



AS-SAWAA'IQ AS-SALAFIYYAH AL-MURSALAH 'ALAL AFKAAR AL-QUTUBIYYAH AL-MUDAMMIRAH

Part 11: Exposing the Qutubite Ignorance, Deception and Fraud in Attempting to Justify Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah as a Unique Basis For The Da'wah of Reform Formulated by the Asha'rites and Mu'tazili Qadarites of Baneer Qutb and Aal Mawdoodi

BENEFIT: The Essence of the Matter: Removing and Unveiling All the Layers and Covers of Falsehood To Arrive at the Actual Root and Core of the Matter and True Reality of Contemporary Qutubi Ignorants:

Stated Safar al-Hawaalee, Majnoon Sayyid Qutb al-Mu'tazilee al-Qadaree, actually quoting word for word, the saying of Sayyid Qutb:

“Indeed, the meaning of this announcement is to snatch away the misappropriated authority of Allaah and return it back to Allaah and repel those who usurped it, those who judge the people by way of legislations from themselves, or who lay down for them methodologies of worship and coming closer (to Allaah) besides those that Allaah legislated. And hence, they take the position of Lords towards the people and the people take the position of worshippers towards them... Indeed, its meaning is to demolish the kingdom of mankind in order to establish the kingdom of Allaah upon the earth, or to use the Qur’anic expression, “He is in the Heavens an Ilaah and in the Earth an Ilaah, and He is all-Wise, all-Knowing”.”

And Qutb al-Mu'tazilee also said, “And the establishment of the kingdom of Allaah upon the earth and ending the kingdom of mankind, and snatching the authority from the hands of the usurpers amongst the servants and returning it back to Allaah alone, and giving authority to the Divine Sharee’ah alone, and abolishing the human laws ... all of that cannot be completed by mere tableegh (conveying) and bayaan (explaining), since those who enslave the servants, those who usurp the authority of Allaah in the earth, they will not submit in their authority, with mere tableegh (conveying) and bayaan (explaining).”

Quoted from the book “adh-Dhaahirah” of Majnoon Qutb al-Mu'tazilee al-Qadaree, otherwise Safar al-Hawaali

The author of “Kashf Akhtaa’ Safar al-Hawaali” says, “I say: Even if he quoted these words from the books of Sayyid Qutb, then he has mentioned them in order seek evidence and argument, and support by way of them. And this speech is not just mere (soo’ ul-adab) bad behaviour towards Allaah, just as some of them have said, “Every disbeliever, every hypocrite, every mushrik, every innovator and every sinner has shown bad behaviour towards Allaah”. Rather this gives evidence to a great corruption in aqeedah, and indeed whatever follows on from this of corruption in the understanding of Tawheed contains a great deal of danger, since it actually indicates an i’tizaali intellect that wallows in I’tizaaal (the aqeedah of the Mu’tazilah). For I do not know any of the sects that have combined between takfeer and qadr except the Mu’tazilah:

So this speech is not just a mere slip of the pen or slip of the tongue, rather it is a firm belief and which is indicated by the actual understanding of tawheed of the person who uttered this speech (and the one who argues by way of it). And no one

utters the likes of this speech, or whatever resembles it, except one of the Qadarite Negators. And “al-Qadr is the arrangement (nidhaam) of Tawheed” as has been said by the Salaf. And when we look into the aqeedah of al-Hawaali, we find that he venerates the Command and Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahee) by way of his veneration of the outward actions, and he makes them to be a pillar from the pillars of Imaan [i.e. upon the way of the Mu'tazilah and the Khawaarij]. And when we add to his extremism in takfeer this matter (i.e. that of al-Qadr) we find that this is pure, hardcore I'tizaaal. Since the Mu'tazilah are Extremists in Takfeer, they venerate the Command and Prohibition, and they do not believe in the good and bad of al-Qadr”. End quote.

The essence of the matter:

Takfir and Khurooj! And methodologies aimed at clashing and removing the current authorities¹, which are set in motion by way of takfir, which is based upon a corrupt understanding of Tawheed (i.e. the understanding of Sayyid Qutb al-Mu'tazilee).

¹ And indeed the saying of khurooj came from the angle of the Mu'tazilah and Khawaarij, who venerated the issue of al-amr wan-nahee, leading them to extremism in takfir. Imaam an-Nawawi (rahimahullaah) said, “And as for revolt - meaning against the rulers - and fighting them, then it is haraam by unanimous agreement (ijmaa') of the Muslims, even if they are sinful oppressors. And the hadeeth are abundantly overwhelming with the meaning that I have mentioned. And Ahl us-Sunnah are united that the ruler is not to be removed, on account of his sinfulness. As for the angle that has been mentioned in some of the books of fiqh of some of our associates, that he is to be removed, and which is quoted from the Mu'tazilah, then this is an error on behalf of the one who says it and is in opposition to the Ijmaa'. And the Scholars have said, that the reason for the absence of his removal and the forbiddence of revolting against him, is due to what arises from that of tribulations, and shedding of blood, and and also corruption that is evident. Hence, the harm from his removal is greater than from him remaining in place.” Sharh Saheeh Muslim (12/229)

BENEFIT: The Understanding of Tawheed With the Mu'tazilite Qadarite Innovators and Wandering Strayers

Sayyid Qutb al-Mu'tazilee al-Qadaree stated: "They (the Arabs) used to know the meaning of "ilaah" from their language, and the meaning of "laa ilaaha illallaaha", they used to know that al-Uloohiyyah means "al-Haakimiyyah al-'Ulyaa". They used to know that "Laa ilaaha illallaaha" is a revolution (thawrah) against the earthly authority that has usurped the most special of the characteristics of Uloohiyyah and it is a revolution (thawrah) upon the various structures that are based upon the principle of this usurpation, and it is a rebellion (khurooj) upon the various powers that judge by legislations from their own selves and for which Allaah gave no authority" (az-Zilaal 2/1005).

And the Mu'tazilee also stated: "(Laa ilaaha Illallaaha), it is known by the Arab person who knows the meanings of the language as: There is no Haakimiyyah except for Allaah, there is no Sharee'ah except from Allaah, there is no authority (sultaan) for anyone over anyone, since the authority is all for Allaah". (az-Zilaal 2/1006).

And he stated concerning al-Haakimiyyah: "It is the most special characteristic of Uloohiyyah". (az-Zilaal 2/890).

And he stated, illustrating the severity of his jahl and the profundity of his confusion: "The issue of al-Uloohiyyah was not the issue of dispute, it was actually the issue of ar-Ruboobiyyah that used to be addressed by the various Messengerships, and it is also the issue that was addressed by the final Messengership (i.e. of Muhammad)" (az-Zilaal 4/1864).

And the ignorant stated, "So the ilaah is the one who deserves to be the rabb (lord), meaning, a haakim (ruler), a leader (sayyid), a controller (mutasarraf), a legislator (musharri'), and director (muwajjih)." (4/2114).

And the compound ignorant stated, "We have already said, "The issue of Uloohiyyah was not the point of rejection with the Mushrikeen. For they used to acknowledge that Allaah – Subhaanahu - is the Creator, Provider, one who gives and takes life (al-Muhyee al-Mumeet), and the Regulator (al-Mudabbir), the Controller, the one who is powerful over everything. However, this acknowledgement was not followed up by its requirements, since the requirements of this acknowledgement of Uloohiyyah is that Ruboobiyyah should be for Allaah alone in their lives, so that they do not present the rituals of worship except to Him, and that they do not judge in any of their affairs to other than Him, and this is the meaning of "That is Allaah, your Lord, so worship Him". (az-Zilaal 3/1763). And alongside this (utter confusion in the very basics of Tawhid) the Majnoon of Qutb al-Mu'tazilee, that is Safar al-Hawaali, considers this compound ignorant to be an Imaam, like Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abdul-Wahhaab (rahimahumallaah)!!

And indeed it is the likes of this I'tizaaal - which contains extremism in Takfeer and also this negation of Qadr which comprises false methodologies of revolution and rebellion in order to give Allaah's authority back to Him(!!), which is what Qutb al-Mu'tazilee al-Qadaree was upon – that was brought by the beguiled Safar al-Hawaali, by way of his Ash'aree master, Mohammad Qutb, into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah. And thus, the ideologies of takfir and activists movements and methodologies were propounded and propagated, the root of them all being the I'tizaaal and Qadr of this Jaahil.

And what more is it that illustrates the great misguidance of these Innovators!

Abstract

A Qutubi Charlatan, Abu Huthayfah al-Kanadie, nurtured upon the concepts and teachings of the Takfiri Intelligentsia such as Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali, Abu Baseer al-A'maa, Abu Qataadah at-Takfiri and others, has qutubised the understanding of Tawheed, by way of jahl and talbees, having none but the Ash'arite, Mu'tazilites of Banee Qutb and Aal Mawdudi, as the basis for this qutubisation of the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyyah.

In the last century, a new generation arose who revived the understanding of the Khawaarij, and who built their da'wah and method of reform upon the methodology of the Khawaarij, attempting at arrive at the thrones of power, by way of takfir and revolutions, and a carefully devised, theoretical, doctrinal program was put in place to justify and propagate this methodology, the source works of which were Banee Qutb and Aal Mawdudi, Mu'tazilah and Ash'ariyyah in origin – who interpreted the Qur'aan with ra'i (opinion).

