibn Taymiyyah clarified the affair for the scholars and the common folk and explained that the Mongol Tartars are from the genus of the Khārijites and are to be fought on that basis. This hardened the resolve of the leaders, scholars and common folk to fight the Tartars. **Thirdly**, the error of both the Takfīrī Jihādists and non-Muslim academics or those with sectarian bias amongst the Muslims in their use of this issue to either justify the modern Jihādī ideology on the one hand or to malign Ibn Taymiyyah on the other and accuse him of being its source. Ibn Taymiyyah considered fighting against the Tartars similar to fighting against the Khārijites and he put them under the same category as those who revolted against ‘Alī bin ‘Alī Ṭālib (رضي الله عنه). **Fourthly**, this is further evidence in the writings of Ibn Taymiyyah for the virtue in fighting against the Khārijite terrorist renegades which is to be performed under the leadership of Muslim rulers.

THE KHĀRIJITE TERRORISTS HAVE BEEN CONTINUOUSLY REFUTED AND CONDEMNED BY ISLĀMIC SCHOLARSHIP FOR 1400 YEARS

The righteous caliph, ‘Umar bin ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. 101H, 8th century CE), the great grandson of the second caliph, ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb, wrote an admonition to the Khārijite terrorists of his time, warning them of the consequences of their transgressions and making clear to them that he would not hesitate to terminate them if they did not cease and desist from their anti-Islāmic activities.¹⁵⁶ Since that time, the written Islāmic tradition of refuting the Khārijite terrorists and waging war against them has been continued by Islāmic scholars and rulers. Islāmic historians have documented the beliefs and activities of this vile group in great detail. Whenever the Muslims adhered to the way of the upright orthodox scholars who held fast to the unadulterated Islām of the Prophet’s Companions, they remained protected from the poison of the Khārijites. But when they became distant from such scholars, they were no longer able to recognize the poisonous ideology of the Khārijites. Ibn Taymiyyah said, “Likewise the Khārijites, when they were people of the sword and of fighting, their opposition to the *jamā’ah* (body of Muslims united behind their ruler) became apparent, when they would fight against the people. But as for today, most people do not recognize them.”¹⁵⁷ From this insightful statement one will recognize that the very first strategic action of the Khārijites is to undermine the orthodox Salafī scholars who the greatest barrier to their evil so that they can gain a foothold in the minds of the youth.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ *Sīrah ‘Umar bin ‘Abd al-‘Azīz* by ‘Abd Allāh bin ‘Abd al-Ḥakam, pp. 75-76.

¹⁵⁷ *Kitāb al-Nubuwwāt (Aḍwā’ al-Salaf, 1420H)* 1/564. This indicates the danger of the Khārijites in that when they are not overtly involved in their revolutionary and bloodthirsty activities, their poisonous ideology still lurks within the shadows, unseen and unrecognized by the common-folk, due to their lack of knowledge and insight about their falsehood and their departure from the teachings and principles of Islām.

¹⁵⁸ One can put into perspective the activities of the Khārijites in Saudi Arabia, the treacherous Quṭbists such as Safar al-Ḥawālī and Salmān al-‘Awdah, when they began to undermine, ridicule and mock the Salafī scholars, accusing them

ISLĀMIC TRADITIONS AND SCHOLARLY AUTHORITIES ON THE KHĀRIJITES THROUGHOUT THE AGES

In another tradition, the **Prophet Muḥammad** (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, “*There will appear at the end of time*¹⁵⁹ a people who are young of age, foolish-minded. They will speak with the best (and most-alluring) of speech (that is spoken) by people and will recite the Qur’ān but it will not go beyond their throats. They will pass out of Islām as the arrow passes through its game. Whoever meets them, let him kill them, for there is a reward for whoever kills them.”¹⁶⁰

The Prophet’s Companion, **Abū Umāmah al-Bāhili** (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) said of the Khārijites, “The Dogs of the people of Hellfire, they used to be Muslims but turned disbelievers.” When Abū Umāmah was asked whether this was his own speech or something he heard from the Prophet, he said, “Rather, I heard it from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).”¹⁶¹

Abū al-Āliyah (d. 90H, 8th century CE), a famous student of the Prophet’s Companions, said: “Allāh has bestowed two favours upon me, I do not know which of them is superior. That Allāh guided me to Islām or that He did not make me a Harūrī (Khārijite).”¹⁶²

Qatādah (d. 118H, 8th century CE), the famous Qur’anic commentator, said about them as cited by Imām al-Ṭabarī, “The Khārijites emerged whilst the Companions of Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) were plentiful in

of being ignorant of current affairs following the first Gulf War of 1991. They were responsible for polarizing a segment of youth away from these scholars and led them in turn to the more extreme Khārijites such as Abū Qatādah and Abū Muḥammad al-Maqḍīsī whose writings and verdicts played an instrumental role through the 1990s and 2000s in creating the extremist, terrorist mindset that is behind ISIS today.

¹⁵⁹ The various Prophetic traditions about them indicate that they were to appear shortly after the death of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and would continue to appear through the passing of time, putting the Muslims to trial.

¹⁶⁰ Reported by Ibn Mājah (no. 167).

¹⁶¹ Reported by Ibn Mājah (no. 175).

