



New York Times: Bin Laden, Qutubism and Salafiyyah

Version 2.1

The New York Times ran an article October 13th in its Arts section entitled “The Deep Intellectual Roots of Islamic Terror” by Robert Worth. What is interesting is the references to Qutubism which have unfortunately been tied to Salafiyyah, due to the ignorance of the author in this regard. What follows below is a reproduction of the text along with mainly corroborations of what has been stated, necessary comments, and corrections to the author’s viewpoints and perceptions in some areas. The basis for this article is not that it tells us anything new, but that it illustrates that the Kuffar have a far better understanding of the affairs of Islamic da’wah, than many of the so-called informed and educated Muslims – until even those who ascribe themselves to Salafiyyah but are wholly ignorant of it.

This is a time in which the groups and sects of Innovation have attempted to ascribe their innovated ways to the pure Islaam that is embodied in the Book and the Sunnah, allowing the non-Muslims thereby to further distort and deface the picture of Islaam in general, and allowing them also to scapegoat and target the Muslims – at a time when the call to Allaah was reaching fruition, with hordes upon hordes entering both Islaam and the da’wah of truth which is the way of the Salaf. In reality, the groups of Innovation actually aid and assist the Non-Muslims in some of their agendas, whether they realise it or not. Ibn Al-Jawzee said: “Abul-Wafaa 'Alee Ibn 'Aqeel said: 'Our Shaikh Abul-Fadl Al-Hamdhaanee said: 'The innovators in Islaam and the fabricators of *ahaadeeth* are worse than the disbelievers. This is because the disbelievers attempt to corrupt the Religion from the outside, whereas these individuals attempt to corrupt it from the inside. They take the similitude of the inhabitants of a land, who strive to corrupt its condition (from the inside), while the disbelievers take the similitude of raiders laying siege to the land from the outside. Thus it is the ones on the inside that open the doors of the land’s surrounding barrier (and let the besiegers in). These types (of people) are far worse to Islaam than the ones who don't attribute themselves to it." *Al-Mawdoo'aat*: 1/51. And indeed, this befits the likes of Bin Ladin and others from the Khawaarij, who play an instrumental role in opening up the lands of Islaam for the expansionist policies of the non-Muslims'.

It is for this reason that the notable Scholars of Islaam, from the first of them to contemporary ones state that the basis of Jihaad is the Jihaad against the Innovators and the other Jihaad branches off from that – as has been stated by Allaamah Abdur-Rahmaan as-Sa'dee, “Jihad, is of two types. The jihad by which the correction and purity of the Muslims is intended and rectification of their beliefs, manners and all of the affairs pertaining to their lives, both the religious and the worldly affairs. And also (Jihad) in cultivating them with knowledge and action. This type is the fundamental basis of Jihad and its support. And it is from this first type that the second type finds its basis, and that is the Jihad

¹ It is unfortunate that the very first ones to speak out in the likes of these issues are the Juhulaa, the ignorant people, who have neither knowledge and nor understanding – and led by mere sentiments and emotions, rush to support anyone who announces a Jihad against the Non-Muslims, and speaks of their iniquities and crimes, and speaks with alluring and beautiful words – without first looking at what exactly is this man’s aqeedah, and what is his manhaj, and what is the level of his knowledge, and what are his goals and motivations, and what are his orientations, and how close or far he is from the Prophetic Manhaj. Indeed, it is in the times of fitan that the ignorant and people of innovation raise their heads – and speak about the public affairs – and the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) referred to them as the Ruwaibidah.

by which those who show transgression against Islaam and the Muslims, from amongst the Disbelievers, Hypocrites, Heretic Apostates and all of the enemies of the religion are repelled and held at bay.” Wujoob ut-Ta’aawan bain al-Muslimeen (p.7-8). Shaikh Abu Anas Hamad al-Uthmaan commented, “And this is what our Scholars have remained upon. They consider that the Jihad against the Innovators is the basis and the Jihad of the disbelievers and heretical apostates branches off from that Jihad.” (Refer to Zajar al-Mutahaawan).²

It is recommended that the reader refer to GRV070003, MNJ130020 and MNJ130021 for some good background information (on the aqeedah and manhaj of Sayyid Qutb) before proceeding with this article, as it helps to put into context, the entire discussion.

² Of course, this does not mean that the Jihad in defence of the Muslim lands is laid off just because of Jihad against the Innovators. Rather, the priorities will change, based upon the particular situation, but the Jihad against the Innovators themselves, is neither forgotten, nor abolished, since it is known that should the Kuffar be repelled, the Innovators and Heretics will turn to the People of Tawheed and the Sunnah and fight them and make lawful their blood – as occurred in Afghanistan with Shaikh Jameel ur-Rahmaan. Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, “From the very well-known narrations that have reached us is that the Shaikh Abu Amr Ibn as-Salaah ordered the taking away of a well known school of Abul-Hasan al-Aamidee (one of the heads of innovation, a Mu’tazili), and he said: Taking this away is better than conquering Akkaa (a stronghold of the Christians of the time).” (Refer to Shaikh Abu Anas Hamad al-Uthmaans, “Zajar al-Mutahaawan”, being a refutation of the principle of Hassan al-Banna of co-operation with the groups of Innovation).

As for the current crisis in Afghanistan, then it is obligatory to assist and help the Afghani people with du’a, and material wealth and possession – alongside calling them to Tawheed and the Sunnah, where that is possible, for those who are present in the land and involved in relief work. It is also necessary to expose the actual objectives of the non-Muslims in their devised conquest of the land of Afghanistan, all in order to secure the oil and gas reserves in the Caspian sea – so it is necessary to expose that and also to advice the Muslim nations and leaders – in the required Sharee’ah manner – not to assist them at all. And it is important in all of this to adhere to the Sharee’ah legislation and the prescribed ways of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil, and not to transgress that at all – otherwise more harms will be created.

The Text

Long before Osama bin Laden appeared on television screens with an AK-47 by his side, he released earlier videotapes in which he appears in the guise of a holy man, sitting peacefully in front of a wall of books. That scholarly backdrop is an important symbol for Mr. bin Laden's terrorist movement as he tries to legitimize his extremist views of Islam³.