And just as the Khawaarij of old, raised the flag of Haakimiyyah, using the best speech of creation, “verily, the judgement is to Allaah”, then in contemporary times, this has been revived, again using, what is considered today to be the best speech of creation, “al-Haakimiyyah”, behind which is takfir and revolution, as the focal point of the rectification of the Ummah. And the stooge of Aal Qutb, Safar al-Hawaali, played an instrumental role in playing the puppet that would infuse the thought of his Ash'ari, Mu'tazili mentors, masters and teachers into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah, using great trickery and deception in all of that, which has been uncovered in recent times (and more on this will follow by Allaah's permission).

This paper is a de-qutubisation of the foreign understandings that have been entered into this subject of the understanding of Tawheed and the affairs of da'wah that relate to it, by a people who are given to extremism and exaggeration, and who were labelled by Imaam al-Albaani as “Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah”, who have “opposed many of the issues of methodology of the Salaf”, and this was said by al-Albaani after reading and commenting upon the book that unites all of the Qutubiyah and Takfiriyyah of today, and which should in reality be entitled “Dhaahirat ul-Khurooj fil-Fikr al-Qutubi”, as that essentially is what the book is aiming for.

We had given respite to the Charlatan behind this work for approximately a year, perhaps that he may recant from his many counts of previous fabrications and lies upon Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, and making tahreef in both wording and meaning (refer to GRV070016), but it is apparent that he continues upon the revolutionary thought of Banee Qutb, calling to it, defending it, promoting it and aiding it.

SalafiPublications
September 2002

Contents

Foreword

Introduction

The Sayings and Clarifications of the Salafi Scholars

Commentary Upon the neo-Qutubite Apologeticism

Summary

Closing Remarks

Foreword

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

O you who believe! Fear Allaah as He should be feared, and die not except in a state of Islaam (as Muslims) with complete submission to Allaah. (Aali Imraan 3:103)

O mankind! Be dutiful to your Lord, Who created you from a single person (Adam), and from him (Adam) He created his wife [Hawwa (Eve)], and from them both He created many men and women and fear Allaah through Whom you demand your mutual (rights), and (do not cut the relations of) the wombs (kinship). Surely, Allaah is Ever an All-Watcher over you. (An-Nisaa 4:1)

O you who believe! Keep your duty to Allaah and fear Him, and speak (always) the truth. He will direct you to do righteous good deeds and will forgive you your sins. And whosoever obeys Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) he has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and made to enter Paradise). (Al-Ahzaab 33:70-71)

To proceed, verily the best speech is the Book of Allaah and the best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). And the worst of affairs are the newly invented matters, every newly-invented matter is an innovation, every innovation is misguidance and all misguidance is in the Hellfire.

Introduction

In this discourse, we will take the apologetic article that seeks to justify the theoretical and doctrinal precepts of Banee Qutb al-Ash'aree, piecemeal, and comment upon it, section by section, to illustrate and indicate the jahl (ignorance), confusion that lies with the author.

Before proceeding in this, it is vital that we make clear the following affairs, so as to close all doors to all those who have played their role in assaulting either the Imaams of the Salafi da'wah, or assaulting the Salafi da'wah itself and describing it with Irjaa' or assaulting those who hold onto it with their molars, being clear upon the foundations of the Sunnah, and not departing from or abandoning that, as they know it is what constitutes the hot coals that one must keep a tight hold on – so in order to close these doors for the likes of these Hizbiyyoon, we say:

ONE: All of the Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah and generality of the Hizbiyyeen who are upon the perception and outlook of Banee Qutb al-Ash'aree and Aal Mawdoodi al-Mu'tazilee, whether that be Suroor and his underground hizb, or al-Hawaali and his Ash'arite, Mu'tazilite masters and mentors that make up Aal Qutb and the generality of those who toy and dance with political discourse, while being the most ignorant of people with respect to it, or Abdul-Khaaliq and his hizb of Shurocrats, or any of the others from the generality of the Harakiyyoon, Takfiriyyoon and Khaarijiyyah, then they know with certainty in their souls, that the Salafees towards whom they have shown the greatest enmity - more so than any of the other groups of Innovation – are the ones who are most desirous for the establishment of Allaah's deen upon this earth, in terms of aqeedah, ibaadah, manhaj, mu'aamalah, siyaasah and in all affairs of knowledge and action. They know this like they know their own sons. And they are not able to say to their own souls, for a single moment, while maintaining sincerity, that the Salafees are not characterised by this ardent desire. Indeed, their souls know this, because the difference is not in the objective or goal, but the actual path that leads to it. And they know that that they have taken the direction of the Ash'arees and Mu'tazilees whose methodologies are the basis of their da'wah and call, in opposition to the methodology of the Prophets.

TWO: The great revival of the Salafee da'wah in the last century can be attributed, first and foremost of course, to Allaah the Mighty and Majestic, as whatever He wills occurs, as He wills, and Allaah indeed aids His Deen and His Messengers, and then it would not be exaggeration to say that it can be attributed partly thereafter to the da'wah of Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullaah rahmatan waasi'an) with its long duration of approximately fifty or sixty years, beginning with his refutation of the grave-worshippers, in his early twenties, to the end of what he achieved at the end of the last century. And some of the most senior people of knowledge have actually specified Imaam al-Albaani as being the reviver of the last century. And the basis upon which his da'wah was built was indeed one of the fundamental principles of the religion, which is judging to Allaah and His

Messenger in all affairs. In calling to the deen of Allaah and making the deen for Allaah and judging back to Allaah and His Messenger in all affairs, be they in aqeedah, manhaj, fiqh, hadeeth, mu'aamalah, siyaasah and other than that Imaam al-Albaani preceded, by decades, those who have monopolised on this concept in recent times to formulate false and innovated methodologies, for what they call "establishment of Tawheed".

It should come as no surprise then that the Qutubite assault should be targeted towards Imaam al-Albaani, and that it should be the last of a long list of assaults that have come from the generality of the Innovators, amongst the Bootiyyah, Ghumaariyyah, Saqqaafiyyah, Kawthariyyah, Soofiyyah, Tableeghiyyah, Khaarijiyyah, Tahreeriyyah, Takfeeriyyah, Ikhwaaniyyah and many others, and the generality of the Mubaddiloon, those who change and replace the deen, whether in aqeedah, ibaadah, or manhaj, or dawah, with their own false innovated ways, rules and guidelines.²

And the reason for that is that the manhaj of Imaam al-Albaani is Rabbaanee, and is that of the Book and the Sunnah, which has starting point that is identical to that of the Prophets and which has a program of reform, with its own priorities, that is identical to that of the Prophets, and which is based upon the understanding of the sunan (ways) of Allaah with respect to His creation.

So when the Innovators saw that there was no way to bypass the likes of this Imaam and those like him who were upon Sunnah and Salafiyyah, then they devised their plan in order to make him fall, and ascribe innovation and misguidance to him, and cast aspersions upon his aqeedah – all in the name of the defence of the aqeedah, the while they themselves had been suckled and mentored and tutored upon the works of the Ash'aree, Mu'tazilee, jaahil of the aqeedah of the

² Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "Tabdeel is of two types: The first of them is that they contradict his (the Messenger's) khbaar (information), and the second of them is that they contradict his amr (command). For Allaah sent him with the guidance and the true religion, and he is truthful in whatever he informs from Allaah, commanding whatever Allaah commanded him, as He has said, "Whoever obeys the Messenger, then he has obeyed Allaah" (Surah an-Nisaa). And the people of tabdeel (i.e. those guilty of it) are those who add to His religion, and His legislation, that which is not from it. And they are the people of the Shar' Mubaddal (the altered, changed, legislation). One time they contradict him in his information (khabr), so they negate what he has affirmed, or they affirm what he has negated... And the issues of the foundations of the religion, generally, are like of this nature, then they also make binding what he did not make binding, rather he declared it unlawful, and they make unlawful what he did not make unlawful, or make binding. Hence, they make it binding to believe these statements and the madhaahib (the various viewpoints) that are in contradiction to his information, and to also make loyalty to those upon them and enmity towards those who oppose them" (an-Nubuwwaat p.94-95).

And he also said, "And on account of this, there occurred from those who mixed truth with falsehood, tabdeel (distortion, changing, altering) on account of what they had changed from the religion, and changing the words from their proper places." (p. 94).

Salaf, jaahil of the affairs of da'wah, Raafidee towards the Sahaabah, Jahmee in Sifaat, Mu'tazili and Ash'aree in aqeedah, Jabaree in Qadr, Asha'aree in his definition and understanding of Tawheed (that it is the ability to invent, create), rejector of Ahaad ahadeeth, denier of the miracles of the Messenger, interpolater of Allaah's attribute of Istiwaa and what is additional to that.

So they did not acknowledge that what they had set out to achieve, was the very thing that Imaam al-Albaani himself had began, more than fifty years prior, before many of the likes of these fresh and reckless newcomers - whose "evil of scum, ignorance and misguidance"³, al-Albaani himself sought refuge from and about which he complained to Allaah - were even born, or while they were playing with toys in the streets.