¹⁶² *Shu‘ab al-Īmān* of al-Bayḥaqī (4/212).

al-Madīnah, Shām and ‘Irāq, and his wives were still alive. By Allāh, none of them (the Companions), male or female, came out as a [Khārijite] ever, and they were not pleased with what they were upon, nor did they support them in that. Rather, they used to convey the criticism by Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) of them and the descriptions with which he described them. They used to hate them with their hearts and would show enmity towards them with their tongues. By Allāh, their hands would be severe against them whenever they came across them.”¹⁶³ This proves that Islām has always been in one direction and the Khārijite terrorists have been in an altogether different direction. There was not a single Companion of the Prophet with them, showing that they departed completely from the main body of Islām.

Imām al-Ṭabarī (d. 310H, 10th century CE) said, “The Khārijites would meet each other and remember the location (of battle) of their brothers [of old] at al-Nahrawān. They held that remaining stationary amounted to cheating and weakness and that in [the activity of] making jihād against the Muslims (*ahl al-qiblah*) lay excellence and reward.”¹⁶⁴

Imām al-Ājurri (d. 360H, 10th century CE) said in his book entitled *The Sharī‘ah*, “It is not permissible for the one who sees the uprising of a Khārijite who has revolted against the leader, whether [the leader] is just or oppressive - so this person has revolted and gathered a group behind him, has pulled out his sword and has made lawful the killing of Muslims - it is not fitting for the one who sees this, that he becomes deceived by this person’s recitation of the Qur’ān, the length of his standing in prayer, nor his constant fasting, nor his good and excellent words in knowledge when it is clear to him that this person’s way and methodology is that of the Khārijites.”¹⁶⁵ This speech of this insightful scholar is not heeded today by the ignorant and youthful who are

¹⁶³ *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī*, Dar Iḥyā al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1421H, 3/209

¹⁶⁴ *Tārikh al-Ṭabarī* (5/174).

¹⁶⁵ *Al-Sharī‘ah* (p. 28).

deceived by the apparent display of what is really fake piety by the Khārijites of ISIS and rush to join them in their evil.

Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalūsī (d. 456H, 11th century CE) said, “And they do not cease to strive in overturning the orderly affairs of the Muslims (to chaos) and splitting the word of the believers. They draw the sword against the people of religion and strive upon the Earth as corrupters. As for the Khārijites and Shīʿah, their affair in this regard is more famous than that one should be burdened in mentioning.”¹⁶⁶

Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728H, 14th century CE) said, “For they [the Khārijites] strived to kill every Muslim who did not agree with their view, declaring the blood of the Muslims, their wealth, and the slaying of their children to be lawful, while excommunicating them. And they considered this to be worship, due to their ignorance and their innovation which caused [them] to stray.”¹⁶⁷ He also said, “The people knowledgeable of the affairs agreed that the greatest swords unsheathed upon the people of the *qiblah* (the Muslims) from those who ascribe to it and the greatest mischief that has occurred to the Muslims from those who ascribe to the people of the *qiblah* is from the factions ascribing to them (the Muslims), for they are most harmful upon the religion and its adherents.”¹⁶⁸

Ibn Kathīr, the famous Qurʾān commentator, (d.774H, 14th century CE) said, “If these [Khārijites] were to acquire strength, they would corrupt the entire earth in Irāq and Shām (Syria) and they would not leave a male or female child nor a man or woman (alive). This is because in their view the people (Muslims) have become corrupt in a way that nothing will rectify their (situation) except mass murder.”¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ *Al-Faṣl Fil-Milal al-Ahwāʾ wal-Niḥal* (5/98).

¹⁶⁷ *Minhāj us-Sunnah* (5/248).

¹⁶⁸ *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (28/479).

¹⁶⁹ *Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah* (10/585).

EXCOMMUNICATION (TAKFĪR) OF THE KHĀRIJITES

Many highly-regarded scholarly authorities throughout Islāmic history have considered the Khārijite renegades and terrorists to be disbelievers and not Muslims.

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (d. 852H, 15th century CE), one of the highly respected scholars who wrote a monumental explanation of the collection of Prophetic traditions by Imām al-Bukhārī, writes, after explaining that the Khārijites are to be fought when they spill blood or take wealth unlawfully after they have been advised and the proof has been established against them, “This was indicated by **al-Bukhārī** in his heading for the aforementioned [Qur’ānic] verse, and those who excommunicated the Khārijites [from Islām] used it as a proof, [this view] is necessitated by what al-Bukhārī did whereby he put them [the Khārijites] alongside the disbelievers [in his chapter heading] whereas he separated [them] from those who [err by] making a faulty interpretation by putting them into a separate chapter heading.¹⁷⁰

This [same view] was also stated explicitly by **al-Qāḍī Abū Bakr Ibn al-‘Arabī** in his explanation of al-Tirmidhī wherein he said, ‘That which is correct is that they [the Khārijites] are disbelievers due to his (صلى الله عليه وسلم) saying, ‘*They exit from Islām*’ and his saying, ‘*I would slaughter them like the slaughtering of [the people of] ‘Ād*’ and in a wording, ‘[the people of] Thāmūd’ and both of these nations were destroyed due to their disbelief. Also due to his saying, ‘*They are the most hated of creation to Allāh, the Exalted*’ and due to their judgement upon everyone who opposed their belief with disbelief and eternity in the Hellfire, [and because of this], they [the Khārijites] were more worthy of this label [of disbelief] than them.’ [End of quote from Ibn al-‘Arabī].”¹⁷¹ Then Ibn Ḥajar continues, “And from

¹⁷⁰ Indicating that the most famous authority in the collection, compilation and arrangement of the Prophet traditions in Islām, Imām al-Bukhārī, inclined to the view of the Khārijites being disbelievers.