"Many Americans seem to think that bin Laden is just a violent cult leader," said Michael Doran, a professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University. "But the truth is that he is tapping into a minority Islamic tradition with a wide following and a deep history."

Although many Muslims are horrified at the notion that their faith is being used to justify terrorism, Mr. bin Laden's advocacy of jihad, or holy war, against the West is a natural extension of what some radical Islamists have been saying and doing since the 1930's. These radicals were jailed, tortured and often executed in their home countries, particularly in Egypt during the 1950's and 60's, for their attacks on Western influences and their efforts to replace their own regime with an Islamic state.⁵

The Muslim extremists, members of Islamic Jihad⁶, who assassinated the Egyptian president Anwar Sadat in 1981, for instance, left behind a 54-page document titled "The Neglected Duty" that provided an elaborate theological justification for what they had done.⁷ Addressed to other Muslims

³ And amongst his extremist views is his takfir by way of the major sins, since he ascribes kufr and apostasy to the Saudi government on account of the existence of usurious transactions and usurious banks, as well as using the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb to accuse the government of changing Allaah's Sharee'ah and making the unlawful to be lawful. Further, his basis of ascription of apostasy to the Saudi government and its apparatus in its decision to employ the Kuffar in the repulsion of Saddam Hussain from Kuwait. And this is the essence of ignorance, as the most that can be truthfully said – if he disagreed with their decision – is that they made a great mistake, in deciding to employ the Kuffar rather than use his own collection of Mujahideen, a fair portion of which came from the Jamaa'at ul-Jihaad – and who were nurtured upon the takfiri ideology of Sayyid Qutb. It would help Osamah bin Ladin to realise that his Jihad efforts were sponsored by the CIA, the US Intelligence through Pakistan's ISI as a proxy – without him even realising, all in order to further US geo-political interests in mid-Asia. He currently remains a pawn in their game. It is not really him they are after – and perhaps after this current tribulation, may Allaah protect the Afghani people from it – he will become another pawn in another phase of the same geo-political game.

⁴ And these statements are accurate with respect to Bin Ladin, for he ascribes himself to Salafiyyah but is as far removed from it as the wolf from the blood of Yoosuf. For Bin Ladin is of the Qutubi school of thought, originating in the writings of Sayyid Qutb (as the author of the article will himself note later).

⁵ Fareed Abdul-Khaliq (one of the former Murshids of Ikhwaan): "We have pointed out in what has preceded that the spread of the ideology of takfir occurred amongst the youth of the Ikhwaan who were imprisoned in the late fifties and early sixties, and that they were influenced by the ideology of the Shaheed Sayyid Qutb and his writings. They derived from these writings that the society had fallen into Jahiliyyah (of kufr), and that he had performed takfir of the rulers who had rejected the Hakimiyyah of Allaah by not ruling by what Allaah has revealed, and also takfir of those ruled over (i.e. civilians), when they became satisfied with this." (Ikhwan ul-Muslimoon Fee Mizanil-Haqq' p.115)

⁶ A major portion of Bin Ladin and his group are actually from the Islamic Jihad, who are known Takfiris. It is not surprising that many of those unsuspecting people who participated in the CIA sponsored Jihad in Afghanistan came back with Takfiri and Khariji ideas and then began to preach them in their own countries.

⁷ And the so called "Neglected Duty" is what was advocated and down by Sayyid Qutb of revolutionary ways and means, assassination plots, violence and terrorism, as a natural extension to his particular aqeedah of Haakimiyyah he had innovated, one which was grossly exaggerated and which led the Ummah to deviate from the manhaj of the Prophets, and also led to great imbalances and turmoils within the da'wah over the years. The da'wah of Qutb contained an inherent rejection of the way in which Allaah deals with the creation and the

rather than to the West, the document drew on earlier thinkers in arguing that rebelling against one's rulers – which is forbidden by most Islamic authorities – is in fact a duty if those rulers have abandoned true Islam.⁸

Mr. bin Laden, whose Al Qaeda movement merged with Islamic Jihad⁹ several years ago, has taken the same tack, drawing on medieval authorities to argue that killing innocents or even Muslims is permitted if it serves the cause of jihad against the West.¹⁰

relation of the threats and promises of Allaah to the creation. This great imbalance and deviation, led to the emergence of many new orientations in da'wah which caused further turmoil. To make things worse, these innovated ways and imbalances were then imported into the mainstream Ahl us-Sunnah by the neo-Qutubiyah.

⁸ This again is the emergence of Qutubism in contemporary activist thought that has plagued most of the movements that splintered from Ikhwaan ul-Mufliseen, such as the Jamaa'at ul-Jihaad, Jamaa'at Takfir wal-Hijrah, and others. The concept of Jihaad has been distorted and exaggerated by the likes of these individuals and has been tied to either:

- ?? the assassination of the great despot (i.e. the overall ruler who does not abide by Islamic law in its entirety) or
- ?? the removal of the governing authority and its replacement by way of a staged revolution by the masses. In other words, amassing the general people for a bloody confrontation with the current authority, or
- ?? the removal of the governing authorities by way of revolution prepared by those elites who have adopted the "Qutubi" intellectual thought and have been nurtured upon it

Though Sayyid Qutb developed his ideological thought quite clearly, he left it open to those who adopted his views, to choose their own way of toppling the current authority. He himself did not get to the stage of outlining the actual method of revolution in detail. However, he does seem to advocate the third route outlined above in his book

In the book "Limaadhaa A'damoonee" (p.6, pp.50-55) in which Sayyid Qutb calls for assassinations (of key figures in the society) and destruction of the infrastructure of cities like Cairo (i.e. by explosives). He also says that those who are to be chosen for these activities are those who have "understood their aqeedah", meaning the aqeedah he has outlined in his other books such as 'Ma'alim Fit-Tareeq', 'az-Zilaal' (Milestones), 'al-Adaalat al-Ijtimaaiyyah' (Social Justice) and others which is one of takfir, civil strife and discord and calls for revolutions and rebellions. This book was the last book he wrote and shows that he did not recant from the destructive methodology he was preaching prior to this in his other books. Commonly, this book is thought to be his repentance from his ideology, but is in reality far from it. A careful reading illustrates that what he means by preaching and nurturing upon the sound creed first of all is actually his own creed which he himself devised (i.e. of takfir and khurooj).