So when they came out with their da'wah, and which was only concerned with the affairs of the rulers and the ways to remove them and replace them, being based upon the concepts they had taken from Banee Qutb and Aal Mawdudi, then Imaam al-Albaani, seeing what they were upon, declared them "the Khaarijiyyah 'Asriyyah", the contemporary Khawaarij. And this is based upon the fact that their da'wah was based chiefly upon two goals, arriving at takfir and effecting revolution.

THREE: That the Qutubiyah and those upon their way, or loyal to them, know also for certainty that the generality of their manhaj was demolished and laid to ruins, when clarifications came from the major scholars on the issues that constituted their manhaj in a broad sense. Such as this issue of Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah, or the way to advise the Rulers, or the issue of obedience to the tyrannical, sinful, oppressive rulers, or the issue of co-operation with the groups of innovation, or the issue of rebelling, or the issue of refuting the Innovators, and separating from them and boycotting them, and many other issues that comprised the generality of their manhaj, and in which they had opposition to the Salaf. From this, they also know and realise that the difference that is between the Salafees, and themselves, is not in the actual aim or objective, which is to establish the deen of Allaah, but in the way and method. So from this they know, that what they have devised of this new innovated da'wah, not known in the history of Islaam, and what they have revolved around, and what they have obligated upon the people, is a narrow, restricted, da'wah, that opposes the da'wah of the Prophets, and makes binding upon the general people that which they are not able, and which itself, does not produce any results, since it is mainly a theoretical da'wah that aims to

³ When he said, "And Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has explained the perspective from which faith, Imaan, consists of actions, and that it increases and decreases - [his discussion] needing no further elaboration - in his book 'al-Imaan'. So the one who requires more detail can refer back to it. I say: This is what I used to write for more than twenty years, affirming the madhhab of the Salaf and the aqidah of Ahl us-Sunnah - and all praise is due to Allaah - in the issues pertaining to Imaan, and then there come - in the present times - reckless ignoramus, who are but young newcomers accusing us of Irjaa!! To Allaah is the complaint of the evil that they are upon, of ignorance, misguidance and scum..." Imaam al-Albani, Adh-Dhabb al-Ahmad an Musnad al-Imaam Ahmad, p.33

rouse the common-folk, and to lead them to clashes and chaos, the end result of which is worse than the original state of affairs that they set out to rectify.

And this is a general rule and reality of all of innovation and its people. For the rejectors of the Attributes, they fled from affirming them in order to flee from tashbeeh, and they ended up in what was even worse, of hulool and ittihad and wahdatul-wujood and the likes, as has been pointed out by Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah in his “at-Tadmuriyyah” and other works. So they adopted the wrong path, in the name of rectification, and ended up in greater misguidance.

And this is a general rule for all of those who depart from the Book and the Sunnah, in their aqeedah, their manhaj, and their da'wah. And this manifestation is also found with the Jamaa'at of today, all of whom set out in the name of rectification, but ended up with greater mischief and corruption in the deen and the dunyaa. One only need to reflect upon the calls of the likes of at-Tableegh, or al-Ikhwaan, or Hizb ut-Tahreer, or Jamaa'at ut-Takfeer and others and see what damage they have caused either to individuals or to societies or the land itself.

So what is intended in this point, is that it is clear that the difference between the Salafees and the Innovators is not in the aim of actualising Allaah's authority, by way of establishment of His deen and His Sharee'ah, but the ways and means.

And it is for this reason that the Salafees are severe in refuting the great deviation that has been brought about by the contemporary Jamaa'at, and amongst them the Qutubiyah and its chiefs, figureheads, and theoreticians. And the greatest of evidences of their deviation, even for a common person, who knows the basics of the Salafee da'wah, is that the most notable Imaams and Shaykhs of the Salafee da'wah are not actually with the Qutubiyah in their da'wah, or in their program, or in their outlook, or in their movement that is based around “al-Haakimiyyah”.

FOUR: There is a difference between what is affirmed by the Salafee scholars that “al-Haakimiyyah”, or if you like judging to the Book and the Sunnah is one of the usool (foundations) of the religion, and between what Banee Qutb and Aal Mawdoodi claim, those who adopted the views of the Philosophers and Ignoramuses in their understanding of Tawheed, that al-Haakmiyyah is most special characteristic of Uloohiyyah and that it is a pillar of Tawheed or one of its independent types. For the first saying, which is that of the Salafee scholars, save that they do not revolve around the word “al-Haakimiyyah” is correct, since judging to the Book and the Sunnah is indeed a foundation (asl), just like the other foundations of the Deen and the Sunnah, such as making Ittibaa' of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), or following the understanding of the Sahaabah (radiallaahu anhum), or affirming the Sifaat, or not sitting or debating with the Innovators, or obeying those in authority in whatever is obedience to Allaah, or not fighting in times of fitnah. So all of these are usool of this religion, and judging to the Book and the Sunnah is also one of these usool, and it is an obligation. And the Qutubiyah and the generality of the Khaarijiyyah know that they have not a

single precedent in the history of the Ummah for this particular da'wah of their's or this particular understanding of Tawheed of their's, despite the fact that the same circumstances that are present today were most certainly present in the past, and which similarly would have necessitate the emergence of groups and factions who would have raised the flag of "Haakimiyyah". So this particular da'wah and reaction to Allaah's decree has not been known in history. Rather, the Salaf have always, in all times, spoken of and implemented this asl, foundation, of referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, but in all affairs, in aqeedah, ibaadah, manhaj, siyaasah, mu'aamalah. Not once, did they focus on any specific aspect, like politics and rule for example, like the contemporaries have done, claiming that they are permitted to make ijtihaad in these issues, when they do nothing but lie, since these affairs are not based upon ijtihaad or opinion.

So the intent here is that there is a difference between what is known of the da'wah of truth, of all times and ages, the Salafee da'wah and a fundamental principle (asl) that has always been a part of it, from the time of Prophethood itself, to this day, which is to refer back to the Book and the Sunnah in all affairs of the deen, not some affairs exclusively (like judging in disputes), but all affairs, in everything - and between what is known of the newly-arisen and reactionary da'wah of the newly-arisen and foolish-minded who have taken the views of the Philosophers⁴, and who were indoctrinated by the books of the Ash'arites and Mu'tazilites, such as Banee Qutb and Aal Mawdoodi, from whom they derived their Khaarijee manhaj - and who then, out of great deceit, sought to find statements of the Salaf in issues that would lend support to their innovation. So it is important to take note of this.

These are just some introductory points that have been mentioned to make a number of realities clear.

We will quote the short essay of neo-Qutubite apologeticism that was in defence of what was initiated by Banee Qutb and Aal Mawdoodi, and comment upon it piece by piece.

But before going into that, it is worthy that we present to you the sayings of the Salafee scholars on this particular subject, so that you can see some of the angles of refutation that have come from the people of knowledge, and which we shall expand upon in replying to the Qutubi Charlatan and his apologetic writings that attempt to raise high the flag first raised by the Rafidee Heretic who took the honour of Moosaa (alaihi-salaam) and the honour of Uthmaan (radiallahu anhu) and attributed nifaaq to some of the Sahaabah.

⁴ As has been noted by the one who said, "And whoever makes al-Hakimiyyah a fourth and separate category of Tawheed is either an ignoramus (jahil) or an innovator (mubtadi'), he has adopted the views of the Philosophers and the views of those who have no knowledge of aqidah or of the shari'ah. Or he is a person who merely narrates [opinions from others] and does not even know what he narrates (from others)!" (al-Muslimun no.639).

The Sayings and Clarifications of the Salafi Scholars

1. The Permanent Committee (Including Shaykh Ibn Baaz)

Question: "Some people, from the callers, have begun giving importance to mentioning 'Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah' in addition to the three well-known categories of Tawheed. So does this fourth category enter within the three categories? or not ' such that we make it a separate category which we must give (extra) importance to?"

And it is said that Shaikh Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab gave attention to Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah in his time when he saw that the people fell short of Tawheed in that aspect, and that Imaam Ahmad in his time gave attention to Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat when he saw the people falling short of Tawheed in that aspect. But as for today then the people fall short with regard to Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah, so therefore we must give attention to it. So how correct is this saying?"

Answer: "Tawheed is of three categories: Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah, Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat, and there is no fourth category. And judging by what Allaah sent down comes under Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah since it is from the types of worship due to Allaah, the One free of all imperfections, and all of the types of worship fall under Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah. Then making 'al-Haakimiyyah' a separate category is an innovated matter, which has not been the saying of any of the scholars as far as we know.

However there were some of them who generalised and said that Tawheed is of two classes: Tawheed of things known and affirmed (al-Ma'rifah wal-Ithbaat) - and it is Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat; and Tawheed of purpose and intentions (at-Talab wal-Qasd) - and it is Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah. Then there are others who particularise and so place Tawheed in three categories, as has preceded, and Allaah knows best.

