



OBSERVATIONS AGAINST THE BOOK SUPPORTING THE MADHHAB OF THE KHAWAARIJ

NDV120001 @ WWW.SALAFIPUBLICATIONS.COM

Imaam al-Albaani, after having read the book, “Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa” (brainchild of Mohammad Qutb), authored by Safar al-Hawali stated, **“I did not think that the author would reach this level”** and also said that the book **“reached the extremity in evil”**¹. It is also well known that the Shaikh called this sect, **“The Khawarij of the Era”** and that they **“perform takfir by major sins”**, and recently Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri labelled this sect as **“Firqah Jins ul-Amal”**², whose saying in reality is that of the Khawarij who make takfir of those who abandon the outward obligatory duties. The chastisement of Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaami of the likes of Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah is only too well known and the Ubaylaan Affair is much too well known!!

Shall we wait for the Permanent Committee to issue a verdict against this book, before we warn from this book and know of its evil and its promotion of the madhhab of the Khawarij? Are not the words of the greatest Imaam of Hadeeth of our times sufficient as knowledge-based testimony?³ Shall we only rejoice when the Permanent Committee issues a verdict that is in our favour and against our opponents?!

Or do we – when and where we are capable - seek the knowledge based proofs and evidences to form our opinion – basing our position upon that, and then wait for our opponent to come forward with his defence or his explanation or his clarification or his recantation? Regardless, of what so and so and so and so might opine or claim?

Either way let the Qutubists answer the following:

ACCUSING THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE UMMAH, ITS MASHAYIKH AND ITS IMAANS WITH IRJAA’

Stated Safar al-Hawali, **“And no one says that the one who abandons it (the prayer) is not a kaafir except one who has been affected by the (thought of) al-Irjaa’, whether he realises it or not.”**!! (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa pp.650-651). And also, **“...without their knowing that the source of this doubt (of the absence of takfir of the one who abandons prayer) and its foundation is actually from Irjaa’!!”** (p.419)

¹ Refer to tapes, “Fitnat ul-Asr” (2 Cassettes) and also “Khaarjiyyah Asriyyah” and this is also narrated by Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi.

² Refer to the tapes, “Al-Furqaan Fee Masaa’il il-Imaan” (2 Cassettes).

³ This is because the Shaikh has around 80 knowledge-based criticisms of the book, which will soon be published by the will of Allaah.

And it is known that the likes of ash-Shaafi'ee and Maalik held onto this view and until even some of the later Hanbalis such as Ibn Qudaamah and others. So this one thinks that the doubt of Irjaa' entered into those mentioned and many more of the Mashayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah. And this is what happens when you abandon the way of the Salaf in dealing with the Innovators, and begin to befriend them and allow them access to your faculties of reasoning – such as what happened to this unfortunate one who was poisoned from the direction of Mohammad Qutb, the brother and “acting minister” of Sayyid Qutb, the Rafidee Heretic and Innovator.

In refutation of the above slander against the whole Ummah are the words of Shaikh Abdur-Razzaaq al-Afeefee, who textually stated that not performing takfir of the one who abandons prayer is the view of the majority, **“And this is the most well-known and the most abundantly (held) view, and it is almost an Ijmaa', yet it is not an Ijmaa', however due to the vast abundance of those who hold this view, it is almost an Ijmaa'”**. (Fataawaa ash-Shaikh Abdur-Razzaaq Afeefee p.394).

So do you allow us O Qutubists to spread this in all the corners of the globe and to pronounce, “Safar al-Hawaali has made an **outright fabrication** against Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah”?

LYING UPON SHAIKH UL-ISLAAM IBN TAYMIYYAH

Regarding the statement of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, “And by this will the doubt be ended concerning this topic. For many people, rather the vast majority of them, in all the various lands do not safeguard their five prayers, and nor do they abandon them completely. Rather, they pray sometimes and leave prayer sometimes. Hence, these people have both Imaan and Nifaaq (hypocrisy) and hence the external rulings of Islaam concerning inheritance and the likes pertain to them. Since, if these such rulings still apply to a pure hypocrite such as Ibn Ubayy and his likes from the (outright) hypocrites, then it should apply to those (i.e. the ones who sometimes pray and other times do not) even more so”, the mouthpiece of Mohammad Qutb claimed, **“What is intended here is that Shaikh ul-Islaam – may Allaah have mercy upon him – has aided the viewpoint that such people are actually disbelievers internally”** (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa' p.668).