⁹ The Islamic Jihad are the ones about whom Imaam Ibn Baz said, "... they are not to be co-operated with, nor are they to be given salaams to. Rather, they are to be cut off from, and the people are to be warned against their evil. Since they are a fitnah (tribulation) and are harmful to the Muslims, and they are the brothers of the Devil (Shaytaan)!" (From the taped cassette (no.11), recorded in the month of Dhul-Hijjah 1408H (1987CE) at 'at-Tawiiyyatul-Islaamiyyah.). Hence, the organisation of Bin Ladin is upon the aqeedah and manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, with his primary and overall objective to topple the Saudi government – this being the desired Jihaad in his view. Refer to his statements in his communication dated 23/8/1996CE on the obligation to expel the Kuffar from the Peninsula.

¹⁰ As for the claim of the author, "Mr. bin Laden, whose Al Qaeda movement merged with Islamic Jihad several years ago, has taken the same tack, drawing on medieval authorities to argue that killing innocents or even Muslims is permitted if it serves the cause of jihad against the West", then this indeed the practice of Bin Ladin and others who are upon his extremist Qutubist methodology (such as Hamood bin Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee) and who have distorted and twisted the words of the Scholars of Islaam, and quoted them totally out of context, in order to justify the killing of innocent civilians, within a context that is similar to the September 11 incident. But as for ascribing this viewpoint also to the "medieval authorities" under question, then this is incorrect. For the

The roots of Mr. bin Laden's worldview date back to a school in medieval Islam that spread throughout the Arab world in the 20th century, known as the Salafiyya, said Bernard Haykel, a professor of Islamic law at New York University. Its name comes from the Arabic words al-salaf al-salih, "the venerable forefathers," which refers to the generation of the Prophet Muhammad and his companions. The salafis believed Islam had been corrupted by idolatry, and they sought to bring it back to the purity of its earliest days.¹¹

"Salafis are extreme in observance, but they're not necessarily militant," Mr. Haykel said. The official Wahhabi ideology of the Saudi state, for instance, as well as the religious doctrine of the Muslim Brothers falls under the banner of Salafiyya.¹²

quotations from these authorities are in the context of an existing military scenario – not situations in which civilians are killed today, who are innocent, and have no role to play in assisting in any war upon the Muslims that can be characterised to be upon wilful intent.

Also note, how the non-Muslims are more well-versed about the concepts of the Book and the Sunnah than the groups of innovation. For the author has confirmed above that rebelling against the sinful, tyrant rulers is forbidden by the vast majority of the scholars, let alone the clear and unambiguous statements in the Sunnah concerning this. And as for when clear, manifest disbelief is observed, then rebellion is also not sanctioned unrestrictedly – rather it comes under the guiding principle of weighing the benefits and harms. In almost every single instance in history (as Ibn al-Qayyim noted in his time, in "I'laam al-Muwaqqi'een", refer to MNJ130006) almost all of the corruption and mischief to occur in the Muslim Ummah, was as a result of not adhering to these principles, and instead rebelling against the tyrannical kings.

¹¹ It is here that the author of the article begins to stray and deviate in his analysis, being influenced by the claims of the Sufis and modernist rationalists, that Salafiyyah was a movement started off by Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abdul-Wahhaab. The roots of Bin Ladin's ideology actually date back to the time of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) when the father of the Khawaarij (the renegades), Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi, accused the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) of not observing "social justice". The Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) prophesised that from the loins of this man will arise a group known as the Khawaarij. Their hallmarks would be excessive piety and worship, alongside killing of innocent Muslims. The main doctrines of this sect were a) declaring sinful Muslims to be apostates and b) rebelling against the rulers. The Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) also stated that this sect will exist and emerge in every generation until the later times.

Hence, this is not a school of thought in medieval times, rather it is much older than that, as has preceded. However, throughout the ages there have existed figureheads who have propounded and revived the same ideologies, with essentially the same underlying concepts but minor variances in the actual detail. In the last century the main theoreticians who revived this methodology (although not from every angle) were the likes of Mawdudi and Qutb, who focused essentially on revolution with strong sentiments of takfir. Both of these individuals were far from being upon the way of Salafiyyah. Rather, some of their other doctrines in the field of creed indicate their affectations to the Ash'ariyyah and Modernist, Rationalist school of thought. This is clear in Mawdudi's works as it is also very clear in Qutb's thoughts, who expounds the Ash'arite viewpoints on the Names and Attributes of Allaah, the Unity of Existence (Wahdat ul-Wujood) that is fundamental to Sufism, his praise of the Sufis and their mysticism, his claim of the Qur'an being created, his rejection of Ahad hadeeth in aqeedah and many other affairs, all of which indicate that his doctrinal roots actually lie strongly with the Sufi/Ash'ari/Modernist tradition, rather than the doctrines of Orthodox Sunni Muslims. It is ironic therefore, that Qutb be tied to Salafiyyah!

¹² Similarly, it is a gross error to liken the Ikhwaan ul-Mufliseen with "Salafiyyah" for they are far from it. Hassan al-Banna, the originator was actually a Sufi and of Ash'arite inclination in his doctrine, known for grave-worship, celebrating the Mawlid, travelling to the graves of the Saints, making tafweedh of Allaah's attributes (i.e. denying that their meanings are known). Hence, the "roots of terror" or the "roots of militant activism" having nothing to do with Salafiyyah. If anything, the doctrinal orientation of those who have been instrumental in encouraging the activism which has led to a destructive and distorted form of Jihaad to be directed to Muslim governments have all been either Sufi/Ash'ari/Rationalist – such as the likes of Hassan al-Banna, Sayyid Qutb, Mawdudi, Rasheed Ridhaa and others. The Ikhwaan themselves fall into two main categories, the Bannaawiyyah (who are more in line of Hassan al-Banna's teachings of activism) and the Qutubiyyah (those who are upon the ideology of Sayyid Qutb). Both with the same overall objectives in mind, but different ways of

Early salafi reformers believed they could reconcile Islam with modern Western political ideas. Some argued that Western-style democracy was perfectly compatible with Islam, and had even been prefigured by the Islamic concept of shura, a consultation between ruler and ruled¹³.

