



## Concerning the [Insidious, Covert] Qutubism of 'Adnaan 'Ar'oor

Shaykh Ubayd al-Jaabiree

### Shaykh Ubayd al-Jaabiree *hafidhahullaah* Addresses the issue of 'Adnaan 'Aroor

Question:

In reference to Adnaan 'Uroor, we hear that some of the Ulamaa hold him to be *majrooh* and others praise him. So we would like you to clarify his status to us may Allaah reward you.

So the Shaykh *hafidhahullaah* responds, after praising Allaah *Subhaannahuwa t'ala* and pronouncing the *Shahaadah* and sending peace and blessings upon the noble prophet *sallallhu'alayhi wa sallam*.

The Shaykh then said,

“To proceed, verily it is not a new thing that the Ulamaa sometimes differ with regards to criticizing an individual or praising him.

And the principle that is established and agreed upon regarding this is that a specific *Jarh* takes precedence over a general *Ta'deel*. So if both a *jarh* and a *ta'deel* contradict each other in reference to a person, **then the *Jarh* is given precedence**. Because in it lays additional knowledge of the person's status.

And the Ulamaa give *tazkiyah* to a person based upon that which is apparent from his situation and his good history. And a lot of the Ulamaa have things hidden from them by the people. And if they knew those things they wouldn't have made the *ta'deel* and the *tazkiyah* of that person.

Because both *jarh* and *ta'deel* is a [form of] giving witness and the just and honorable Ulamaa would never give *tazkiyah* to an individual who deserves a *jarh*, or in better words they would never conceal a *jarh* and prefer giving a *tazkiyah*. Because this would be *talbees* and deception to the people. Just as they would never make a *jarh* on a person who deserves a *tazkiyah* because that

would be oppression to such a person. So this principle is general with regards to making a judgment of someone.

And there is another principle, also used for judging statements and actions.

Which is that the statements and actions of someone are weighed by Ahlus Sunnah, using two scales. They are the text and the *ijmaa*, so whoever agrees with the text and the *ijmaa* then his statement and action is accepted. And whoever contradicts a text or an *ijmaa* then his statement and action is rejected without any sympathy. Then Ahlus Sunnah deals with this mistaken individual, by what he deserves. So if he is from the people of bidah and desires he is dealt with sternly and he is made known to the people. And if he is not from the people of bidah but rather, he slipped and a few minor mistakes. Then it is enough just to refute the issue at hand. And the objective of all of this is to protect the Sunnah from infiltration of bidah, so that it will remain pure in both statement and action.

Now regarding the *ustaad* Adnaan ibn Muhammad 'Uroor, then what I can recall at the moment is a few lines from some of his statements. And I will mention them together with the clarification of the mistakes they contain. And their contradiction to that which is correct or rather their contradiction to the Sunnah.

Then I will speak about the man based upon what I recall of his statements. And I will not add nor will I delete *insha'llaah wa t'ala*. And I don't know this man personally nor have I met him, rather I know of him.

Regarding the first thing, he was asked in some European countries, I don't know if it was in Britain or not, I cannot remember.

He was asked about giving the *bai'ah* to the king in Saudi Arabia, whether this is legislated or not?

So he replied, "I am not a Saudi"

So the man fled from giving a judgment based upon what he believes regarding the *bai'ah* to the man in authority here, which is that it is neither valid nor legit. So he said, "I am not a Saudi".

And this shows that he doesn't hold the *bai'ah al qutriyyaa* to be valid, when it is in fact valid and legitimate. And what he should have done if he was brave and outspoken was to clarify his opinion with respect to this issue. As for his

reply, then it was a reply of *tablees*. And the people of knowledge always clarify what they believe.

And the *bai'ah* that we have is valid and *Alhamdulillah* since the people of knowledge such as Shaykh ul-Islaam ibn Taymeeyah and others have given the verdict of the validity of the *bai'ah al qutriyyaa*. Which is given to a ruler who gains authority in a country, and his word remains dominant therein. From such a case, hearing and obeying him is *Waajib*, and giving *bai'ah* to him is *Waajib*.

The second statement is that he ('Uroor) said about Sayd Qutb,

“He is the best ever, who has spoken about manhaj”.

This implies that the manhaj of Sayd Qutb in da'wah is the better one and the most prominent. And there are two points to make in reference to his statement, the first being that Sayd is not from the ulamaa of this *deen* and doesn't have an understanding of *Tawheed* nor an understanding of the sunnah. This becomes evident to whoever looks through his books and analyses them thoroughly. And also, the man is 'a thinker' as they say. So he doesn't have the suitability that makes him a caller to Allaah upon clarity and because of this he has deviated greatly in his books.

And the second point is that he conceals the misguided manhaj of Sayd Qutb and gives him *tazkiyah*. And whoever looks into the issue of Sayd (Qutb) through his books will clearly see the deviations and calamities in both *aqeedah* and manhaj. For he carries the banner of takfeer in this age, and his books contain *wahdatul-wajood* and *jabr* and *ta'teel* of the *Sifaat*. And the call to 'the freedom of belief' and the call to the 'unification of the religions' and slandering of the prophet *sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam's* companions.