And this is a slander and mighty fabrication against Shaikh ul-Islaam, for the nifaaq being ascribed to such people here is the nifaaq of action not that of belief, since it is not possible for both Imaan and nifaaq of belief to co-exist in the heart!!

And to prove this is a mighty slander and fabrication, here are some other words of Shaikh ul-Islaam which make his intent clear, “An as for the one who persists upon abandoning the prayer, never ever praying at all, and then he dies upon this state of persistence in not praying and upon this abandonment, then this one is not a Muslim. However, the majority of people pray sometimes and abandon prayer sometimes. So they do not safeguard their prayers, and hence they are under the threat of punishment. And they are the ones who are mentioned in the hadeeth which is reported in the Sunan by way of Ubaadah from the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) that he said, “There are five prayres that Allaah has ordained upon the servants in a day and a nights. Whoever safeguards them will have a

guarantee from Allaah that he will enter him into Paradise, and whoever does not safeguard them does not have any guarantee from Allaah. If He wills, He will punish him and if He wills, He will forgive him”.⁴

So do you allow us O Qutubists to spread this in all the corners of the globe and to pronounce, “Safar al-Hawaali has made an **outright fabrication** against Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah”?

MOCKERY AND BELITTLEMENT OF IMAAM AL-ALBAANI

Stated the mouthpiece of Mohammad Qutb, “**Rather, one who fights against partisanship for madhhabs has himself fallen into it (Irjaa’), such as Shaikh al-Albaani**” (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa’ p.658). And also, “**And the Shaikh – may Allaah preserve him – is amongst the most severe of people in fleeing and making others flee from the blind-following of the Hanafees in the subsidiary issues (furoo’, i.e. fiqh). So how can that be when this (i.e. Irjaa’) is from the major matters (usool, i.e. aqidah)**” (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa’ p.726). He means here, how can the Shaikh forbid blind-following in matters of fiqh, and then fall into what the Hanafees fell into of matters of aqidah (i.r. Irjaa’).

And the truth of the matter is that Imaam and Muhaddith, al-Albaani was demolishing the very foundations of Irjaa’ in the Hanafi thought in his commentary upon Aqidah at-Tahaawiyah around 30 years ago, when Safar al-Hawali was most probably playing in the streets. But as for this mockery and belittlement, then we are not ignorant of it and nor are we ignorant of the desired goal behind it and or are we ignorant of the way of the Salaf towards such despicable behaviour – and we have in Imaam Ahmad a most notable example.

ANOTHER OUTRIGHT FABRICATION

Stated Safar al-Hawali, “Verily, Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah are followers of the texts of the Sharee’ah in every single affair. So whatever the legislation has declared to be kufr absolutely, then in their view it is kufr, absolutely (i.e. major kufr) – **such as the one who abandoned prayer or practiced magic or ruled by a legislation other than that revealed by Allaah. And they labelled such a one an Unbeliever (kaafir) in absolute terms.** And as for what the legislation declared to be from the acts of sin, but also labelled as kufr, then they label (such acts) as kufr also, but they do not declare the one who falls into it an Unbeliever.” (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa’ p.723)

Have you seen such boldness from a doctor in aqidah?! And have you seen a greater fabrication against Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah? The doctor attempted to pass off abandonment of prayer and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed as major disbelief in absolute terms. He avoided the well-known tafseel (clarification) and tafseer of the Salaf in this regard, that of Ibn ‘Abbaas, and that of the Salaf past and present. Instead he parroted the view of Sayyid and Mohammad Qutb – those who are known for their Takfir and Khurooj and who apply the apparent meaning of the verses in Surah al-Maa’idah to all the Rulers without exception!!