That optimism began to fade after World War I, when the Western powers carved up the remains of the Ottoman empire into nation-states⁴. A crucial step came in the 1930's, when some radicals began to argue that Islam was in real danger of being extinguished through Western influence, said Emmanuel Sivan, a professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who has written extensively on modern Islam. It was then that Rashid Rida¹⁵ and Maulana Maudoodi developed the notion that modern Western culture was equivalent to jahiliyya (the word is the Arabic term for the barbarism that existed before Islam).

But if one man deserves the title of intellectual grandfather to Osama bin Laden and his fellow terrorists, it is probably the Egyptian writer and activist Sayyid Qutb (pronounced SIGH-yid KUH-tahb), who was executed by the Egyptian authorities in the mid-1960's for inciting resistance to the regime.

As Fathi Yakan, one of Qutb's disciples, wrote in the 1960's: "The groundwork for the French Revolution was laid by Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu; the Communist Revolution realized plans set by Marx, Engels and Lenin. . . . The same holds true for us as well."⁶

In his most popular book, "Signposts on the Road" (1964), Mr. Qutb wrote: "This is the most dangerous jahiliyya which has ever menaced our faith. For everything around is jahiliyya: perceptions and beliefs, manners and morals, culture, art and literature, laws and regulations, including a good part of what we consider Islamic culture."

Perhaps even more important, Mr. Qutb was the first Sunni¹⁷ Muslim to find a way around the ancient prohibition against overthrowing a Muslim ruler. "Qutb said the rulers of the Muslim world today are no longer Muslims," Mr. Haykel said. "He basically declared them infidels."⁸

arriving at them. Therefore, it is an error to associate what Bin Ladin is characterised by to "Salafiyyah", rather the roots of it lie elsewhere.

¹³ Well amongst the contemporary ones is Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq, the renowned Shurocrat and hardened Bannaawi, who calls for the co-operation with all the groups of bid'ah and dalaalah, within a democratic framework, under the principle of collective work, to help bring about rectification. He simply revived the Bannawi Novelty and toyed with it.

¹⁴ This being a fulfilment of the saying of Allaah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), "The nations will soon invite each other over you, just as a group of people invite each other over some food..." to the end of the hadeeth.

¹⁵ Rasheed Ridhaa, although clothing himself with Salafiyyah, was in fact from the rationalist school of thought, which sought to place the intellect above and beyond the revelation itself. He has been refuted by the Salafi Scholars such as Shaikh Muqbil who refuted him for his rejection of the reality of magic and also illustrated his being far away from Salafiyyah.

¹⁶ Allaahu Akbar! Straight from the students mouth. Revolutions and coups are not from the ways of Islaam, since they only bring destruction of the worldly affairs, and very rarely have, if at all, produced more good than evil.

¹⁷ Qutb was not a Sunni, but a deviated Ash'ari, Mutazili, Sufi.

He did so, Mr. Haykel added, in a particularly persuasive way, by reinterpreting the works of a medieval intellectual named Ibn Taymiyya.¹⁹ A towering figure in the history of Muslim thought, Ibn Taymiyya lived in Damascus in the 13th and 14th centuries, when Syria was in danger of domination by the Mongols.

Mr. Qutb equated Ibn Taymiyya's intellectual and political struggle against the Mongols with his own struggle against Gamal Abdel Nasser and the other Arab rulers of his day. It was a risky move, because Islamic tradition states that if one Muslim falsely calls another an infidel, he could burn in hell, Mr. Haykel said. It may also have sealed his death warrant²⁰, because Egypt's rulers did not take such threats lightly.²¹

¹⁹ Stated Qaradawi, one of the Astray Innovators of Ikhwaan, "And it was in this period that the books of the Shaheed (*), Sayyid Qutb appeared, the books that represented his final thoughts (in ideology, before his death). Those which justified the takfir of (whole) societies... the breaking of all sentimental attachments to society, breaking off ties with others, and the announcement of a destructive jihad against the whole of mankind. And showing contempt against the du'at who call for lenience and softness, accusing them of idiocy, and being defeatist . [Saying all of this], in front of the western civilisation. He made this manifest, in the most clear manner in the tafsir, "Fee Zilaal il-Qur'aan", in the 2nd edition and in 'Ma'alim fit-Tariq' (Milestones, Signposts), and the bulk of it is taken from 'Zilal' and 'Al-Islam wa Mushkilat al-Hadaarah' and others..." (Priorities of the Islamic Movement p.110)

(*) It is not permissible to make this statement without adding "Inshaa'allaah".

And indeed, Sayyid Qutb and his works are the axis and referent point for all of today's activists and sects of the Khawaarij – all of whom have hijacked the concept of Jihaad, and have deviated from understanding the actual principles, levels, types, priorities, objectives, and precursors for it. Which is why such extremism, and mostly fruitless agitation is observed from them. Their Jihad, for the most part, is the internal struggle against the "apostate" ruler.

²⁰ And all of this is corroborated by many from the figureheads of Ikhwaan themselves, such as the Innovating Heretic that is Yusuf al-Qaradawi and also Fareed Abdul-Khaaliq, former murshid of Ikhwaan. In reality, Qutb revived the way of the Khawaarij, raising high the flag of their father, which was "social justice". In the name of the absence of "social justice" embodied in the absence of ruling by the Islamic legislation in its entirety, all contemporary, rulers, societies and nation states were declared apostate – and therefore legitimate targets for a destructive Jihaad (refer to GRV070003, Elementary Qutubism for a detailed elaboration).