So it is obligatory to give attention to all of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, and to begin by forbidding shirk, since it is the greatest of sins and annuls all of the deeds, and a person upon it will remain for ever in the Fire. Also all of the Prophets began with the command to worship Allaah alone and the forbiddance of shirk; and Allaah has commanded us to follow their way and to proceed upon their methodology in da'wah and the rest of the affairs of the deen. So giving attention to tawheed with its three categories is obligatory in every time, since shirk and divestment (ta'teel) of the names and attributes are still found, indeed they occur very often and their danger increases towards the end of time, and the seriousness of these two is a matter hidden from many of the Muslims, and those who call to these two are many and active. So occurrence of shirk is not something restricted to the time of Shaikh Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab, nor is divestment (ta'teel) of the names and attributes restricted to the time of Imaam Ahmad, rahimahullaah, as occurs in the question. Rather their danger has increased and their prevalence has grown in

Muslim societies today. So they are in the greatest need of those who will forbid from falling into them and who will make clear their danger. Whilst knowing that being upright upon the commands of Allaah and avoidance of what He forbids and applying by His Sharee'ah, all of that falls under realisation of Tawheed and remaining free from shirk.

And may Allaah extol and send peace upon our Prophet Muhammad and his true followers and his Companions.

Taken from 'al-Muslimoon,' no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

2. Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan

The following discussion occurs on the tape "Questions and Answers on Haakimiyyah" with some Kuwaiti Brothers:

Questioner 1: There is someone who has made a fourth category for Tawheed and called it Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah. **Shaikh Fawzaan:** [interjecting]... This is misguidance..., this is misguidance. This is misguidance and an [unnecessary] addition, which the people of knowledge have not affirmed. Tawheed is but two or three categories... this is contradictory, one person says Tawheed is only one category and another says it is four categories. All of this is misguidance.

Questioner 1: This person's evidence is that the basis for this categorisation... **Shaikh Fawzaan:** [interjecting]... [words unclear].. Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah an independent category and it does not enter into Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah? It enters into Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah! It is a type of worship and is a type of devotion to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic.

Questioner 2: He says that these three categorisations, al-Uloohiyyah, ar-Ruboobiyyah and al-Asmaa was-Sifaat, he says that this is a matter which is arrived at by the ijtihaad of the scholars, or by way of investigation and analysis (istiqraa').

Shaikh Fawzaan: That is sufficient for us, we will not add to what they have unanimously agreed upon, and they agree upon this.. [then] there comes an ignoramus in the twentieth century... he says 'I am a Mujtahid and I will add to what the People of Knowledge have agreed upon'. This is misguidance... **Questioner 2:** [interjecting]...

Shaikh Fawzaan: This is clear error! Because al-Haakimiyyah enters into Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah. Who has made it another category or made it an independent category? Will he make the prayer into a fifth or sixth category and jihaad a seventh category? [Because] all of the types of worship are from the types of Tawheed? This is not correct...

Questioner 2: So this is an innovated saying, this saying [Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah]? **Shaikh Fawzaan:** Yes, there is no doubt in this, it is in opposition to the Ijmaa [of Ahl us-Sunnah]. None of the people of knowledge have ever spoken with it. It is in opposition to the Ijmaa.” End (Refer to MNJO7005).

The Shaykh also said, in his book, Sharh Kashf ush-Shubuhaat, (p.46), “And in this era of ours there is found one who explains “laa ilaaha ilallaaha” that it means “singling out Allaah with al-Haakimiyyah”, and this is an error. Since, Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah is just a part of the meaning of “laa ilaaha ilallaaha”, and it is not the root, base meaning of this great statement. Rather its meaning is “there is nothing worthy of worship in truth except Allaah, with all the various forms of worship”, and entering into this is Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah. And if the people were to restrict themselves to Haakimiyyah only, and so stood to implement it besides the various other forms of worship, then they would not be Muslims. And for this reason you find that the associates of this ideology do not prohibit Shirk and nor do they concern themselves with it, rather they call it “Shirk of the simple people”, and Shirk to them is only Shirk in Haakimiyyah. And this is what they call “ash-Shirk as-Siyaasee” (the political shirk). Thus, for this reason, they concentrate upon it as opposed to other (aspects of it), and they explain Shirk to mean that it is obedience to the oppressive rulers.”

3. Shaykh Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaymeen

Shaikh Muhammad ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen was asked concerning this, and he replied that: “Whoever claims that there is a fourth category of tawheed under the title ‘Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah’ is to be counted as an innovator (mubtadi’). So this is an innovated categorisation which emanates from an ignorant person who does not understand anything of the affairs of ‘aqeedah and the deen. This is because ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ falls within Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah from the aspect that Allaah decrees whatever He wills.

It also enters under Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah in that the servant must worship Allaah according to what He has decreed. So it does not fall outside the three categories of tawheed, which are: Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah, Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat.”

Then, when asked, ‘How are we to rebut them?’ he replied:

“We rebut them by saying to them, ‘What does ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ mean?’ It does not mean except their saying that judgement is for Allaah alone ‘ and that is Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah. So Allaah, He is the Lord, the Creator, the Sovereign Owner, the One in control of the affairs. But as for what they intend by it and an explanation of the danger of this idea of theirs, then we do not know their intentions and desire, so therefore we cannot estimate the seriousness of this matter.’

Taken from 'al-Muslimoon,' no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

4. Shaykh Muhammad Naasir ud-Deen al-Albaanee

Shaikh Muhammad Naasiruddeen al-Albaanee was asked, "Our Shaikh, may Allaah bless you, the scholars of the Salaf, may Allaah have mercy upon them, mention that Tawheed is of three types: 'ar-Ruboobiyyah,' 'al-Uloohiyyah' and 'al-Asmaa was-Sifaat,' so is it correct for us to say that there is a fourth Tawheed that is 'Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah' or 'Tawheed of Judgement?' So he replied:

"'Al-Haakimiyyah' is a branch of the branches of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, and those who focus their attention upon this newly invented saying in the present age use it as a weapon not to teach the Muslims the Tawheed that all of the Prophets and Messengers came with, but rather as a political weapon. So if you wish I will establish for you what I have just said, even though this question has repeatedly been answered by me, many times - or if you wish we will continue upon our topic.

I have said in similar circumstances, as support for what I have just said, that usage of the word 'al-Haakimiyyah' is part of the political da'wah that is particular to some of the parties present today; and I will mention here something that occurred between myself and someone who gave the khutbah in one of the mosques of Damascus. So on the day of Jumu'ah he gave a khutbah which was all about judgement being for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. But this person made an error with regard to a matter of fiqh. So after he had finished the prayer I went forward to him and gave him 'salaam,' and said to him, 'O my brother, you did so and so, and that is contrary to the Sunnah.' So he said to me, 'I am a Hanafee, and the Hanafee madhhab says what I have done.' So I said, 'Subhaanallaah! You have given khutbah that judgement is just for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, but you only use this word to attack those rulers whom you think are Unbelievers because they do not rule according to the Islamic Sharee'ah. But you have forgotten about yourselves - that Allaah's judgement covers every Muslim. So why, when I say to you that the Messenger did so and so, why do you say, 'But my madhhab is such and such.' Then you have contradicted that which you call the people to.'

So if it were not for the fact that they use this saying as a tool for political propaganda of theirs, then we would say, 'This is our merchandise that has been returned to us.'

Taken from 'al-Muslimoon,' no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

Summary and Remarks

What has been quoted above from the people of knowledge is sufficient for anyone who ascribes himself to the Salafi aqeedah and manhaj. And it is impossible that anyone claiming Salafiyyah today, will leave the collective words of those who are

manifestly and clearly upon the aqeedah and manhaj of the Salaf, in the affairs of Names and Attributes, the affairs of Qadr, the affairs of Imaan, the Affairs of the threat and promise (al-wa'd and al-wa'eed), command and prohibition (al-amr wan-nahee), the affairs of the methodology of da'wah and the generality of the affairs of knowledge and action, knowing that they are united on this issue - that he will leave all of this from these scholars, some of whom are the Imaams of Salafiyyah in contemporary times, and then adopt the philosophy of an Ash'ari, Mu'tazili, jaahil of the aqeedah of the Salaf, jaahil of the affairs of da'wah, Raafidee towards the Sahaabah, Jahmee in Sifaat, Mu'tazili and Ash'aree in aqeedah, Jabaree in Qadr, Asha'aree in his definition and understanding of Tawheed (that it is the ability to invent, create), rejector of Ahaad ahadeeth, denier of the miracles of the Messenger, interpolater of Allaah's attribute of Istiwaa. By Allaah, this is impossible, and this alone is the greatest of proofs today, and most manifest realities that the followers of the manhaj of Bane Qutb, are astray, following those who are astray, being guided by those who are astray, and openly witnessing against themselves that they are being led and guided by those who are astray, those who are Ash'ari, Mu'tazili and who are free from the Salaf, like the freedom of the wolf from the blood of Yoosuf (alaih salaam).

And so we say to every Salafee in every part of the earth, do not be beguiled by the toing and froing of these people, for what has been mentioned above is sufficient as a reminder to them, that they are upon misguidance and deviation, being led in that by the Ash'arites and Mu'tazilites from whom they have taken their aqeedah and manhaj in these affairs, the Bane Qutb and Aal Mawdoodi.

And now to proceed...