¹⁷¹ ‘*Āriḍat al-Aḥwadhī* (9/38) and refer also to *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* (12/299).

those who inclined towards this orientation is [Imām] al-Ṭabarī¹⁷² in his [work], ‘Tahdhīb’ wherein he said, after citing the traditions in this topic [relating to the Khārijites], ‘Within this is a refutation of the one who said that no one can [ever] leave Islām from the people who turn to the direction [of Makkah for prayer] after he deserves this ruling unless he knowingly intended to leave Islām. Such a person [holding] this view is invalidating this tradition [about the Khārijites] that *‘they speak the truth and recite the Qur’ān but they exit from Islām and have nothing to do with it.’* And it is known that they [the Khārijites] did not make lawful the spilling of the blood of the Muslims and taking their wealth except erroneously on account of what they interpreted wrongly from the verses of the Qur’ān with what was not intended by it.’¹⁷³ After citing from these scholars, Ibn Ḥajar says, “And what supports their excommunication [takfīr] is the example mentioned in the tradition of Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī, meaning the one that is yet to come in the chapter which follows. That which is apparently intended by it is that they exit from Islām and no longer have any connection to it, just as the arrow passes right through its game due to the speed and strength of its propulsion, in that it has no connection to the game at all [after passing through it].”¹⁷⁴ A page later, Ibn Ḥajar mentions the position of Imām al-Qurṭubī, the famous exegete of the Qur’ān, “And the statement of excommunication (takfīr) [of the Khārijites] is most apparent from the [Prophetic] tradition.” Ibn Ḥajar also states “Upon the view of their excommunication, they are to be fought against and killed, and their wealth is to be taken, and this is the saying of a group of the people of Prophetic traditions regarding the wealth of the Khārijites.”¹⁷⁵

¹⁷² Imām Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310H, 10th century CE) wrote one of the most rigorous and extensive explanations (tafsīr) of the Qur’ān based upon the statements of the Companions of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and their students.

¹⁷³ Faṭḥ al-Bārī (12/300).

¹⁷⁴ Faṭḥ al-Bārī (12/300).

¹⁷⁵ Faṭḥ al-Bārī (12/301).

Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz bin Bāz (d. 1419H, 20th century CE) the former muftī of Saudi Arabia stated, “That which is apparent from the Prophetic traditions is that they are disbelievers.” He also said, after mentioning the view of the scholars who consider the Khārijites to be sinful, astray Muslims, “That which is correct is that they are disbelievers,” citing as evidence the statement of the Prophet, “*If I was to reach them, I would slaughter them like the slaughtering of ‘Ād.*” The people of ‘Ād were a nation of the past who belied their Prophet and were destroyed by a screaming, violent wind without a single survivor. Shaykh Ibn Bāz then said, “The correct and apparent view from the textual evidences is that on account of their extremism, their expulsion of Muslims (from the fold of Islām) and declaring them to be eternal inhabitants of Hellfire, they are disbelievers.”¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁶ <http://www.binbaz.org.sa/mat/20688>.

MUSLIM SOCIETIES AND NATIONS DO NOT BENEFIT FROM THE KHĀRIJITE EXTREMISTS AND THEIR TERRORISM

Today, ISIS and al-Qaidah, their ideology and their activities are as alien to Islām and its people as were their predecessors, the Khārijite renegade extremists who embarked upon murdering the Prophet's Companions. Terrorists such as Usāmah bin Lādin, al-Qā'idah and ISIS do not serve the interests of Muslims, their governments, nations or lands. This raises the question as to whose interests are being served by the activities of the Khārijites in reality. The Muftī of Saudī Arabia, Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz Āl al-Shaykh recently said, "I doubt they are Muslims (in truth)... they are under dubious banners (of leadership) in which there is no goodness." and "The terrorism of ISIS is the very first enemy of Islām."¹⁷⁷ And he also said, "These factions [of Khārijites] are nurtured under the pens of global intelligence agencies."¹⁷⁸ It should now be clear that actions of terrorism, destruction and chaos founded upon a twisted, evil ideology is **literally** the very first enemy to Islām and its people and is most detrimental to them in many different ways. Further, claiming the ideology of the extremists and terrorists is a product of Salafī Islām and scapegoating Salafīyyah for their actions is the height of injustice and is founded upon either gross ignorance or malicious intent. This is because the Khārijite terrorists excommunicated those who are the foundation of Salafīyyah, the Prophet's Companions. The greatest enmity of the Khārijites is designated for the Salafīs and their Scholars because just as the Prophet's Companions stood against them with the pen (and sword), those upon the Salafī way continued that tradition right until this day of ours. For that reason you will not see sustained and articulate refutations of these people except in the writings and books of the Salafī scholars and their followers.

¹⁷⁷ This was covered in many leading Arabic newspapers in August 2014. Refer to <http://arabic.cnn.com/middleeast/2014/08/19/saudi-mufti-isis>.

¹⁷⁸ Refer to <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TmuNHYRQkCQ>.

WHO ARE THE IDEOLOGICAL LEADERS AND GROUPS OF THE MODERN DAY KHĀRIJITES AND SUBVERSIVE MOVEMENTS?