As for drawing upon the works of Ibn Taymiyyah, then the deduction of proof from his works by the Qutubi Intelligentsia, is geared towards a justification of the innovation of the Kharijite methodology of reform, and not the actual methodology of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, which was embodied by Tasfiyah and Tarbiyah (purification and cultivation), fundamentally.

²¹ And this illustrates the actual foolishness of all of the Khawaarij who are characterised by lack of understanding of the religion and ignorance. For these people, when they openly come out and make threats and attacks against the authorities, or the Ruler, declaring them to be apostate (based upon what they have been nature of the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb), and then make threats upon their lives, making their blood lawful, then what else do they expect from the rulers and authorities? A bunch of flowers as appeasement? Milk Tray? So when those who are in authority, fear for themselves and for their lives and for the decline of the authority and power they yield, they begin to put pressure upon these activists. Then when they are faced with this repression, they increase in their takfirism and kharijism, and then the state begins to imprison and harm. While no justification is being made for any type of repression – it is important to realise that the methodology that these people have chosen – which is that of Sayyid Qutb – is one that leads them to their own destruction. It is exactly as Hasan al-Basri said about their predecessors. Al-Hasan al-Basree (d.110) said, "Verily, al-Hajjaaj is the punishment of Allaah. So do not repel the punishment of Allaah with your own hands. But you must submit and show humility, for Allaah the Most High stated, "And indeed We seized them with punishment, but they humbled not themselves to their Lord, nor did they invoke (Allâh) with submission to Him." (Al-Mu'minun 23:76). (Minhaj us-Sunnah of Shaikh ul-Islam 4/528)

Ibn Sa'd relates in his *Tabaqat al-Kubraa* (7/163-165), "A group of Muslims came to al-Hasan al-Basree seeking a verdict to rebel against al-Hajjaaj [a tyrannical and despotic ruler]. So they said, "O Abu Sa'eed! What do you say about fighting this oppressor who has unlawfully spilt blood and unlawfully taken wealth and did this and that?" So al-Hasan said, "I hold that he should not be fought. If this is a punishment from Allaah, then you will not be able to remove it with your swords. If this is a trial from Allaah, then be patient until Allaah's judgement comes, and He is the best of judges." So they left al-Hasan, disagreed with him and rebelled against al-Hajjaaj – so al-Hajjaaj killed them all. Al-Hasan used to say, "If the people had patience when they are being tested by their unjust ruler, it will not be long before Allaah will give them a way out. However, they always rush for their swords, so they are left with their swords. By Allaah! Not even for a single day did they bring about any good."

Then the most amazing thing is that when those who do not agree to their extremist views and their adulterated Qutubi manhaj, advise them and correct them, they come out with their famous slogans, "You are stooges, you are paid, you are with the "apostates", you reject Jihad, you support the Kuffar against the Muslims" and so on from their well known ejaculations of misguided sentiments arising from a confused and bewildered forelock.

²¹ The Mongol assimilation into the Muslim Ummah was a unique phenomenon in world history when an invading force actually adopted, wholesale, the religion of those they invaded (i.e. the Muslims). However, the Mongols (the Tartars) did not actually adopt the Islamic religion, strictly speaking. This is because the Tartars, although some of them did choose Islaam, they entered it with their viewpoint that Islam, Christianity and Judaism are all legitimate religions, and their laws and legislations are legitimate legislations. Some of them also considered Genghis Khan to be a Prophet, equivalent in status to Mohammad, Jesus and others, and also took his law to be binding upon themselves. They basically treated all religions and all respective laws to be one and the same in level and status, and allowed themselves to choose whatever they wanted from these religions, holding all of that to be correct and valid.

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "As for pure nifaaq (hypocrisy), then there is no doubt about the kufr of a person who has this. For he does not consider it to be obligatory to have tasdeeq (assent) in the Messenger (of Allaah) in what he informed (of revelation from Allaah), and nor does he consider it obligatory to obey him in that which he commanded – even though he may alongside this, believe that the Messenger is great and lofty in status, in knowledge and action, and that it is permissible to believe in him and obey him. Yet he says, "There is no harm in the differing religions, when the diety (that is worshipped) is the same one (in all of them)". And he considers that safety and happiness (in the Hereafter) can be attained by following the Messenger and not following the Messenger, either by following the ways of the Philosophers, or the Sabians, by way of becoming a Christian or a Jew; which is the saying of the Philosophers and Sabians in this particular issue and other issues. For even if they believe in him (the Messenger) and obey him, they do not actually believe in the obligation of that upon all of the inhabitants of the earth such that the one who abandons believing in him and obeying him will be punished. Rather, they consider the likes of this to be similar to adhering to the madhhab of a particular Imaam, or (following) a tareeqah ([Sufi] order) of a particular Shaikh or obedience to a King. And this is the religion of the Tartars and whoever entered along with them." (Majmoo' al-Fataawaa7/639).

As for Qutb's ideology and of those who are upon Qutubism, then they draw upon a misrepresentation of the true and proper reason's for the apostasy of the Mongols, and then build upon this, their doctrine of Haakimiyyah, which essentially states that the absence of judging by the Islamic legislation, in every single facet and every single affair, is tantamount to apostasy, even if that be accompanied with the belief in the obligation to judge by the Islamic legislation and the superiority of the Islamic legislation, (an important factor not found in the Tartars in the days of Ibn Taymiyyah). Rather, the Tartars, did not even believe it compulsory to adhere to Islaam, and that it was a matter of choice – one could choose Islam, or Christianity, or Judaism, or the religion of Genghis Khan as prophet – and thus, built upon this belief, they held it permissible to resort to judgements and laws alien to Islaam, treating them all to be equivalent to those of Islaam and often putting them above and beyond those of Islaam.

While Orthodox Muslims tend to "tafseel" or distinction, detail in this particular matter, Qutb's ideology led to an absolutism and generalisation, upon which rulers, societies and nation states were declared apostate, without consideration of the above facts.