And I will read to you a statement from Sayd Qutb's books and I think it is in his book '*ma'raktul islaam wa ratsmaliyyah*'. He says, 'it is inevitable for Islaam to dominate because it is the constructive and affirmative *aqeedah* which is formed from both communism and christianity together in complete harmonious blend. And it comprises both their objectives and adds to them balance and moderateness'.

So we ask Adnaan ibn 'Uroor and his likes who are amazed by Sayd Qutb, 'explain to us this statement and what does Sayd intend by it and what does it mean?'

And its explanation will only be one of two things, either he believes Islaam to be a foundation for communism and christianity and they are both branching from it. Then this is a justification for him, meaning christianity is true and communism is true.

Or he believes them to be the foundation and Islaam is a mixture of the two and this is more severe than the first one. And both explanations a corrupt, deviant and in fact kufr, it is a statement of *kufr*. But this doesn't mean that we make *takfeer* on Sayd, we don't do this. What we believe is that he is deviant, misguided and misguides others. And those who defend him are either ignorant of his *minhaj*. And don't know what his books contain of misguidance and deviation or they are trying to cover him up. The same way ibn sooreeyah did, when he concealed the verse of stoning. When two jews committed fornication and the jews asked the messenger of Allaah *sallallahu'alayhi wa sallam*, and he asked, "what do you find in the torah?" they said "we expose them and lash them". So Abdullaah ibn Salaam (who use to be a jew and then became a Muslim) said, "you have lied, verily it has the verse of stoning". So torah was brought and ibn Sooreeyah stood up and read from it, putting his hand on the verse of stoning. And he read what was before it and after it. So Abdullaah ibn Salaam said, "you've lied, verily it has the verse of stoning. Lift up your hand". So he lifted it and there was the verse of stoning.

Hence there are from amongst the followers of Sayd Qutb and those who close their eyes to his misguidance and deviation, which his books are full of. Those who's situation and actions resemble the actions of the jews. Because they only mention about Sayd Qutb some minor things, literal things and social issues that the ulamaa have talked about and finalized. Thus, 'Sayd Qutb doesn't posses anything new' and by this they deceive the masses. Saying that he is "a *Imaam*" and "a *shaheed*" and "a reviver". So these people are actually defending innovations in the religion of Allaah, meaning the second category of people. As for the first one, then they are ignorant and don't know anything about Sayd Qutb. Other than it is said to them, "he (Qutb) fought and strove and was killed *feesabeelillaah*".

And the third statement of *al-ustaad* Adnaan is that in some of his books he affirms the inseparable relation between manners and *tawheed*. Meaning, between the manners of the *da'ee* (caller) and *tawheed*. And he concludes by saying that *tawheed* without manners is of no benefit.

And this is an innovated statement which means that whoever is rough and harsh in his *da'wah* and has stern manners, then his *tawheed* is of no benefit to him (!) And this is not correct, it means bad manners contradict *tawheed*. And this is not correct, rather it is a lie. And I don't know this to be from the people

of the past and I don't know him to have any *salaf* in this. And he uses as daleel, the action of the prophet *sallallahu'alayhi wa sallam* when he was in Mecca. That only a few people believed with him and then he made *hijrah*. And only when he *sallallahu'alayhi wa sallam* used good manners with the people of Mecca, many of them became Muslims.

This means that the prophet *sallallahu'alayhi wa sallam* was not beneficial in his early stages of *da'wah*. And this is a slander against the messenger of Allaah *sallallahu'alayhi wa sallam*.

These are some of the statements and there are many others in the books of Adnaan 'Uroor. But I would like to say two things,

Number one, this man Adnaan is one of two categories. Either he is ignorant of the *dawatus Salafiyah* and ignorant of the Sunnah and is not from the callers to Allaah with *baseerah*. Rather he's moved by his emotions and thus started saying what he said. Then verily I call him to fear Allaah with regard to the Muslims. And to learn the Sunnah and study it from its people. And to leave that which results in misguidance and evil.

Or he is a person of *hawaa* and *bidah*. Then I call him to make *towbaa* to Allaah *azaawa'jal* and to leave the *bidah*. And to call people to the Book and the sunnah and *tawheed* and the correct *aqeedah*, and to abandon this foolishness. And I believe that he relies on the principle of 'coming together'. Meaning the principle of *al-manaar* and then the *ikhwaan al-muslimeen* which is, "lets co operate in that which we agree upon and over look each other in that which we differ upon". Or the principle of *al-muwazanah*, which is to look into the good and bad deeds of an individual. Then to blend the bad deeds with the good deeds and this is *bid'atul asr* the most prominent *bidah* of these times. Which has evolved from the first one.

And I have just remembered a fourth statement, the man also allows *khilaaf* in *aqeedah*. And this what strengthens my thought that he is upon that false principle of *ta'aawun*. Meaning that let us co-operate and leave that which we differ upon, which we mentioned earlier.