⁴ Refer to Fataawaa al-Kubraa (Chapter:Kitaab us-Salaah, Issue: The one who abandons prayer without any excuse).

Stated Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, **“So when there is the saying of the Salaf that man can have Imaan and hypocrisy in him, then likewise is their saying that he can have Imaan and kufr (in him).** But Ibn Abbaas and his companions said “not the kufr that ejects one from the religion”, as regards His saying, “the one who does not rule by what Allaah revealed then they are kaafir.” They said: “kufr that does not eject one from the religion”. And Imaam Ahmad and other Imaams of the Sunnah followed them in this.” (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 7/312).

He also said, “A person can be a Muslim and alongside that have something of kufr with him as well, kufr that does not expel from the religion, the lesser kufr (kufr doona kufr), as has been stated by Ibn Abbaas and his companions concerning the saying of Allaah, “And whosoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed are the Unbelievers” (5:44). They said, “This is the kufr that does not expel from the religion, it is the lesser kufr (kufr doona kufr), the minor dhulm and the minor fisq”. And this is also what Imaam al-Bukhaari has used as evidence in his Saheeh, for “The Book of Imaan” with which he began with affirms the madhhab of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah (in this regard)” (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 7/350).

Ibn al-Qayyim said, “And there is another principle, that disbelief, kufr is of two types: the kufr of action and the kufr of juhood (denial) and ‘inaad (stubborn rejection). As for the kufr of juhood then it is when one disbelieves in what is known to have been brought by the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) from Allaah, out of juhood and ‘inaad from amongst the Names, Attributes, Actions and rulings of the Lord. This type of kufr negates faith from every single aspect. As for the kufr of action, then this divides into two types: A type which negates Imaan and a type which does not negate Imaan. So prostrating to an idol, belittling the mush-haf (the Qur’an), fighting the Prophet and reviling him negates Imaan (i.e. Islaam). As for ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and abandoning the prayer, then that is from the kufr of action absolutely. So the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever and the one who abandons the prayer is a disbeliever due to the textual ruling of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), however this is the kufr of action not the kufr of belief. It is also impossible for Allaah – free is He from imperfection – to call the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed to be a disbeliever and for the Messenger of Allaah to call the one who abandons the prayer to be a disbeliever, and then not apply the label of “disbeliever” to them⁵. And the

⁵ Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen stated, “The saying of the one who ascribed to Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah that he said, “When kufr is made absolute (i.e. al-kufr is used), then the major kufr (kufr akbar) is what is intended” constitutes a poor and evil understanding, while he seeks to use this statement as evidence for Takfeer based upon the verse “then they are the disbelievers (5:44)”!! Despite the fact that there is nothing in this verse that indicates this is **the kufr** (al-kufr). As for the correct saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam then it is his separation – may Allaah have mercy upon him – between the kufr with the definite article (al-kufr) and that without it (kufr). As for [applying the word kufr] on the basis of a characteristic, then it is correct for us to say, “they are disbelievers (haa’ulaa kaafiroon)” or “they are the disbelievers (haa’ulaa il-kaafiroon), based upon the understanding that the kufr they have been described with does not expel from the religion. Hence, there is a difference between the act being described (with kufr) and the doer of the act being described (kufr).” Fitnah of Takfir (pp.77-78)

There are also instances when the word kufr is used absolutely (i.e. al-kufr) but the kufr that expels from the religion is not intended. An-Nasaa’ee reports (Sunan al-Kubraa, 118) as does ‘Abdur-Razzaaq (in his Musannaf, 20953) from Ibn Abbaas that he said about having intercourse with a woman through her anus, “that is the kufr (dhaalikal-kufr)”. Al-Bukhaaree also reports a hadeeth from Ibn Abbaas (5273, and also in Fath ul-Baaree 9/400) and in which there occurs the saying of the wife of Thaabit bin Qays, “However I hate disbelief (al-kufr) in Islaam” and she means by this ingratitude to the relatives.

Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) negated Imaan from the fornicator, thief, and the one who consumes khamr, intoxicants. And also from the one whose neighbours are not safe from his evil. So when the label of Imaan has been negated from such a one, then he is a disbeliever from the point of view of his action, but the kufr of juhood and belief (i'tiqad) has been negated from him. **It is likewise in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, "Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another." (Kitaab us-Salaat of Ibn al-Qayyim)**

Likewise, the doctor again lied upon Ahl us-Sunnah by claiming that they hold abandoning prayer to be major kufr absolutely!! And we have already dealt with this above.

DISTORTING THE METHODOLOGY OF THE PROPHETS

Stated Safar al-Hawali – “What is the core issue on account of which the Prophets, Martyrs and the Righteous fought for?” and he continues a page later, “...If the reality of worship had been but the mere rituals of devotion, then none of this would have deserved the sending of a convoy of Messengers and Messages. The Tawheed of Uloohiyyah, the Tawheed of Ruboobiyyah, the Tawheed of Qawaamah, the **Tawheed of al-Haakimiyyah**, the Tawheed of the source of the Sharee'ah, the Tawheed of the methodology of life, the Tawheed of direction by which the people conduct their worldly life completely ... this is the Tawheed that is deserving of all the Messengers to be sent (for its sake).!!” (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa pp. 94-96).

Know that he has actually quoted the exact words of Sayyid Qutb in defining the Tawheed that the Messengers were sent with – and in the view of Sayyid Qutb, the Messengers were sent only for the sake of Haakimiyyah. This is why you see Sayyid Qutb falling into serious errors in explaining the meaning of the Kalimah. And what is actually intended by all of the types of Tawheed that Qutb mentioned above is but the issues of rule and rulership. Perhaps, this is the reason why Safar al-Hawali only spoke of the apparent meaning of the verse in Surah al-Maa'idah, avoided the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas completely and then declared ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be major kufr absolutely, without mentioning the well-known tafseel of the Salaf in this regard.

MAKING THE AQIDAH SUBJECT TO IJTIHAAD

Add to the above Safar al-Hawali's claim that rebelling against the sinful, tyrant ruler is a matter of ijtihaad on account of which a person must not be called an innovator or labelled astray – ascribing this meaning to Imaam Ahmad, as he says, **“And we observe from the words of Imaam Ahmad that the matter is one of ijtihaad and weighed due to what benefits may accrue from it, and it is one on account of which a person must not be called an innovator or labelled astray.”** (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa' p.263)

Anyone familiar with the aqidah of the Salaf and the books of aqidah of the Salaf know that rebelling against a sinful Muslim ruler is forbidden, and the Salaf consider this to be a matter of aqidah, opposed only by the Khawarij and the Murji'ah.

Ibn Shahin has narrated from [Sufyan] ath-Thawree that he said **“The Murji’ah hold it permissible to use the sword against the people of the Qiblah (muslims in general).”** (Laalikaa’ee in Usul ul-I’tiqad, no.1834). He also reports that it was said to Ibn al-Mubarak, “Do you hold the view of Irja’?” He replied, **“How can I be a Murji’ when I do not hold it permissible to come out with the sword (against the Muslims).”** (Al-Kitab ul-Latif, no. 17). Further, as-Sabuni (d.449) narrates with an authentic chain of narration going back to Ahmad bin Sa’id ar-Ribati that he said, “‘Abdullah bin Tahir said to me, ‘O Ahmad, certainly, you (people) have hatred of those (meaning the Murji’ah) based on ignorance, and I have hatred of them based upon knowledge. **Firstly, they do not believe that obedience is due to the ruler...**”. (Aqidat us-Salaf wa Ashabul-Hadith no. 109).