Commentary Upon the neo-Qutubite Apologeticism that Seeks to Justify What Baneer Qutb Derived from Aal Mawdoodi of the Concept of Imaamah [which Aal Mawdoodi Derived from the Raafidah] And Which Baneer Qutb Subsequently Reformulated as “Haakimiyyah” And Which the 2nd and 3rd Generation Offspring of Neo-Qutubiyah Reformulated as “Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah” Intending by All of That To Lend Support to the Methodology of Reform Laid Down by the the Ash’arite Mu’tazilites that were Baneer Qutb and Aal Mawdoodi, and Which Itself Is Qadarite in Nature, Perception and Outlook, And Which is Clashing with The Rulers With Rebellions, Assassinations, Coups In Order to Overthrow Them and Replace Them, And Adopting This As the Methodology of Da’wah in Establishing Tawheed

Text:

Is Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah a Bid'ah?

Commentary: This type of question does not arise from a Salafite who has guided himself by the Imaams of the Salaf, and who has understood Tawheed in its overall comprehensive, meaning, definition and understanding. Rather, this type of question arises from the one who wishes to open up the door of debate, and to enter into it the ramblings of the Innovators, those who claimed that the most “special and specific and unique characteristic of Uloomiyah” is Haakimiyyah and that the meaning of “Laa ilaaha ilallaaha” is “there is no Haakim but Allaah”, as textually occurred from the Ash’arite Mu’tazilites of Baneer Qutb, who themselves are the most ignorant of people of the meaning of “Laa Ilaahah Ilallaah”, as will be mentioned later in this discourse, giving it the tafseer of the Soofee Hulooloes, and Ittihaadees. And it is clear that the likes of these people are not content with the da’wah of the Messengers, and instead wish to adopt the ways and methods of the disbelievers, which is working towards a ideological justification of a replacement of the current authorities, by clashes and revolutions, by employing concepts such as these.

Shaikh al-Albaani was asked, “What is called in the current times as a military overthrow (coup) against the ruler, is this from the religion or is it an innovation?” The Shaykh replied, “These actions have no basis in Islaam, and it is in opposition to the Islamic manhaj in laying down the foundations of the da’wah, and bringing about a righteous land for it. For this is one of the innovations of the disbelievers by which some of the Muslims have been affected by, and this is what I mentioned in commenting and explaining al-Aqeedah at-Tahaawiyah” (al-Asaalah vol. 10, 1414H).

Text:

Prepared by Abu Huthayfah Yusuf al-Canadee

Commentary: Yes, this individual is a Qutubi Quh, parading as a Salafee, who has been suckled by the doctrines of Sayyid and Mohammad Qutb, and their stooge, Safar al-Hawaali, and he has taken his nourishment from the fountain of the Ash'arite Mu'tazilites who first laid down Haakimiyyah as the most unique and specific characteristic of Uloohiyyah. And we have replied to his many fabrications and lies in previous articles in this series. And most worthy of being noted is what has been explained in GRV070016 is that this ignoramus made six or seven counts of fabrication and lies upon Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, and in one instance even doctoring a quote from Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah. All of this has been documented, so refer to it.

And the reality of this individual is that when he saw the Salafi Imaams and Scholars defending Imaam al-Albaani from the filthy accusation coming from the neo-Khaarijiyyah, and when he saw that we presented these statements and also refuted the neo-Qutubite claims, and also highlighted the depravity that was with the stooge of Aal Qutb, al-Hawaali, who claimed that the one who does not make takfir of the one who abandons prayer is upon Irjaa', then this was not to his liking, and so his soul enticed him to write a refutation of us, and which we praise and thank Allaah for, and by which we were greatly pleased, since this refutation is actually an encyclopaedia of falsehood, misquotes, lies, distortions, fabrications, ignorance, faulty understandings and much more, and which has now been recorded against him, and all praise is due to Allaah. To date, we have replied to only what amounts to six or seven pages from his refutation, and this alone has been sufficient to prove his depravation and the true and real origins of his knowledge-based sucklement.

So we warn from this individual, as he is a Charlatan, and is not genuine, and tries to wear the gown of knowledge, pretending that his overgarment is Salafiyyah, whereas in reality, his undergarments are but Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah.

Text:

It should be understood that the current terminology and classification of the different Sharee'ah sciences mostly were not used by either of the first three generations or "the Salaf us-Saalih " at all. It would be rare to find any of them using some of the terms that are so common today such as "Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah" or "Tawheed Ar-Rooboobiyyah" or "Tawheed Asmaa' wa Sifaat". Rather, we see them referring to Tawheed generally as one subject. However, later generations divided these classifications of Tawheed for the purposes of teaching and categorizing the different aspects of Allaah's Tawheed. Some of them, such as Ibn Al-Qayyim, only referred to two categories of Tawheed as he said, in his

explanation of the Tawheed as it has come from the Qur'aan in Surat Al-Kaafiroon and Al-Ikhlaas:

Commentary: Al-Kanadie begins with some introductory points (muqaddamaat), and upon which the main bulk of the Qutubite apologeticism will be based in the remainder of his essay.

His confusion appears from the very beginning. He will begin to confuse his readers into not distinguishing between two matters, and then confuse the readers into thinking this particular issue to be something that it is not. The two separate issues are as follows:

- a) The Salaf explaining what exactly is the Tawheed that is in the Qur'aan and which was the basis of the da'wah of all of the Messengers, and the Salaf using words or explanations to explain this Tawheed and what it is, and what it comprises, and what its foundations are. So what is being focused upon here is the actual "fahm" (understanding) of the Tawheed that the Messengers' were sent with and which the Book was revealed with.
- b) Just the mere issue of the Scholars using terminology and classifications for Tawheed

His intent throughout his essay is to focus upon the second of the two issues above, which is the mere fact that there exist (according to al-Kanadie), different classifications of Tawheed, and associated terminologies. He will then present this issue as being one of Ijtihaad, and in which the later Salaf differed (when in fact they did not differ at all, since what they explained is actually exactly the same in meaning), trying to justify this, by the mere presence of what appears to be two different classifications, when in reality they are both the one and same thing.

Text:

"...and they have both covered the two types of Tawheed, for which there is no salvation nor any success without them. And they are Tawheed Al-'Ilm wa'l-'Atiqaad...(i.e. the Tawheed of Knowledge and Beliefs)" - and he, may Allaah be merciful to him, goes on to explain this category, until he said, - "...and the second, is Tawheed Al-Qasd wa'l-Iraadah...(i.e. Tawheed of Intention and Purpose.)" - and likewise, he goes on to explain this category. ["Badaa'a Al-Fawaa'id ", Vol. 1/145-146]

And the point here is that Tawheed Al-'Ilm wa'l-'Atiqaad includes His Names and Attributes from the point of view of what we know and believe concerning Allah. And the Tawheed Al-Qasd wa'l-Iraadah includes them as well from the point of view of how we worship Allaah according to His Names and Attributes. So this was an alternate way of explaining and classifying Tawheed while giving emphasis to two aspects instead of three.

And likewise, Ibn Abee Al-'Izz, may Allaah be merciful to him, said in his chapter of Tawheed:

"Further, the Tawheed to which the Messengers invited and which was the main context of the revealed Books are of two kinds:

i) Tawheed fi'l-Ithbaat wa'l-Maa'ifah (Tawheed of Acknowledgement and Knowledge): The first is to acknowledge the Being (and existence) of Allaah, the Most High, along with all His Attributes, Acts and Names. In this, He is unique. There is none like Him in all these characteristics - as Allaah Himself and His Messengers informed us. And ii) Tawheed fi'l-Talib wa'l-Qasd (Tawheed of Solicitation and Intent): The second, the Tawheed of Solicitation and Intent, has been well defined by the following short chapter from the Qur'aan: [Say: O you disbelievers... (Al-Kaafiroon, 1)] And: [Say: O People of the Book, come to an equitable term between yourselves and us, that we shall worship none but Allaah... (Aal-'Imraan, 64)] [Look to "Sharh' Al-'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyah" eng. Trans. Pg. 8-9, published by Al-Attique]

Commentary: What he has quoted here is correct and true, which is that according to Ibn al-Qayyim, Tawheed is of two types. While it is important to note here something that al-Kanadie al-Qutubi does not point out at all, which is that in defining this Tawheed in this way, Ibn al-Qayyim, and in fact whoever else defined Tawheed (whether with two categories, or three) meant to define the overall, comprehensive Tawheed that has come in the Book and the Sunnah, and which was the basis of the call of all of the Messengers. The issue is not one of having the freedom of choice to choose whatever terminologies we wish, but it is of attempting to define the overall, comprehensive, all-inclusive Tawheed that has come in the Book and the Sunnah. And this is actually the intent of those who spoke on the issue of understanding Tawheed in categories. They meant to explain, not certain aspects of Tawheed or highlight certain aspects, as the Qutubiyah explain, but to actually define the overall, all-inclusive, comprehensive, Tawheed that has come in the Book in the Sunnah, and which differs from what the Innovators are upon.

Text:

And it is worth mentioning that Ibn Abee Al-'Izz mentioned this classification of two categories, only a few pages after explaining Tawheed with the three common categories; "Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyah" and "Tawheed Ar-Rooboobiyyah" and "Tawheed Asmaa' wa Sifaat". But it was not strange for him to classify Tawheed in one manner and explain it using these categories and then explain it an alternate way with the use of only two categories as they both aid the understanding of Tawheed and that which it covers. And this occurs within the same precise chapter! It is also interesting to point out that Ibn Abee Al-'Izz spends much of this chapter in refuting the people of Bid'ah who have denied certain aspects of Tawheed. And this was due to their understanding of what Tawheed includes and implies, yet the classification and categorization of Tawheed was not

important as he, himself used two alternate methods of classification for the purpose of explaining and emphasizing its implications and components.