At the head of them is the Iranian *Bāṭinī Ismāʿīlī Shīʿite*, **Jamāl al-Dīn**, pretending to be “al-Afghānī.” His dubious and sinister movements across Egypt, Iran and Turkey in the 19th century were attempts at altering the forms of government in those lands to facilitate foreign exploitation. He was the inspiration behind **Ḥasan al-Bannā**, the *Ṣūfī Ashʿarī*, setting up the Muslim Brotherhood, an instrument of destabilization in Muslim lands. Al-Bannā also called to nearness and unity with the Shīʿites. **Abū Aʿlā Mawdūdī** propounded the Khārijite revolutionary methodology in his writings, claiming that the primary goal of the Prophets was toppling the tyrannical rulers. He was a close friend of the mushrik, kāfir, al-Khomeinī. **Taqī al-Dīn al-Nabahānī**, a former Baʿthist nationalist, furthered the idea of the need of a political party to ferment revolution as a means of establishing the Islāmic state - he was an *Ashʿarī, Muʿtazilī* hybrid. Finally, the ideological grandfather, who made explicit what those before him concealed, **Sayyid Quṭb**, another *Sūfī Ashʿarī*. He propounded the Khārijite, takfīrī doctrine with full expression and added to it a distorted conception of jihād. No Salafīs or ‘Wahhābis’ here.¹⁷⁹

A common theme in the writings of these figureheads is the revilement of ʿUthmān (رضي الله عنه) and Muʿāwiyah (رضي الله عنه), accusing them of nepotism and mismanagement of capital and the absence of social and economic justice

¹⁷⁹ Following the failed attempts to assassinate Jamāl Abd al-Nasser in Egypt, many of those upon the doctrines of Sayyid Quṭb fled to Saudi Arabia, seeking sanctuary and refuge, which they were graciously given. They repaid the favour by working sedition and spreading their takfīrī poison - giving birth to the Quṭbiyyah and Surūriyyah movements prominent in the 1990s. It is due to them that extremism and terrorism is associated with Saudi Arabia. In reality it is the infiltration of the Muslim Brotherhood (al-Ikhwān al-Muslimūn) within Saudi educational institutions that led to the emergence of Khārijites such as Safar al-Ḥawālī, Salmān al-Awdah, Usāmah bin Lādin and others who carried the poison of Sayyid Quṭb.

in their rule. This type of commotion led to revolution against ‘Uthmān and his eventual assassination and the subversive group behind this, the Saba’ites, were the seed group from which both the Khārijites and the Rāfiḍah Shī’ites emerged following the civil strife between ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) and Mu‘āwiyah (رضي الله عنه) which they instigated. It should come as no surprise then, that all of those mentioned, al-Afghānī, al-Bannā, Mawdūdī, al-Nabahānī and Quṭb have in their works, the poison of the Shī’ites or calls to nearness with the Shī’ites. All contemporary takfīrī jihādī movements have their ideas traced back to these thinkers and writers. Their primary focus is around the rulers and revolutionary activity.

The seeds of this ideology in the 20th century were laid by **Abū A’lā Mawdūdī** during the 1940s within his writings within which he distorted the message of Islām, giving it a political interpretation and representing Islām as a political ideology concerned primarily with wresting power from the ruling authorities who assert legislative and executive power over laws that govern the lives of their subjects. He portrayed the message of all the Prophets, from Nūḥ (عليه السلام) to Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as one in which political power and authority was the essential meaning of the declaration, “lā ilāha illallāh.”¹⁸⁰ Mawdūdī preceded Sayyid Quṭb in this concept and Quṭb himself took it from Mawdūdī and also recommended the writings of Mawdūdī to his own followers. Upon this basis, the Messengers were sent to establish a political infrastructure. Since all current rulers govern the lives of their subjects, they have usurped the right of Allāh to rule (Ḥākimiyyah) and have thus, revoked Islām. On that basis, establishing Islām requires an overturning of this situation through revolutions. Whilst Mawdūdī was the original expounder of these ideas, they remained an ideology and were not implemented practically until Sayyid Quṭb took them to the next level.

¹⁸⁰ There are evidences to suggest that Mawdūdī was a crypto-Rāfiḍī. First his ideology resembles the Imāmah ideology of the Rāfiḍī Shī’ites who make it from the greatest pillars of the religion. Secondly, he criticised ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه). Thirdly, he spoke ill of Mu‘āwiyah (رضي الله عنه). Fourthly, he was a close friend of “Āyatollāh” Khomeini and praised the Iranian Revolution.

SAYYID QUTB AND 20TH CENTURY TAKFIRĪ JIHĀDĪSM

In his book *al-‘Adālah al-Ijtimā’iyyah Fī al-Islām* (Social Justice in Islām) and *Kutub wa Shakhṣiyāt* (Books and Personalities), Sayyid Quṭb interpreted early Islāmic history through a Marxist, Socialist, Communist lens, reviled the third Caliph ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) and excommunicated Mu‘āwiyah (رضي الله عنه), his parents and ‘Amr bin al-‘Āṣ and the rulers of Banū Umayyah, accusing them of mismanagement, hoarding capital and creating class separation. He praised the revolution initiated and led by ‘Abdullāh bin Saba¹⁸¹ which led to the assassination of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) and described it as a manifestation of the “true Islāmic spirit.”