Ibn Taymiyyah is known for his clarity in this particular matter, and his adoption of "tafseel" and also his affirmation of the forbiddance of rebellion against the Rulers – though many of Qutb's disciples attempt to argue otherwise from his works. Simply because Ibn Taymiyyah is known to be "a towering figure", until even

But decades after his death, Mr. Qutb's equation continues to inspire radicals like Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, who was convicted of conspiring to blow up the United Nations and other New York City landmarks, and Osama bin Laden. Mr. bin Laden quotes Ibn Taymiyya in the same way, arguing that the Saudi government – which earned his wrath by expelling him and serving as host to American troops during the Persian Gulf war – is illegitimate.

"By opening the Arab peninsula to the crusaders, the regime disobeyed and acted against what has been enjoined by the messenger of God," Mr. bin Laden wrote in his 1996 "Declaration of War against America." In so doing, the Saudi leaders ceased to be Muslims, he concluded.²²

That message resonates even with Muslims who do not share Mr. bin Laden's extreme views, largely because many Arabs see not just the Saudi regime but the entire political order in the Arab world

in non-Muslim academic circles, many of the groups of Innovation attempt to use his works to justify their own doctrines. A notable example is Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq of Kuwait, who in his efforts to justify working by the principles of democracy, drew upon the writings of Ibn Taymiyyah pertaining to "collective work" in order to legalise the co-operation between the various Islamic groups and parties in existence today (Ikhwan, Tabligh, Hizb ut-Tahrir and others) within the framework of country in which there is a democratic apparatus. Thus, many of the deviants draw upon the words of the classical orthodox scholars, all in order to justify their innovated ways and means.

²² Qutubism is nothing but the revival of the methodology of the Khawaarij, and is focused primarily on the affairs of rule and rulership. Revisiting this da'wah, which is based primarily on an extremist and exaggerated interpretation of the Kalimah, and the claim that its meaning is embodied in al-Haakimiyyah, that is Allaah is only Lawmaker, then any departure from ruling by Allaah's Law in its entirety, constitutes Shirk. Built upon that, the societies in existence today are all apostate, and in reality there has been no true Islamic society in existence for hundreds of years. Therefore, since the nature of the current societies is such that it is representative of the pre-Islamic Jaahiliyyah, the way to re-establishing Allaah's Law is by vacating and departing from the society ('Uzlah), and breaking off from it. Then re-building and preparing, ready for the cataclysmic confrontation, with the "Fir'aunic leaders", who have assumed for themselves the position of godhead in legislating. And this was the "Jihaad" that was envisioned by Qutb.

Terms used in Qutb's conceptualisation included, Haakimiyyah, 'Uzlah (the breaking off), Ummah al-Ghaa'ibah (the absent Ummah), Jaahiliyyah and many others. The Qutubi Model is fundamentally flawed, in that it attributes all evil and oppression and injustice to the "leaders" who have "assumed godhead", and hence a "top-down" approach is inevitable. The model as a whole contains an intrinsic rejection of the way in which Allaah operates in His creation, and also the way in which true rectification is achieved. This naturally creates an imbalance in the orientations of da'wah, leading to much confusion and strife, and also excessive bloodshed, when the blue-print programme of Qutb is carried out, or initiated.

The corruption and tyranny which actually exists in the vast majority of the Muslim lands is something that breeds affection to the ideology of Qutubism, unfortunately. Thus, the polemics of individuals like Omar Abdur-Rahman, Bin Ladin and others draw upon this in order to proliferate their ideology. Key to their ideology is the treatment of major sins as major disbelief. Amongst the arguments they have drawn is the issue of interest based transactions, claiming that the Saudi government has declared them lawful, and has thus fallen into apostasy. Signing an agreement to be involved in usurious transactions does not indicate that taking usury has been declared lawful in principle. And by using this type of argumentation, the likes of Bin Ladin and others have fallen into the doctrines of the Khawaarij who would make takfir on account of major sin. Similarly, they argued that seeking the aid of the non-Muslims and inviting them to Saudi Arabia characterised apostasy. Though the Muslims were split regarding this issue, the orthodox scholars who held it was not permissible considered those who held it permissible to have made an erroneous ijtihaad (judgement), but did not judge them with apostasy. As for Bin Ladin, already poisoned by the extremism of Sayyid Qutb and his doctrine of Haakimiyyah, it was an easy justification for declaring the whole government, alongside its apparatus to be apostate, as well as declaring the major scholars of Saudi Arabia to be complicit in all of this.

today as tyrannical and corrupt, said John Voll, a professor at the Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding at Georgetown University.

"Part of the appeal of bin Laden is that he can look people in the eye and say: 'I know you live in a police state, I know you're living in poverty, and the reason for it is clear: Satan is doing this to you. So come join my holy war,' " he said.²³

²³ As for the appeal that neo-Kharijites like Bin Ladin seem to have upon the common people, then that is not surprising considering that his likes have been described by the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), "At the end of time, there will emerge a newly-arisen (i.e. young), foolish minded people, who will speak with the best speech of the creation...", and Ubaydullaah bin Abi Raafi' the mawlaa of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, "When the Harooriyyah (Khawaarij) came out in rebellion, whilst he was with Ali bin Abi Talib, they said, "The judgement belongs to none but Allaah", and Ali said, "A truthful word by which falsehood is intended". And the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), despite highlighting their excessive worship, their supplication and fasting, stated about them that "they are the worst of creation", and "if I was to reach them, I would slaughter them like the slaughtering of Aad". (Refer to Kitaab uz-Zakaat in Saheeh Muslim).

So the likes of the Khawaarij speak with beautiful, appealing words, which are true in and of themselves, but by which falsehood is intended. There is no doubt that there exists much corruption and tyranny in the Muslim lands, and the way to face this is by acting upon the Prophetic methodology of reform that is embodied in the call to Allaah and inviting to Tawheed and the Sunnah. But as for the Qutubists, then they draw upon the perception they have of the Muslim Ummah, its rulers, societies and states, and then utilise that for their falsehood which is but judgements of apostasy and disbelief, calls to rebellion and the destructive Jihaad against Muslim societies first outlined by Sayyid Qutb in the fifties and sixties – all of which brings further destruction upon the Muslim Ummah.