Commentary: The deception upon the readers begins here, which is to begin to portray the issue as using terminologies in order to aid and assist in understanding aspects of Tawheed. On the surface, there might appear to be nothing wrong with these words, but as we will see, these words are being used to lead to a particular conclusion. As stated before, the later Salaf did not use terminologies merely for the sake of it, and the issue is not even one of terminologies. The issue is explaining the overall comprehensive, all-inclusive Tawheed that has come in the Book and the Sunnah in a manner that is complete and thorough. And this was the intent of the earlier Salaf (like Ibn Battah) and later Salaf. Not merely to highlight certain aspects of it, and parts of it, or isolated things that constitute it.

And at this point is necessary for us to explain this issue in more detail⁵:

ONE: Tawheed is either in knowledge or action. Thus Tawheed has only two aspects - it is either in knowledge or in action. Some of the scholars divide the Tawheed of knowledge into that which relates to His Names and Attributes and that which relates to His Lordship (i.e. he is singled out with the actions of creating, owning, providing, benefiting, harming and so on).

TWO: The above understanding is actually found in detail in the Book and the Sunnah – and is not a matter of “terminology used by the later scholars” as some have claimed. Rather, the whole of Tawheed is understood in the manner above, and this understanding was clear from the earliest to the later times. The scholars merely spoke with terms that define this overall, comprehensive, all-inclusive Tawheed - that has come in the Book and the Sunnah - and it is either in knowledge or in action.

THREE: When the above becomes clear, then to judge by what Allaah has revealed relates both to Ruboobiyyah, or al-Asmaa was-Sifaat (or the Tawheed of knowledge, in the sense that one accepts that judgement is one of the exclusive rights of Allaah, and that He is al-Hakam) and Uloohiyyah in the sense that one judges by Allaah’s judgement. And this is similar for all of the other affairs that comprise Tawheed. So for example tawakkul includes holding the belief that Allaah alone benefits and harms, as well as adopting the ways and means in order to bring about that which is desired – so this is knowledge that is held and action that is performed. And so on... for all the other actions. So the Salaf in their defining of Tawheed exactly as it has come in the Book and the Sunnah, they meant to define the overall, inclusive, Tawheed that was the basis of the da’wah of the Prophets and the Tawheed that has come in the Book and the Sunnah, and which comprises both knowledge and action.

⁵ These points are quoted from a post in the Spubs.Com Forum replying to the same author, by one of the members.

FOUR: Once this is clear, one can appreciate the nature of the da'wah of the Prophets and the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah in all times. The starting point of the da'wah to Tawheed, in every age and era, is exactly the same and does not change, and in light of this, the classification or understanding of the Salaf, of this Tawheed, does not change either, since they define it exactly as the Quraan and Sunnah have defined it, in its all inclusive, all encompassing, comprehensive manner – and this overall Tawheed is the basis of their call – and they begin as always, exactly where the Prophets began, and they do not begin with any one part of it, exclusively, or base their call around it exclusively.

FIVE: The claim of some of the Harakiyyoon, that the scholars used terminologies for Tawheed to highlight certain aspects, at times when giving importance to them was needed, is baatil and a lie upon the Salaf. Rather, the classification of the scholars, whether it is Ibn Battah's three-fold classification or Ibn al-Qayyim's two-fold classification, then the aim of that was to define the overall, comprehensive, all-inclusive Tawheed that has come in the Book and the Sunnah. And this claim or this premise – that the scholars gave prominence to certain affairs of Tawheed, when the situation demanded that – is really a premise that is being employed in order to justify the deviation away from the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah – [that is calling to the all-inclusive, all encompassing Tawheed, which has a particular starting point] - and towards the methodology of Qutb and Banna in calling to Haakimiyyah and Imaamah - [that is calling to the narrow and restricted Tawheed, which has a particular starting point].

Thus, in light of all of this, that Ibn Abil-'Izz mentions both categorisations of Tawheed does not mean that the terminologies are not important and therefore every Zaid, 'Abdullah and Qutubi is free to devise his own terminologies to give prominence to the specific concepts around which his narrow, restricted, deficient da'wah is built around, and that all of this is just a matter of Ijtihad. No.

Tawheed is either in knowledge or action. And in light of this, the whole of the Salaf are agreed that Tawheed is only either these two categories, or if we break down the Tawheed of knowledge into the Tawheed that either relates in the belief and knowledge that singles Him out in his Actions (creating, owning, sustaining, providing, giving life, taking life, etc.), or which relates to the belief and knowledge that singles Him out in His Names and Attributes. And thus we have three categories. **These are not two separate classifications. They are exactly the same classification and exactly the same understanding.** And they are not two separate sets of terminologies. They are exactly the same terminologies in meaning, except that one of the two aspects of Tawheed, which is that of knowledge, has been explained to be with respect to two issues that constitute it, either Ruboobiyyah, or al-Asmaa was-Sifaat.

Ibn Abil-'Izz, says, (and it is also the saying of Ibn al-Qayyim in al-Madaarij, from this third volume), the following, “And as for the Tawheed **that the Messengers**

called to, and which the Books were revealed with..." (al-Madaarij, 3/418 and see Sharh at-Tahaawiyah of Ibn Abil-'Izz p. 89), and this shows what we indicated earlier, that the Salaf, in defining Tawheed in this way, meant to indicate the actual, all-inclusive Tawheed that the Book and the Sunnah has come with, and not merely to make an ijtihaad in using terminologies so as to highlight certain aspects of it. And further, this is a matter of Ijmaa' between Ahl us-Sunnah, that this Tawheed is either two or three categories (in light of the above explanation) and that there is nothing to be added to it or taken away from it.

As for the saying of al-Kanadie,

It is also interesting to point out that Ibn Abee Al-'Izz spends much of this chapter in refuting the people of Bid'ah who have denied certain aspects of Tawheed. And this was due to their understanding of what Tawheed includes and implies

Ibn Abil-'Izz, just like Ibn al-Qayyim in his Madaarij, from whom we have just quoted above, actually refute the generality of those who are astray in Allaah's Names and Attributes, who deviated in aspects of Tawheed, due to their understanding of Tawheed and what it includes and implies. And this shows that their da'wah, like that of the Salafees today, is a truthful da'wah, which addresses all aspects of Tawheed, unlike the da'wah of the Qutubiyah, the Haakimists, those who know that Banee Qutb was Ash'arite, and of the same category of those same people of Bid'ah and Dalaalah that Ibn Abil-'Izz and Ibn al-Qayyim refuted, in the course of their explanation of the Tawheed that the Messengers called to and which the Qur'aan was revealed with.

Thus, this indicates two matters:

Either, the Qutubiyah, Khaarijiyyah, do not actually understand this Tawheed that the Messengers called to, and which causes them to be blind to the deviation that is found with their pole and axis, Banee Qutb, who denied certain aspects of Tawheed, namely al-Asmaa' was-Sifaat, due to propounding the doctrines of Jahm and those of the Mu'tazilah and Ash'ariyyah.

Or they do understand this, but they are Innovators, Strayers, who are deceitful to this Ummah, and hate that any refutation should be made of Banee Qutb, on account of its deviation in this aspect of Tawheed, and its rejection of this aspect of Tawheed, in the same style and method as the Innovators, the Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah and Ash'ariyyah. And thus, knowing that if they were to address this aspect of Tawheed and call with the da'wah of the Messengers, the all-inclusive Tawheed, it would mean the end of Banee Qutb and would require that its pole and axis be entered into the ranks of the Innovators, who deviate from the Tawheed of the Messengers in al-Asmaa' was-Sifaat, and be entered into the generality of the ranks of the Mu'attilah and Mu'awwilah. And thus it would mean no harakah (movement) and no self-styled fuquhaa ul-waaqi', and no pseudo-scholars labelled as "mufakkireen", and no "theorists", "thinkers" and "culturists" and no "sahwah"

(qutubi awakening), and no working towards an ideological and practical revolution, and no pretence of adhering to the Salaf. Qutubism would collapse, and the deceit made apparent.

Text:

So although the most common and perhaps the best division of the different aspects of Tawheed are these three (i.e. Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyah, Tawheed Ar-Rooboobiyyah and Tawheed Asmaa' wa Sifaat) this does not mean that these terms and classifications are from the legislated terminology of what Allaah, the Most High, revealed to His Messenger or what was taught to the companions or passed to the succeeding generations at all. Rather, these terms do not even exist in the Book of Allaah or in the Sunnah or the Prophet or the statements of the companions in the first place. So how can someone claim that using a fourth or fifth classification of Tawheed for the purposes of explaining and categorizing the science of Tawheed is an innovation (Bid'ah)?! Especially when we see that many of the early scholars have only used two categories of Tawheed to explain and identify their importance.

Commentary: Al-Kanadie pretends here, or strongly tries to portray that there are many different classifications and divisions, and that many from the Salaf entered into speaking about these definitions and that the “the most common and perhaps the best” is where Tawheed has been categorised into three.

Firstly, there are only two well-known classifications from the Salaf, as has preceded, not scores or hundreds, as the author might be trying to imply. Secondly, these two classifications, in reality **are not different**, they are exactly the same from the point of view of their origin and basis, and from the point of view of meaning afforded by them, and the intent behind them. Again this has been explained previously.