In the writings of Qutb there is to be found an ideological framework identical to the ideology of the Khārijites and of socialist, communist movements who operate under the banner of social justice and equal distribution of wealth. Thus, in this period Quṭb started writing about Islām from a doctrinal angle, unlike his previous phrase, in which his

¹⁸¹ The 1906 edition of the Jewish Encyclopedia has an entry for Abdullāh bin Saba’ as follows, “A Jew of Yemen, Arabia, of the seventh century, who settled in Medina and embraced Islam. Having adversely criticized Calif Othman’s administration, he was banished from the town. Thence he went to Egypt, where he founded an antiothmanian sect, to promote the interests of Ali. On account of his learning he obtained great influence there, and formulated the doctrine that, just as every prophet had an assistant who afterward succeeded him, Mohammed’s vizier was Ali, who had therefore been kept out of the califate by deceit. Othman had no legal claim whatever to the califate; and the general dissatisfaction with his government greatly contributed to the spread of Abdallah’s teachings. Tradition relates that when Ali had assumed power, Abdallah ascribed divine honors to him by addressing him with the words, ‘Thou art Thou!’ Thereupon Ali banished him to Madain. After Ali’s assassination Abdallah is said to have taught that Ali was not dead but alive, and had never been killed; that a part of the Deity was hidden in him; and that after a certain time he would return to fill the earth with justice. Till then the divine character of Ali was to remain hidden in the imams, who temporarily filled his place. It is easy to see that the whole idea rests on that of the Messiah in combination with the legend of Elijah the prophet.” End of quote. This entry indicates the origins of the Shi’ite sect.

interest was purely artistic and literary.¹⁸² This ideological framework is greatly reminiscent of the slogan of “social justice” raised by Dhul-Khuwayṣarah al-Tamīmī, the father of the Khārijites who accused the Prophet Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) of being unjust in the distribution of wealth and from whose descendants, the Prophet informed, would come the Khārijites who would depart from Islām and, motivated by other than Islām, would fight and kill the Muslims. In 1952, Quṭb had some involvement in the socialist coup of Jamāl Abd al-Nāsir. For some reason, he fell out with the Free Officers in 1953 and was given a prominent position by the then supreme guide and leader of the Muslim Brotherhood, Ḥasan al-Ḥuḍaybī. It was in this decade, within Nāsserite Egypt, that Quṭb’s extremist doctrines began to take shape more fully. In this period, his hatred of all Islāmīc societies, his excommunication of them (judging them with apostasy) and instigating violent jihāds against them began to develop in his writings. He explicitly negated the Islām of all contemporary Muslim societies and conveyed the idea that there has been no Islāmīc society in existence since the time of Banū Umayyah, the first ruling dynasty after the four righteous caliphs.

Sayyid Quṭb said, “The whole of mankind, including those who repeat from the minarets, in the eastern and western parts of the world, the words ‘Lā ilāha illallāha’, without any [consideration of] meaning or reality, then they are the most sinful of people and will be the most severely punished on the day of Judgement **because they have apostatised** by turning to the worship of the servants (of Allāh).”¹⁸³ Quṭb also wrote, “**Today we are in Jāhiliyyah (pre-Islāmīc ignorance), like that which was prevalent at the dawn of Islām, in fact more oppressive (i.e. severe). Everything around us is Jāhiliyyah...**”¹⁸⁴ And also “**This society in which we live is not a Muslim society.**”¹⁸⁵ He also said, “**The Ummah (of**

¹⁸² Quṭb’s early writings were simply artistic and literary discussions of the style of the Qur’ān and were not studies on Islāmīc subjects.

¹⁸³ In al-Dhilāl (2/1057).

¹⁸⁴ Ma‘ālim Fī al-Ṭarīq, 17th edition, 1991 (p.21).

¹⁸⁵ In al-Dhilāl (4/2009).

Islām) has ceased to be in existence (ghābat al-ummah) and has not been perceivable for a very long time.”¹⁸⁶ After Quṭb announced his hatred and excommunication (takfīr) of all Muslim societies, governments and institutions without exception,¹⁸⁷ he continued, in a hateful, thunderous tone and advocated violent revolutions against them. Sayyid Quṭb wrote, “And this important duty, the duty of instigating a Islāmīc revolution is general, it is not restricted to one region exclusive to another. Rather, it is what Islām desires, and places it in front of its vision, that it should instigate a comprehensive revolution in all inhabited places. This is its greatest objective and its loftiest goal to which it turns its vision, except that it is absolutely mandatory for the Muslims or members of any Islāmīc party to immediately embark upon their duty by instigating the urgent revolution, and striving to alter the structure of rule in their lands in which they live.”¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ Ibid. (p. 8).

¹⁸⁷ This is acknowledged by many prominent figures amongst the Muslim Brotherhood (al-Ikhwān). Farīd ‘Abd al-Khālīq, former leader amongst the Ikhwān, writes, “We have pointed out in what has preceded that the spread of the ideology of takfīr occurred amongst the youth of the Ikhwān who were imprisoned in the late fifties and early sixties, and that they were influenced by the ideology of ... Sayyid Quṭb and his writings. They derived from these writings that the society had fallen into the disbelief of pre-Islāmīc ignorance, and that he had performed takfīr of the rulers who had rejected the ḥākimiyyah of Allāh by not ruling by what Alāh has revealed, and also takfīr of those ruled over (civilians), when they became satisfied with this.” And he also said, “The adherents of this ideology, even if their jamā’āt (groups) are numerous, believe in the kufr (disbelief) of all the present Islamic societies and that their jāhiliyyah is like the jāhiliyyah of the disbelievers before they entered into Islām during the era of the Messenger. Then they built Sharīah rulings in relation to them (these societies) upon this foundation and defined their relationships with individuals from these societies in implementation of that. They judged the society with disbelief because it did not apply the legislation of Allāh, and nor adhere to His commands and prohibitions.” Refer to *Ikhwān al-Muslimūn Fī Mīzan al-Ḥaqq*, (p.115, 118). This ideology of excommunication of the rulers and the Muslim masses is not found in the works of Ibn Taymiyyah nor Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb

¹⁸⁸ Fī Dhilāl al-Qur’ān (9th edition, 1980, 3/1451).