Orthodox Muslim scholars, however, have encouraged patience upon this tyranny and oppression, indicating that it is as a result of the oppression of other subjects themselves, due to their sinfulness and disobedience. Hence, their methodology of reform is fundamentally different to that of the ideologues of Qutubism. Recognising the existence of tyrannical and oppressive rulers, orthodox Muslims abide by the legacy of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) embodied in his words, "There will be after me Leaders who do not guide themselves with my guidance and nor do they adopt my Sunnah, and there will arise from amongst them, men with the hearts of devils in the bodies of men." I (Hudhayfah) said, "What shall I do then, If I reach that time?" He said, "Hear and obey the leader, even if he strikes your back and takes your wealth, then still hear and obey". (Bukharee, Muslim and others).

Stated Ibn Abil-'Izz al-Hanafi, "And as for adhering to obedience to them (the Rulers), even if they commit oppression, then this is because the evils and harms that arise on account of rebelling against them, is numerous times more than that which occurs as a result of the oppression of the Rulers themselves. Rather, in having patience over their oppression there is expiation of sins, and a multiplication of the reward. For Allaah did not empower them over us, except due to the corruption in our actions, and the recompense for an action is its like (al-jazaa'u min jins il-'amal). Hence, it is upon us to strive (ijtihaad) in seeking forgiveness, making repentance and rectification of our actions. Allaah the Most High said, "And whatever affliction befalls you, then it is from what your hands have earned, yet He pardons many" ... and He the Most High said, "...And whatever evil befalls you, then it is from your own soul", and He the Most High said, "And thus do we turn some of the oppressors against others on account of what they used to earn". Hence, if the subjects (of a state) wish to save themselves from the oppression of the tyrannical ruler, then let them abandon oppression themselves." (Sharh Aqeedat ut-Tahaawiiyyah).

Stated al-Hasan al-Basri, "Know – may Allaah pardon you – that the tyranny of the kings is a retribution (niqmah) from among the retributions of Allaah the Most High. And Allaah's retributions are not to be faced with the sword, but they are to be faced with taqwaa and are repelled with supplication and repentance, remorse (inaabah) and abstention from sins. Verily, when the punishments of Allaah are met with the sword, are more severe. And Maalik bin Deenaar narrated to me that al-Hajjaaj (Ibn Yoosuf) used to say, "Know that every time you commit a sin Allaah will bring about a punishment from the direction of your ruler (sultaan)". And I have also been told that a person said to al-Hajjaaj, "Do you do such and such with the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)?" So he replied, "For the reason that I am the punishment of Allaah upon the people of Iraaq, when they innovated into their religion whatever they innovated, and when they

Mr. bin Laden himself, however, has very little religious education. "He's a playboy from a very rich family, so he needed other people to relay the message to him," Mr. Sivan said. The two people who influenced him most directly were Abdallah Azzam, a Palestinian who was killed by a car bomb in 1989, and Safar al-Hawali, a Saudi who has periodically been jailed by the authorities. Both men were steeped in the writings of Sayyid Qutb, Mr. Sivan said.²⁴

abandoned the commands of the their Prophet – alaihis salaam – whatever they abandoned." (Adaab Hasan al-Basri, of Ibn al-Jawzee, pp.119-120, by way of Mu'aamalal ul-Hukkaam, of Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis).

²⁴ As for Safar al-Hawali being "steeped" in the writings of Sayyid Qutb, then steeped is not the word. Rather, this head of misguidance is infatuated, plagued, diseased, and seduced by the writings of Sayyid Qutb – having been introduced to them by Qutb's brother, Mohammad Qutb. And what indicates this is his revival of the repugnant doctrines of Sayyid Qutb that is "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa", his PhD thesis supervised by Mohammad Qutb. A two volume work, the first volume of which is directed at eulogizing Sayyid Qutb and promoting his doctrines and his methodology and the second volume of which is directed at belittling and ridiculing the creed and methodology of Orthodox Muslim scholars, such as Shaikh al-Albani and others. This head of misguidance and diseased partisan – claiming to be a champion of the Salafite creed – exposed his own debauchery in his persistent efforts to raise Sayyid Qutb – who mocked Moosaa (alaihis-salaam), reviled Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), and revived almost every innovated belief known to the Muslim Ummah over fourteen hundred years. The hypocrisy in al-Hawali's treatment of Sayyid Qutb, and his lack of sincerity of purpose – evidenced by his blatant contradiction in claiming to champion the Salafite creed, yet hiding and pretending to be ignorant of the heresies of Qutb, some of which reached the level of kufr - was exposed and refuted by numerous scholars. When one of the scholars wrote a work in refutation of those who had erred in the field of Allaah's Names and Attributes, al-Hawali wrote to him and urged him to remove the chapter on Sayyid Qutb from his work – all of which indicates the repugnant Irjaa' that is with al-Hawali – the very Irjaa' that he accused Ahl us-Sunnah with. Refer to Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee's excellent exposition of this great contradiction of al-Hawali in NDV120002).

Al-Hawali ha still not repented from his clear and blatant lies against Imaam Ibn Baaz (this is on tape and recorded, refer to GRV070022 for an example). Nor has he repented from his slander and revilement of the major scholars, accusing them of what amounts to senility, and making mockery of them in his poetry, and accusing them of going along with the Zionists, a them that is developed very strongly and explicitly by Bin Ladin. Nor has he repented from his blatant repugnant Irjaa' by raising, promoting and aggrandizing the Heretic that is Sayyid Qutb, who uttered statements of kufr and apostasy in his mockery of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam), called for the abolition of slavery arguing it is outmoded, made Islaam to be a concoction of Christianity and Socialism, made takfir of Banu Umayyah and other great and wicked calamities. So after all of this al-Hawali labels him "Shaheed" – illustrating the severity of his blindness and the repugnance of his Irjaa'. And then to expose his hypocrisy, al-Hawali went on to stage a devised assault upon the aqeedah and manhaj of Shaikh al-Albani (rahimahullaah) and went even further to slander the likes of Imaam ash-Shanqeetee and mainstream Ahl us-Sunnah by accusing them of being affected by Irjaa'. So no repentance has been forthcoming from him, and he has had years to do so, but he continues in his deceit of the youth and his treachery to them, and his concealing of the truth – may Allaah guide him back to his sense – those that Mohammad Qutb robbed him of. Now he is writing letters to George W. Bush, putting himself at the forefront, gaining the accolade of the masses for this "daring feat" and "daring to speak out" – [if only he had spoken out against the Mockers of the Prophets and the Revivers of the Innovations of the Jahmiyyah, Ash'ariyyah, Mu'tazilah Raafidah and others as a sign of his love of the Salafi aqeedah and manhaj] - yet he conceals what his own hands have wrought of the great corruption and deviation in the Salafi Manhaj and the furthering of the youth away from knowledge and its people.