THE KHAWAARIJ ARE THE MURJI’AH

It should also come as no surprise that the doctor in aqidah should also compare between the two Shaikhs of Islaam, Ibn Taymiyyah and Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and the Rafidee Heretic, Sayyid Qutb. But to make matters worse he refers to him as “the Shaheed, Sayyid Qutb”, and falls into the blameworthy Irjaa’ he is supposed to be refuting in his extremely evil book. ‘Abdur-Rahman bin Mahdi – may Allah have mercy upon him – said, **“The basis of Irjaa’ is Istithnaa, to not except oneself (or others from having perfect Imaan or from being guaranteed Paradise etc.)”**⁶

And it is for this reason we hold that the unfortunate doctor does not know Irjaa’ and nor does he know those whom he accuses of Irjaa’⁷. Rather, he got poisoned from the direction

⁶ Reported by al-Khallaal in as-Sunnah (1061), al-Aajurree in ash-Sharee’ah (p.139) and others. Something similar is also reported by Ibn Shahin in al-Kitab al-Latif (16) and al-Lalikaa’ee in Usul ul-I’tiqad (1835). The apparent disconnection in the chain of its Athar does not do it any damage since something similar to it has come with a connected and saheeh chain in Tahdhib ul-Aathar of at-Tabari (1519) and something similar has also been mentioned from Sufyan. Refer to al-Hilyah of Abu Nu’aym (7/33) and al-Abaateel of Jawzjaani (42).

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, “It is not permissible to testify for a specific individual that he is a shaheed, even if he had been killed while performing jihad against the disbelievers. This is because this implication of this testimony is that Paradise has been testified for him, and testification for Paradise is not permissible except for those whom the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has given testimony for. However it can be said, “It is hoped that he is amongst the Shuhadaa”...As for when is one resolved and says, “He is a Shaheed”, then this is unlawful, haraam. It is not lawful to say this because this is from the matters of the unseen...” (Alfaadh wa Mafaahem Fee Meezaan il-Islam, p.18)

⁷ Now reflect O Sunni, upon the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, **“Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa’ has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa’.** Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah’s pardon – **have jealousy in their hearts.** For when [one of them] sees that a person has been met with acceptance [by the people], he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers]. So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity!

We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji’ – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication. Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!”** Cassette: Makaalmaat Ma’a Mashaayikh ad-Da’wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4)

of the neo-Khawarij, the likes of Mohammad Qutb and Sayyid Qutb, as did his partner Salmaan al-Awdah, who got corrupted from the direction of Mohammad Suroor and Mohammad Qutb and also Sayyid Qutb.

DEFENDING THE RAFD OF SAYYID QUTB

After mentioning some of the issues on account of which ‘Uthmaan was reviled (such as embezzling funds from the Bayt ul-Maal, nepotism (preferential treatment to his own relatives) and other issues), the doctor appended a footnote, stating, “And these matters, then either the truth concerning them is with him (i.e. Uthmaan) – may Allaah be pleased with him – clearly, or they were issues of Ijtihad that he made... **or he exceeded the limits – may Allaah forgive him – in some of these subsidiary issues**, however this does not equal anything compared to his excellence and his precedence.” (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa, p.243)

Now, the picture is complete!! Now we understand the words of Imaam al-Albaani we quoted at the beginning of this chapter, **“I did not think that the author would reach this level”** and also his saying that this book **“reached the extremity in evil”**. And now perhaps we can also understand why Imaam al-Albaani also acknowledged, **“I have now come to know that our brothers in Madinah were more knowledgeable of them than us”!!**

And now we understand the perfect truth in Imaam al-Albaani’s judgement upon these newly-arisen, foolish-minded reckless youths!! That they are **“The Khawarij of the Era”**.

Of course, the doctor in aqidah, at the command of his master, the brother of Sayyid Qutb, is attempting to try and water down the fact that Sayyid Qutb, the Rafidee Heretic, reviled Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) on account of these affairs and made mockery of him and accused him with dishonesty and the likes. The doctor is trying to make it sound plausible that Uthmaan may have made some mistakes, and hence there should be no rejection for the one who criticised him for these “mistakes”, that is, the brother (Sayyid Qutb) of the supervisor (Mohammad Qutb) of the book that reached “the extremity in evil”!!!