Once takfīr had been made of all societies and destructive revolutions announced against them, the only thing left was the practical methodology of launching the proposed revolutions. And it is here that Quṭb plagiarizes the essential idea of “What is To Be Done?,” a tract written by Vladimir Lenin between 1901 and 1902. It constituted a skeleton plan for the revolution and was later refined and republished in 1907. Quṭb’s book “Mā’ālim Fī al-Ṭarīq” (Milestones) formed the basis of a new, innovated understanding of jihād in the 20th century. These particular writings of Quṭb were strongly influenced by Marxist, Communist revolutionary movements. In addition to the notion of social justice, Quṭb’s ideology took shape around a number of other concepts such as *Jāhiliyyah*¹⁸⁹ and *Hākimiyyah*. The first alludes to all contemporary Muslim societies reverting to the pre-Islamic days of ignorance through which they are judged apostates. The second alludes to the sole right of Allāh alone to judge which Quṭb alleged to have been usurped by all rulers and governments. Within this framework, Sayyid Quṭb redefined the notion of jihād and took it away from its noble and honorable status to one involving terrorism, chaos, treachery, perfidy, slaughtering of civilians and everything that opposes the spirit of Islām. Thus, all contemporary takfīrī and jihādī movements are operating upon the philosophy and thought (*fikr*) of Sayyid Quṭb and not the Islām of Muḥammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his Companions which is based upon revelation (*waḥī*).

In a 2003 article, **Daniel Brogan** wrote “Quṭb’s work is to militant Islām what Das Kapital was to Communism.”¹⁹⁰ **Ladan and Roya Boroumand** wrote, “Like Mawdudi and various Western totalitarians, he [Quṭb] identified his own society (in his case, contemporary Muslim polities) as among the enemies that a virtuous, ideologically self-conscious, vanguard minority would have to fight by any means necessary,

¹⁸⁹ In this concept Sayyid Quṭb was influenced by the French Philosopher, Alexis Carrel and his book, “*Man, the Unknown*” in which the idea of “barbarism” of modern societies is developed.

¹⁹⁰ *Al Qaeda’s Greeley Roots*, June 2003.

including violent revolution, so that a new and perfectly just society might arise. His ideal society was a classless one where the ‘selfish individual’ of liberal democracies would be banished and the ‘exploitation of man by man’ would be abolished. God alone would govern it through the implementation of Islamic law (shari‘a). This was Leninism in Islāmist dress.”¹⁹¹

Paul Berman wrote in an article published in the New York Times, 23rd March 2003, “The few had to gather themselves together into what Quṭb in ‘Milestones’ called a vanguard - a term that he must have borrowed from Lenin.”

Rod Dreher wrote, “What is to be done? Lenin famously asked about Czarist Russia. Quṭb’s answer to the same question about the West was, in part, ‘Milestones,’ a Leninist-style tract advocating worldwide Islāmīc revolution.”¹⁹²

Phil Paine wrote, “The first thing one notices about Quṭb’s ideological thought is how little it has to do with traditions of Islām, or the needs of people in Islāmīc countries. It is profoundly European in inspiration, and it’s chief models are Hitler, Marx and Lenin... Lenin is by far the strongest influence. Whole passages look like they were simply copied out from his works and then a pseudo-Islāmīc terminology inserted, ‘revolutionary vanguard’ becoming ‘Islamic vanguard’, and so on... As Marxist mumbo-jumbo justified the telling of any lie, the betrayal of any value, the commitment of any atrocity, in the name of an implacable destiny, so too, does Milestones.”¹⁹³

¹⁹¹ In an article titled *Terror, Islam and Democracy*, *Journal of Democracy* 13.2 (2002) 5-20.

¹⁹² In the *Dallas Morning News* (27th August 2006).

¹⁹³ In his review article, *The Ideology of Sayyid Quṭb* (22nd August 2006)

Lawrence Wright observed about the book ‘Milestones,’ that “Its ringing apocalyptic tone may be compared with Rousseau’s ‘Social Contract’ and Lenin’s ‘What Is to Be Done?’ - with similar bloody consequences.”¹⁹⁴

From these citations, we can see the truthfulness and insight in the words of the scholar, Rabī bin Hādī, “And this revolutionary ideology [of the modern Khārijites], we do not say it is ‘influenced by the ideology of the Khārijites’ but we say that it is influenced by the Communist, nationalist and secularist revolutions before it is influenced by the ideology of the Khārijites.”¹⁹⁵ The modern, twisted, distorted concept of jihād has its roots not in the works of Ibn Taymiyyah or Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, but 20th century, Ṣūfī Ash‘arī thinkers influenced by European revolutionary movements. Excommunicating the rulers in broad terms became the most fundamental principle of Islām and a requisite to social justice in this new doctrine - indicating the grossest of ignorance of the Islāmic creed and the laws of Allāh in His creation as will become clear in what is to follow next.

¹⁹⁴ Cited by Daniel Martin in *Sayyid Quṭb: The Father of Al-Qaida*, published in the Independent in August 2006.

¹⁹⁵ *Kashf al-Sitār* (pp. 32-33).