Al-Hawali, along with others such as al-Awdah, al-Qarnee, al-Qahtanee and others were preaching the destructive doctrines of Sayyid Qutb to the youth in Saudi Arabia, and mobilising them for the rebellious coup that would topple the current government. The scholars actually became aware of their direction and orientation and subsequently put an end to their teaching and preaching. Bin Ladin is of the same school of thought and acquired his indoctrination from Mohammad Qutb, Azzaam, and Omar Abdur-Rahmaan and others.

Mr. bin Laden does seem to have deviated from the radical tradition in one sense, by focusing his attacks on the United States rather than Arab regimes. In his 1996 declaration, he went so far as to say that Muslims should put aside their own differences so as to focus on the struggle against the Western enemy – a serious departure from the doctrine of Qutb and even Sadat's killers, who argued that the internal struggle was the one that mattered.

But that may be merely a shift in tactics, not in overall strategy. "Bin Laden is using the U.S. as an instrument in his struggle with other Muslims," Mr. Doran said. "He wants the U.S. to strike back disproportionately, because he believes that will outrage Muslims and inspire them to overthrow their governments and build an Islamic state."²⁵

²⁵ And all of the indications and evidences in Bin Ladin's recent statements seem to indicate that this is indeed the stratagem of Bin Ladin (refer for example to his statement of 23/8/1996CE, in which his orientation becomes crystal clear. Amongst his statements being that after Imaan, there is no greater obligation in the religion other than to expel the US forces out of Arabia?!). While he expressly rejected any involvement for 9-11 immediately after the terrorist attacks, as soon as the US led attacks began on Afghanistan, he immediately came out with a statement aimed at taunting the non-Muslim forces, and also declaring the alleged hijackers as being "the best of the Muslims, the vanguard of Islaam". The only effect this could possibly have is to justify the reasons for the attacks on Afghanistan, and also assist the non-Muslim forces in totally shaping public opinion to the view that these attacks are totally justified, since even if Bin Ladin was not actually responsible, he definitely makes himself complicit in 911 by his words. Even a six year old child could work out the implications and effects of these types of statements in the particular context and the particular time and situation in which they were made.

And this, only brings more harm to the innocent people of Afghanistan, as well as facilitating the expansionist policies of the non-Muslims who are more interested in the oil and gas resources in the Caspian, as well as control over Afghanistan's poppy production (which is a business worth \$300 billion annually) – rather than being worried about Bin Ladin – whom they created in the first place, via their proxy that is Pakistans' ISI. Bin Ladin, therefore, as opined by Michel Chossudovsky (Professor of Economics, University of Ottawa) and others, is actually "a keyasset in the facilitation and justification of US foreign policy". In other words, Bin Ladin is dancing to the tune, whether he realises it or not!

Summary and Conclusion

Osamah Bin Ladin is of the Qutubi School of Doctrine and of Salafiyyah and the Salafis he is far removed, just as he is from the notable orthodox scholars of Islaam, such as Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, those that he seeks to use to justify his extremism. The author of the above news article has fallen into error in his analysis of the so called “intellectual roots of Islamic terror” and his ascribing it to Salafiyyah. Though the bulk of his article has been very accurate in tracing the thoughts and influences of Bin Ladin and his connection to the Qutubi school of doctrine, he could have not been more wrong in attributing Bin Ladin’s methodology to the way of the “Salaf” – as the way of the Salaf is free from all the subsequent innovations and deviations that occurred, rather it is the pure Islaam in which justice and absence of oppression is embodied.

Additionally, the non-Muslims seem to have a greater understanding and awareness of the thoughts and ideologies within Islam, more that can be said about the biased Muslim partisans who have claimed that “there is no such thing as Qutubism”, “it is a figment of the imagination” and other such denials, and who have for many years now attempted to ridicule the efforts of the Salafis in exposing and refuting the corrupt heresy that is Qutubism, and which has not visited the Muslim lands, except with turmoil and destruction of their worldly affairs, only facilitating thereby, increased intervention of outside forces.

Further the Khawaarij – like the other groups of innovation – are those who open up the doors of infiltration for the Kuffar – and over the last 2 or 3 decades the various takfiri, haraki, and khariji groups that emerged – have all been either monopolised, controlled, directed, infiltrated or used, in one way or another to assist the Kuffar in their plots and agendas – this includes the Jamaa’at ul-Jihad, the GIA of Algeria, the Ikhwan in general in Egypt. Because the likes of these people advocate terrorism and bloodthirsty revenge against the Kuffar (as well as against Muslims, after takfir has been made of them), then military and intelligence units of the Kuffar, - for the most part - stage atrocities to allow them to shape policies and public opinion to facilitate their geo-political or other interests. Mossad is known for this, and has pulled off many stunts in a variety of different countries to this end. Had these groups of innovation, and the Khawarij in particular not emerged, or had been repelled, the likes of these opportunities would not exist for the Kuffar.

It is in the interests of the Kuffar to secretly support the likes of these people behind the scenes – to assist in increased destabilisation of regions – and then outwardly wage a war against them as a cover for the implementation and justification of their own long term internal and external policies.

Maktabah Salafiyyah
16th October 2001