SUMMARY

These are less than ten errors that the mouthpiece of Mohammad Qutb, fell into and which illustrate that he is untrustworthy from a scholarly perspective, has an innovation to hide, defends the Innovators, reviles the Imaams of Ahl ul-Hadeeth, and other such despicable characteristics. Imaam al-Albaani noted around eighty mistakes in this evil book⁸ and –

⁸ This book was actually part of the plot coming from the direction of Mohammad Qutb and he intended by this to penetrate deeply into the ranks of the Salafis – as the Ikhwan have been trying for over 40-50 years. This is similar to the plot of Mohammad Suroor, whose strategy is the same. It is only now, after all that time, that they have managed to come really close – part of their success being due to the fact that they used the likes of Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah as the Puppets, so that the unsuspecting would not consider otherwise. And part of their success being due to the fact that many of those who ascribe themselves to Salafiyyah, think that Salafiyyah is just about Tawheed ul-Asmaa was-Sifaat and that if you are sound in Aqeedah, you are sound in Manhaj!! For this reason many of those ascribing themselves to Salafiyyah disdain the issues of Manhaj, treating them as insignificant, and in reality this is the cause of their confusion and bewilderment in the trials that we are facing today.

BENEFIT: MANHAJ DETERMINES ENTRY INTO PARADISE OR HELLFIRE!!

Imaam al-Albaani was asked, “Some of the youth differentiate between the aqidah of the Salaf and the manhaj of the Salaf so you see some of them upon the aqidah of the Salaf yet they allow themselves to work with some of

inshaa'allaah – they will soon be published in the work, “Hiwaar Haadee Ma’a Safar al-Hawaali” – so refer to it!

the methodologies that exist today, even though there maybe what opposes the manhaj of the Salaf within them in terms of practice. So is there a binding link between the aqidah and manhaj of the Salaf in the practical implementation of the Salafi manhaj?

The Shaikh replied: “That which I believe and worship Allaah with is that there are both generalities (in similarity) and specific (aspects) between the Salafi manhaj and aqidah. Aqidah is more specific than manhaj as all of you know. Aqidah has a link with what is called – in the view of many of the Jurists – the “knowledge of tawhid”, and this is the chief and fundamental aspect of Islaam. However, manhaj is more vast than aqidah or tawhid.

As for those who claim that the differentiation that has come in this question (between aqidah and manhaj), **then they desire by this to make it permissible for themselves to adopt ways and means in their daw’ah to Islaam which the Salaf us-Salih were not upon.** To say this in a different way, they consider that they have the liberty to adopt whatever ways and means they think will help them to convey (and actualise) Islaam, and you are aware of the examples of this type or these types of means.

For example, open demonstrations and rallies in order to force the rulers to turn their attention to what the society complains about and similar matters. So we say that what has come in the Book and the Sunnah and what the Salaf us-Salih were upon with respect to objectives, goals and ways and means are sufficient for the Ummah. **However, the reason which leads some of the people to permit themselves to adopt these ways and means, in fact it is correct for me to say that they permit themselves to blindly-follow the disbelievers in the ways that they have adopted in order to actualise what they call either democracy or social justice and other such words which have no reality to them.** So they – I mean these Muslims – permit themselves to blindly follow the disbelievers in these ways and means.

We say, our Lord, the Mighty and Majestic has made removed us from having any need, by our Shari’ah, of this separation which has been explained (i.e. between aqidah and manhaj) and that we should be needy of the disbelievers and that we should take from their ways and means, which might be good for them, (but) only because they have no Shari’ah by which they guide themselves. It is for this reason that we say that manhaj is more vast than aqidah and tawhid, **hence it is necessary to adhere to what the Salaf us-Salih were upon with respect to both these affairs; the one that is vast (manhaj) first and foremost** and the one that is more narrow (tawhid), meaning aqidah.” (Al-Asaalah Magazine, Vol 22).

And to reinforce this meaning, dear Brother and Sister, we leave you with the words of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan. He was asked: “Is [entry into] Paradise and Hellfire dependent upon the correctness of one’s Manhaj (methodology)?”

His reply: “**Yes. When a person’s manhaj is correct he will be in Paradise.** So if he is upon the manhaj of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih, he will become one of the inhabitants of Paradise by Allaah’s permission. **And when he travels upon the manhaj of the misguided strayers, he is threatened with the Hellfire.**” (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah p.77).