WHAT IS THE RULE OF ALLĀH IN HIS CREATION AND WHY ARE THERE SINFUL, TYRANNICAL RULERS?

These realities are unknown to the Khārijites because they have no understanding in the religion. It is clearly established in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah that the nature of the rulers and their rule is directly tied to the actions of the servants. The Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم), explained “*And never do a people cheat in the weights and measures except that they are taken by years (of hardship), scarcity of resources and the tyranny of the ruler upon them.*”¹⁹⁶ Elaborating upon the same principle, **Imām Ibn al-Qayyim** (رحمته الله) said: “And reflect in His, the Most High’s wisdom in making the kings of the servants, their leaders and their rulers to be of the same species as the actions [of the servants]. Rather, it is as if their actions became manifest in the appearances of their rulers and kings. If they remain upright, then their kings will remain upright, and if they turn away (from uprightness), then they (the kings) too will turn away from uprightness.¹⁹⁷ And if they (the servants) oppress [each other], then their kings and rulers will oppress [them]. And if plotting and deception appears from them, their rulers will [be made to] behave likewise (towards them), and if they (the servants) withhold the rights of Allāh that are between themselves and become miserly with respect to them, then their kings and their rulers will withhold the right that they (the servants) have upon them and will become miserly with respect to them. And if they take from the one who is considered weak what they do not deserve to take from him in their dealings, then the kings will take from them (the servants) what they do not deserve to take (from them) and will inflict them with taxes. And everything that they (the servants) take away from the weak person (unjustly), the kings will take away from

¹⁹⁶ *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Mājah* (no. 4019) from ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Umar (رضي الله عنه).

¹⁹⁷ In the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Umar (رضي الله عنه) the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, “*And never do a people cheat in the weights and measures except that they are taken by years (of hardship), scarcity of resources and the tyranny of the ruler.*” *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Mājah* (4019). When this is for cheating in the weights and measures, then what about shirk with the Lord of the worlds, the greatest of all injustices, that is found widespread in the majority of Muslim lands?

them with power, force. So their actions (those of the servants) become manifest in their actions (those of the kings and rulers). And it is not from the Divine wisdom that the evil-doers and the sinners are made to be ruled over [by anyone] except by one who is of their like. And when the very first band (of Islām) was the best of the generations, and the most pious of them, then their rulers were likewise. And when they (the people) became corrupt, the Rulers were made corrupt over them. Thus, the wisdom of Allāh refuses that the likes of Mu‘āwiyah, and ‘Umar bin ‘Abd al-‘Azīz are put in authority over us in the likes of these times [the 8th Century Hijrah], let alone the likes of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Rather, our rulers are in accordance with our (nature) and the rulers of those before us were in accordance with their (nature).”¹⁹⁸

Ibn al-Qayyim also said, “For every Allāh, the Sublime, with His wisdom (*ḥikmah*) and justice (*‘adl*) makes the (consequences) of the actions of the servants to appear to them in forms (*ṣūwar*) that are appropriate to (their actions). So sometimes it is in the form of a drought or barrenness (of land). Other times it is by way of an enemy. Other times by way of tyrannical rulers. Other times by way of general diseases (that spread). Other times it is by anxiety, grief and worry that reside in their souls and do not leave them. Other times it is by preventing the blessings from the sky and the Earth from them. Other times it is by unleashing the devils upon them to incite them to the causes of their destruction, so that His word can be established upon them and so that each of them arrives at the outcome destined for him. The intelligent (*‘āqil*) traverses with his insight (*baṣīrah*) in all regions of the world and witnesses this, and he sees the occurrence (of these instances) of Allāh’s justice and wisdom taking place.”¹⁹⁹

These statements of Ibn al-Qayyim are in effect, an insight into the statement of Mu‘ādh bin Jabal (رضي الله عنه), who said, “The ruler is from the

¹⁹⁸ *Miftāḥ Dār al-Sa‘ādah*, (Dār Ibn ‘Affān, 2/177).

¹⁹⁹ *Zād al-Ma‘ād* (4/363).

affair of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) whoever reviled the ruler is in reality reviling the affair of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ).”²⁰⁰ The ruler is from the placement of Allāh, He places rulers in accordance with what the subjects deserve, as a direct expression of the actions of the servants themselves, a law in Allāh’s creation. Thus, when the modern Khārijites revile and attack the oppressive rulers who do not judge by Allāh’s law with respect to their subjects, attempting to remove them and acquire power, they are corrupters of an already corrupted situation. The situation was corrupted by the people due to their deeds, their *shirk* (associationism), *bid’ah* (innovation), *ma’ṣiyah* (disobedience), as result of which Allāh punished them from a way amongst the ways at His disposal, which includes tyrannical rulers who do not judge by Allāh’s law and do not implement justice to the detriment of the subjects. Ibn Taymiyyah said, “Indeed, the affair [of rule] being destined for the kings and their deputies from the rulers, judges and leaders is not due to the deficiency in them alone, but due to the deficiency in both the shepherd and the flock together, for ‘As you yourselves behave, you will be ruled over (in a like manner)’ and Allāh, the Exalted has said, **‘Thus do we turn some of the oppressors against others on account of (the deeds) they earn.’** (6:129).”²⁰¹ And Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Ṭurṭūshiyy said, “I never ceased hearing the people saying, ‘Your actions are your workers, as you yourselves behave, you will be ruled over (in a like manner)’ until I grasped this meaning from the Qur’ān, Allāh, the Exalted said, **‘Thus do we turn some of the oppressors against others on account of (the deeds) they earn’.** (6:129). And it used to be said, ‘Whatever you show rejection against in your time, then it is your own deed that has corrupted that for you.’ And ‘Abd al-Malik bin Marwān said, ‘O subjects, you have not dealt justly with us. You want from us the *sīrah* (way, approach, behaviour) of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar but you do yourselves do not behave with respect to us or yourselves with their behaviour’.”²⁰²

²⁰⁰ Related by Abū Amr al-Dānī in *al-Sunan al-Wāridah fil-Fitan*.