So let not the reader be deceived by these deceptions.

Now pay attention to his saying,

...this does not mean that these terms and classifications are from the legislated terminology of what Allaah, the Most High, revealed to His Messenger or what was taught to the companions or passed to the succeeding generations at all. Rather, these terms do not even exist in the Book of Allaah or in the Sunnah or the Prophet or the statements of the companions in the first place.

As we said earlier, the deception of this Qutubi lies in his making the issue revolve around the mere fact that terminologies exist, and sticking this idea into the reader's mind, rather than actually explaining that the intent behind all of this, which is to explain the overall, all-inclusive, comprehensive Tawheed, which the Messengers actually called to and with which the Book was actually revealed.

So taking this approach and fixing this in the reader's mind, and then falsely portraying (in an implicit manner) as if there were many of the Salaf who spoke on this subject using lots of different terminologies and so on, that therefore, this is not a matter of text or ijmaa', but is subject to the personal ijtihaad of every Zaid, 'Abdullaah and Qutubi.

And this is his actual objective as is clear from what occurs next,

So how can someone claim that using a fourth or fifth classification of Tawheed for the purposes of explaining and categorizing the science of Tawheed is an innovation (Bid'ah)?!

And this indicates that the utterer of these words is a jaahil (ignoramus), not knowing what comes out of his head, no having any coherence of thought, and nor able to grasp what he is speaking of, confused and bewildered. And the explanation of this is as follows:

When it has already preceded that Ibn Abil-Izz or Ibn al-Qayyim or others explained Tawheed, either by saying it is in knowledge or action (and hence has two aspects), or that it has three aspects if we further subdivide the Tawheed of knowledge into that which relates to Ruboobiyyah and that which relates to Uloohiyyah, then what they have explained is the overall, comprehensive Tawheed that the Messengers called to and with which the Book was revealed. If that is the case, then where is there a need to add an additional fourth, or fifth, or sixth, or seventh category, when the objective for which Tawheed was explained as having two or three categories has already been achieved, fulfilled and is a matter of ijmaa'?

This ignoramus has failed to realise this basic issue, and on account of this, continues to show his stupidity and his logical inconsistency in what he has composed in attempting to defend the doctrine of the Ash'arite Mu'tazilite who is his real source of knowledge.

And then continues in his ignorance, and foolishness in the same vain and says,

Especially when we see that many of the early scholars have only used two categories of Tawheed to explain and identify their importance.

Again indicating that this person does not understand that these scholars did not sit around for a couple of hours, thinking about giving importance to Tawheed and then say, "let us speak about the importance of some aspects of Tahweed, let us choose two categories of Tawheed and speak of their importance, right, fine, well we have tawheed of knowledge and tawheed of action, right that's it, these are the two that we can think of, let us give importance to these", and then leave the room open for other people to come and "give importance" to other so called aspects of Tawheed. No, al-Kanadie is confused and ignorant. Rather, the Salaf defined the

overall, all-inclusive Tawheed, that the Messengers called to and with which the Book was revealed.

So either he acknowledges this and says yes, and indeed he has no option but to, since we can remind him of what Ibn Abil-'Izz, says, and what Ibn al-Qayyim says in al-Madaarij, from this third volume, “And as for the Tawheed that the Messengers called to, and which the Books were revealed with...” (al-Madaarij, 3/418 and see Sharh at-Tahaawiyah of Ibn Abil-'Izz p. 89) – so either he acknowledges this and says “yes, you are right”, in which case his whole argument, and his words above are rendered futile, baseless, and foolish, and characteristic of someone who does not have a clue as to what he is talking about. Or he says, “no, I disagree”, in which case he lays bare his ignorance and foolishness also.

Text:

Similar to this, in Mustaalih Al-Hadeeth (the classification and terminology of Hadeeth sciences) the earliest scholars did not use the word "Shaath" (incorrect), when referring to narrations or parts of narrations, which were in contradiction to more reliable reports. Rather, the earliest Hadeeth scholars classified these narrations as "Munkar" (objectionable) and the word Shaath became used later to identify these reports. So is this an innovation (Bid'ah)?

Commentary: Then al-Kanadie, comes and starts to make things even more difficult for himself, and starts illustrating the bankruptness of his ra'i and falsafah (opinion and philosophy).

Let us illustrate to him, that there is nothing for him in this example here and that rather, this only supports the people of the Sunnah, those who are upon the da'wah of the Prophets, and that it only causes loss and ruin to those who have falsely claimed Salafiyah whilst guiding themselves by the doctrines of their Ash'arite Mu'tazilite pole and axis that is Sayyid Qutb. According to the logic in the argument above:

Some scholars used the term “Tawheed ul-Qasd wat-Talab” to refer to the Tawheed in action (which includes actions of the hearts and limbs), and then other scholars before, or after them, used instead “Tawheed al-Uloohiyah”, or “Tawheed ul-Ibaadah”. So the issue here is that these are all synonymous terms that do not give a different meaning or concept. All of them are synonymous. So the question does not arise whether these terms are a bid'ah or not.

However, those who bring Tawheed ul-Haakimiyah, then is this synonymous with what is intended by “Tawheed ul-Qasd wat-Talab” or “Tawheed ul-Ibaadah”, or “Tawheed ul-Uloohiyah”? No it is not synonymous, because it does not include what is included and comprised in these terms. Rather, this term represents only one aspect, unlike the other three all-inclusive, all-comprehensive aspects, and then built a unique, independent category of Tawheed (and indeed the Ash'arite

Mu'tazilite originators of this doctrine, claimed it to be the most specific, unique, special feature of Uloohiyyah, and its very pillar and foundation!)

Thus, with respect to the first three, then there is no innovation in them at all, as they are all synonymous in meaning, in both what they indicate and portray and in what they comprise of everything that comes under them, even if the terms used are different. And with respect to the fourth, then it is an innovation, since it is not synonymous with the other three in indication and what it comprises and what comes under them. Rather, it is specifying something that the Salaf never specified in the course of their explaining and defining the overall, comprehensive, all-inclusive Tawheed.

And thus, we establish once more, exactly what we outlined at the beginning, that this confused and bewildered individual has deceitfully focused merely on the "terminology" without looking at the intent and objective behind these terms in the first place, as a result of which he has landed himself into this folly.

In his refutation of Mohammad Qutb and his explaining the meaning of "laa ilaaha illallaaha" to mean, "there is no deity but Allah and no haakim but Allaah), Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan explains within his answer, "...So he (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) explained that the meaning of "laa ilaaha ilallaaha" is singling out Allaah with worship, all of it, and not just with Haakimiyyah alone... and as for explaining it with Haakimiyyah, then it is a deficient tafseer, and it does not give the meaning of laa ilaaha illallaaha... and the tafseer that "there is not deity except Allaah (given by Mohammad Qutb) is a baatil, false tafseer, since wahdatul wujud (unity of existence) is necessitated by it... and it is obligatory to say "there is not diety in truth, except Allaah". (al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah, p.68).

And so the intent here is that the various terms that the Salaf used, "Tawheed al-Uloohiyyah" or the "Tawheed of Action", or the "Tawheed of Qasd and Talab", then all of them point to the same reality and overall meaning and concept. And the intent behind them is to explain the Tawheed that the Messengers came with. The same cannot be said about "Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah", as the Messengers did not come with this Tawheed, as this is a deficient, narrow, restricted Tawheed.

So the philosophy and logic of al-Kanadie is fallacious, and his underlying reasoning is shaky and weak and far from being straight, just like the aqeedah of the Mu'tazilite, Ash'arite, who is the origin of this way of thinking, and from whom al-Kanadie is being nourished, while trying to hide and cover it.

Text:

So if someone is to say that the term "Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah" is an innovation (Bid'ah) because it was not used by the first three generations (Salaf us-Saalih) then it is upon them to show any of the first three generations using these three categories (i.e. Tawheed Al-Uloohiyyah, Tawheed Ar-Rooboobiyyah and Tawheed Asmaa' wa Sifaat) in their

terminology as they are used today. This is because the burden of proof is upon the one who has alleged the infraction and not the other way around.

Commentary: This is where the original deceit of al-Kanadie, when he laid the foundations of his essay, at the beginning, leads to. Because as we said, he has fixed the readers mind into the mere terms, and not been honest and actually explained what did the Salaf intend behind these terms. They intended to explain the Tawheed of the Qur'aan and of the Messengers, all of it, as a whole. So we say in reply to this beguiled one:

ONE: As for these terms that the Salaf used, then in employing them and using them, we have not innovated anything new in our aqeedah or our manhaj or our da'wah, rather we have, by way of these terms, understood the Tawheed that the Messengers called to, and which the Book was revealed with, and by virtue of it, based our da'wah and call upon it, as a result of which we have agreed with the Prophets in the basis and starting points and priorities of their call, both theoretically and practically (as opposed to the harakiyyeen and neo-makhaarijah, those who often claim that they are upon the right priorities in their da'wah, but practically they are only interested in takfir and khurooj).