And he uses as proof for this '*khilaaf*' the *khilaaf* of the *ulamaa* with regards to the Throne and the Pen. 'Which of the two preceded the other?' then he screams at the top of his voice and I have the tape, "is this not *khilaaf* in *aqeedah*?"

So he who has no knowledge of the Sunnah and cannot distinguish between the *Usool* and the *Furoo'*". And doesn't know of the *khilaaf* of the *ulamaa* in this

issue and its like. Then he will become affected by the *kalaam* of Adnaan 'Uroor.

But this issue is clear because the scholars that differed in this issue did not differ about the creation of the Throne and the Pen nor their existence. Rather they differed about which one of them preceded the other and there is no harm in this. Because all of them agree upon their creation and their existence. So the *khilaaf* was in a *fara'* (*faroo'*) and the *raajih* with us is that the Pen was created first. Due to the *haadith*, "verily the first thing that Allaah created was the Pen".

That was the first thing and the second thing is that I advise you O my children, to study and learn the sunnah. And to get it firmly established within you and also *at-tawheed* and the correct *aqeedah*. Taken from the Book and the sunnah and in accordance with the *salaf us saalih*. And don't be deceived just because some students of knowledge give the brother (Adnaan) *tazkiyah*. Because I think I have about six different *tazkiyaat* from people. And the only one I know from them is the brother as Shaykh 'Ali ibn Hasan 'Ali ibn Abdul Hameed al-Halabee al-Atharee and I don't know the rest of them. And I believe that Shaykh 'Ali is considered a *salafi* by us and I don't know anything other than *salafiyyah* from him in both *aqeedah* and *manhaj*. If he knew of what I have presented to you and what Adnaan's books contain of deviation and bidah. He (shaykh 'Ali) would not have given him *tazkiyah* to him. And I don't think he would give him *ta'deel* being that he (Shaykh 'Ali) is a man of *salafi aqeedah* and *manhaj*. As for the rest of them (that gave Adnaan 'Uroor *tazkiyah*) then they are obscure to me and I don't know anything about them.

This is from one aspect and from another aspect is that some students of knowledge and scholars may declare an individual reliable. And speak good of him and give him *ta'deel* and do this with both his tongue and pen. But if his situation becomes clear to him (which is that he doesn't deserve *tawtheeq* and *tazkiyah*) then he takes back his statement, he takes back his statement of *ta'deel*. So don't find that strange because we have examples of this from some of the great imaams, which clarifies this issue. And if you were to know of this example you would clearly find the truth.

Because ash-Shaafi'ee *rahimahullaah* use to declare Ibraheem ibn abee Yahya reliable. And use to say about him, 'he who I don't suspect related to me' and other similar statements implying reliability and *ta'deel* and *tazkiyah*. But this Ibraheem has been criticized by the people of knowledge and the imaams. Those who are greater than ash-Shaafi'ee and those who are of the same caliber and those who are lesser than him.

They criticized him immensely, like *al-Imaam* Maalik when he was asked about him, “was Ibraheem ibn Yahya reliable?” he said “no not even in his *deen*”. So ash-Shaafi’ee’s *rahimahullaah ta’deel* and *tawtheeq* of Ibraheem ibn abee Yahya was of no benefit to Ibraheem. Because Ibraheem was *majrooh* (disparaged) with the people of knowledge. And it didn’t harm ash-Shaafi’ee neither because ash-Shaafi’ee is an imaam.

So shaykh ‘Ali ibn hasan ibn ‘Ali ibn Abdul Hameed, his *ta’deel* of Adnaan ibn Muhammad ‘Uroor does not benefit Adnaan as far as we see it. But it doesn’t harm shaykh ‘Ali either. So we are *mutawast* we are in the middle and *Alhamdulillah*.

This is what was possible to say at the moment about Adnaan al ‘Uroor. As an advise to our brothers in our own country Saudi Arabia and our brothers from America and Europe whose countries Adnaan wanders about in, area after area. And I think that this matter has become clear and evident.

Since this man does not deserve any *tazkiyah* and he is not a *Da’ee* (caller) to *Salafiyyah* upon *baseeraa*. So one does not rely upon him with regards to the establishment of the sunnah and the establishment of *aqeedah*.”

The questioner then goes on to tell the shaykh, “Adnaan ‘Uroor gave a talk in France and was asked, ‘why do you use the statements of Sayd Qutb?’ so he said, ‘this is for the sake of *da’wah* so that the Qutbis return to the *salafi manhaj*”.

Then the shaykh (*hafidhahullaah*) replied,

“As I have said to you, Sayd Qutb is not from the people of *salafi manhaj*. I’ve clarified to you the statement’s of Sayd Qutb and I have clarified for you the statements of Adnaan ‘Uroor. So if this man is a *salafi da’ee* upon clarity then he would never have narrated or used the statements of Sayd Qutb. I have clarified this to you before”.

End of the words of our shaykh, Shaykh Ubayd al-Jaabiree (*hafidhahullaah*).