²⁰¹ *Maḥmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (35/20-21).

²⁰² *Sirāj al-Mulūk* (2/467-468).

Thus, modern-day Khārijite movements are further corrupters of already corrupt situations and this is from their ignorance and their inability to grasp the ‘aqidah of Ahl al-Sunnah in these great and mighty affairs of *al-qaḍā wal-qadar*, the actions of the servants, the rule of Allāh in His creation and the purpose, justice and wisdom in Allāh’s actions and His legislations - and from that is the famous ḥadīth related by Hudhayfah (رضي الله عنه), which is a stake in the heart of every braindead Khārijite, that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, “*There will be after me rulers who do not guide themselves by my guidance nor follow my Sunnah and their will appear amongst you men whose hearts are the hearts of devils in the bodies of men.*” Hudhayfah said, “*What shall I do if I reach that (time)?*” He (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, “*Hear and obey the ruler, even if your back is beaten and your wealth is confiscated.*”²⁰³ And this is only after we accept that the rulers targeted by the Khārijites are as evil as they are made out to be, for most of what the Khārijites allege is from their own evil understanding or complete lack of understanding of the rulings of the Sharīah, treating things permitted in the Sharīah to be disbelief - just as the very first Khārijites treated the matter of arbitration to be disbelief.

²⁰³ Related by Muslim in his Ṣaḥīḥ.

CLOSING NOTES

The Sharī'ah of Islām judged the Khārijites to have departed and exited from Islām just as an arrow passes through its game. The following citation will help us to grasp one of the angles from which this is indeed the case. Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb said, in demonstrating the contrast between the way in which the Sharī'ah treats the sinners and the heretical innovators, "Chapter: What has come [to show] that innovation is more severe than major sins due to His saying, **“Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills.”** (4:116) and his saying, the Most High, **“That they may bear their own burdens in full on the Day of Resurrection and some of the burdens of those whom they misguide without knowledge. Unquestionably, evil is that which they bear.”** (16:25). And in the Ṣaḥīḥ [of al-Bukhārī] that he (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said about the Khārijites, *‘Wherever you find them, slaughter them’* and within [the Ṣaḥīḥ] is that he prohibited from fighting the tyrannical rulers, so long as they pray.”²⁰⁴

The Shaykh cited the first verse (4:116) to show that no matter what level of sin is committed (by the sinners, rulers included) it can be forgiven, unless it is shirk. And the second verse (16:25) is about the innovators who will bear their burden and that of all those whom they misguided. In the first ḥadīth he indicated how the Khārijites (despite their outward piety and alluring speech about the religion and Allāh’s right to judge and so on) are to be slaughtered wherever they are found²⁰⁵ and in the second ḥadīth he indicated how the sinful, tyrannical rulers must not be fought so long as they pray. This is an indication of how the Sharī'ah of Islām preserves both the worldly and religious interests in contrast to what the intellects and opinions of men may surmise. It came with rulings and injunctions that actualize the greater benefit and repel the greater harm. Unlike atheistic, materialist philosophies which came with

²⁰⁴ *Faḍl al-Islām* within the *Majmū' Mu'allafāt* (6/1156).

²⁰⁵ This is for the rulers to pursue and not for the subjects.

social revolutionary movements to topple monarchies and governments (under the guise of establishing social, economic and political justice) leading to mass murder, chaos, civil strife, destruction of infrastructure and whose beneficiaries are not the masses but an elite few, the Sharī'ah of Islām came with the opposite: The preservation of peace and security despite the presence of tyranny and social and economic injustice. It came with patience upon the tyranny, injustice and self-preference of the rulers, despite their sinfulness and injustice, alongside strong incitations to slaughter and kill the revolutionary renegades (Khārijites) who revolt against the authorities and create more evil and harm than which is found from the rulers alone. And this is despite the apparent great piety of these Khārijites in their abundant beautified speech, their prayer and fasting.

And all praise is due to Allāh and may peace and blessings be upon His Prophet and Messenger, Muḥammad.

Abū 'Iyaad

1st Ramaḍān 1436H / 18th June 2015

Ibn al-Qayyim (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said:

The people of Islām are strangers amongst mankind. And the believers are strangers amongst the people of Islām. And the people of knowledge are strangers amongst the believers. And the people of the Sunnah who separate it from the desires and innovations, they are strangers. And those who call to it and have patience upon the harm of the opposers, they are the severest of them (all) in strangeness. However, they are the people of Allāh in truth. There is no strangeness for them (in reality), (rather) their strangeness is only in relation to the majority about whom Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) said, **“If you were to obey most of those upon the Earth they would misguide you from the path of Allāh”** (6:116). So the ones (mentioned in the verse) are (the real) strangers to Allāh and His Messenger and their strangeness is the deserting (type of) strangeness even if they are well-known and pointed towards.

Madārij al-Sālikīn (3/186).