As for the Qutubiyah, then what they intend by this term, as has already proceeded from the Scholars of the Salaf of contemporary times, then they intend by it to deviate away from the methodology of the Prophets and set up starting points and priorities in the da'wah that deviate from that of the Prophets and of all of Ahl us-Sunnah in all times and ages, and to actually change the understanding of Tawheed, and to subsequently build upon this, their specific da'wah that they have taken from the Mu'tazilah and the Khawaarij, which is takfeer and revolt. The objective around which their da'wah revolves is arriving at takfeer and overthrowing of the current authorities, by calling to a narrow, restricted form of Tawheed. So this "Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah" has a special significance and focus in da'wah.

So the term "Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah" is not merely a term on its own with no other relevance attached to it, rather it is a term connected to the takfeer and rebellion and revolution that goes alongside it, and follows on from it, and this is an innovation in da'wah, since this is the starting point and the priority of da'wah to many of those put to trial by the doctrines of the Ash'arite Mu'tazilite that originated this affair, Sayyid Qutb. And those who are upon this da'wah, the likes of Suroor and al-Hawaali and others, actually promote and justify this da'wah from the ideological perspective, as is clear from their books.

Indeed, this is what Imaam al-Albaani surmised about them, "Al-Haakimiyyah' is a branch of the branches of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, and those who focus their attention upon this newly invented saying in the present age use it as a weapon not to teach the Muslims the Tawheed that all of the Prophets and Messengers came

with, but rather as a political weapon.” (Taken from ‘al-Muslimoon,’ no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.)

TWO: Their claim to al-Haakimiyyah is a false one, and a lie, since they do not abide by what it requires in all of the affairs of da’wah and manhaj. And the clearest of manifestations of this is that they do not refute or desire to refute the Ash’arite Mu’tazilite who deviated from Tawheed in al-Asmaa was-Sifaat, and who is in fact the base and origin of their deviation. So when they make the claim to raise high this banner of Haakimiyyah, then know this is a lie and a false claim, and their actions and behavior renders it a lie, because they make apparent their contradiction in their claim from the very beginning. Rather, they make enmity and walaa and baraa’ based upon this Ash’arite Mu’tazilite, and free themselves from those who refute him and expose his deviation away from Tawheed, in al-Asmaa was-Sifaat, rather in his actual flawed and baatil understanding of Tawheed.

For the Salaf, when they correctly defined the overall comprehensive, all-inclusive Tawheed, they refuted all its opposers. And as for the contemporary Haakimists, to whom only “Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah” is relevant today, and which is the basis of their da’wah, then they do not proceed upon a manhaj which is like that of the Salaf, which in its scope and outlook, is determined by the scope and outlook on Tawheed, which is all-inclusive and comprehensive. Thus, you see them, allowing them to proceed upon doctrines that emanated from an Ash’arite Mu’tazilite, jaahil of the aqeedah of the Salaf, jaahil of the affairs of da’wah, Raafidee towards the Sahaabah, Jahmee in Sifaat, Mu’tazili and Ash’aree in aqeedah, Jabaree in Qadr, Asha’aree in his definition and understanding of Tawheed (that it is the ability to invent, create), rejector of Ahaad ahadeeth, denier of the miracles of the Messenger, interpolater of Allaah’s attribute of Istiwaa and what is additional to that. And then showing the greatest of enmity to those who refute him and banish his books, and many of them, remain silent and do not utter a word, while at the same time, they have seen it fit to launch a great assault against one of the Imaams of the Sunnah, Imaam al-Albaani, and to ascribe innovation and misguidance to him, using in all of that deceit and falsehood, and following in the ways of the rest of the Innovators who assaulted Imaam al-Albaani, during the course of his fifty or sixty years in da’wah to Allaah.

So the likes of this manifestation from them, shows that their claim to al-Haakimiyyah is false and a lie, and is full of contradiction, as they themselves do not judge by the Book, the Sunnah, and the way of the Salaf in their da’wah and manhaj.

As for his saying,

This is because the burden of proof is upon the one who has alleged the infraction and not the other way around.

Then this is the greatest of falsehoods, and the most foolish of follies and warmest of warm-fuzzies. Rather, the burden of proof is for the Khaarijiyyah, Qutubiyah, to bring the proof that the Salaf took something that enters into Tawheed, such as loving Allaah more than all else, or fearing Allaah more than all else, or sacrificing to Him alone, or making du'a to Him alone, and then single it out as a separate category of Tawheed, outside of what it already enters into of the Tawheed of al-Qasd wa-Talab if you like, or Tawheed al-Uloohiyah, if you like, or Tawheed ul-Ibaadah if you like, or Tawheed of Action if you like - all of which are synonymous terms, which represent the sum total of the all-inclusive, all-comprehensive da'wah of the Messengers and the Tawheed that they were sent with - and then gave it a title such as "Tawheed ul-Mahabbah", or "Tawheed ud-Du'aa", or "Tawheed ul-Khawf", or "Tawheed udh-Dhabh".

The burden of proof is upon this one, and not the other way around. This is because it has already been established that the classifications that already exist (whether two or three categories) are actually synonymous and not different, and that the Salaf when they spoke of them, they were not willy nilly picking out particular aspects of Tawheed, in order to highlight them, rather they, spoke of the overall, all-inclusive Tawheed that the Books of Allaah contain and that the Messengers called to. Whether we mention, Tawheed al-Asmaa was-Sifaat or Tawheed ar-Ruboobiyyah separately, then this is the Tawheed of Knowledge. And whether we say Tawheed ul-Uloohiyah, or Tawheed al-Ibaadah, or Tawheed al-Qasd wat-Talab, then all of this is Tawheed of Action, and these are synonymous terms. And the claim of the Qutubi, that these terms actually point to different meanings or aspects of Tawheed is false and a lie, since all these terms, actually point to the right of Allaah being worshipped alone, with all affairs of Ibaadah, collectively as a whole.

If we revisit the discussion from Shaikh al-Fawzaan that we quoted at the beginning,

“Shaikh Fawzaan: That is sufficient for us, we will not add to what they have unanimously agreed upon, and they agree upon this.. [then] there comes an ignoramus in the twentieth century... he says ‘I am a Mujtahid and I will add to what the People of Knowledge have agreed upon’. This is misguidance...**Questioner 2:** [interjecting]...

Shaikh Fawzaan: This is clear error! Because al-Haakimiyyah enters into Tawheed ul-Uloohiyah. Who has made it another category or made it an independent category? Will he make the prayer into a fifth or sixth category and jihaad a seventh category? [Because] all of the types of worship are from the types of Tawheed? This is not correct...

Questioner 2: So this is an innovated saying, this saying [Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah]? **Shaikh Fawzaan:** Yes, there is no doubt in this, it is in

opposition to the Ijmaa [of Ahl us-Sunnah]. None of the people of knowledge have ever spoken with it. It is in opposition to the Ijmaa.”

Thus, the burden is upon this Qutubi, and his likes to justify their deviation away from the Salaf. So ponder over this, and do not be deceived by these false arguments, which are built upon false introductory points (muqaddamaat). And this affair is clear.

Text:

So the author of the message quotes the statement of Shaykh Saalih Al-Fawzaan saying:

"In order to say this, they relay [sic] on the idea that dividing Tawheed is just a traditional way of explaining it, not something restricted. Based on this assumption, there is nothing preventing us from adding another category. So it should be said to such a person, "This division is not a traditional explanation, rather it goes back to the Book and the Sunnah, and the Salaf took these three categories directly from the Book and the Sunnah."

Firstly, and after declaring our love and respect for the noble Shaykh Saalih Al-Fawzaan, may Allaah preserve him, we say that this response is ambiguous. This is because a person could quite rightly say in response, "The Tawheed of Allaah's Haakimiyyah also goes back to the Book and the Sunnah," and as we have stated earlier, the one who says that any of the first three generations (Salaf us-Saalih) used the terminology of the three more common divisions of Tawheed must prove this by bringing their statements wherein they actually use the terms Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah, Tawheed Ar-Rooboobiyyah and Tawheed Asmaa' wa Sifaat. And until now, we have not been presented with a single narration of this nature.

Commentary: Look at this talbees and jahl, all of it based upon his false muqaddamaat (introductory points upon which he based his essay).

And the answer to him is as follows:

ONE: The intent of the Shaykh is clear, is that the explanation itself is from the Book and the Sunnah, and the explanation of Tawheed in this manner is intended to illustrate the overall, all-inclusive Tawheed that the Messengers called to, and not merely highlight certain aspects, as the Qutubiyah portray.

TWO: When this is clear, the issue is not as the Qutubi continues to portray throughout the whole of his essay, that it is matter of terminology, and the scholars using different terminologies and highlighting different aspects of Tawheed as time goes by and so on.

THREE: Similarly, one could say, that Tawheed ul-Mahabbah, and Tawheed ul-Khawf, and Tawheed ud-Du'aa, and Tawheed ul-Inaabah, and Tawheed ul-Khashyah, and Tawheed udh-Dhabh, all of them have a basis in the Book and the

Sunnah. However, this was not the intent of those who classified Tawheed. They did not willy-nilly pick individual affairs that are a part of Tawheed, in order to highlight them and devise terminologies for them. Rather, their intent was to define the overall, comprehensive, all-inclusive Tawheed, that the Book of Allaah came with and which the Messengers called to, as has preceded.

Thus, what this Qutubi is doing here, which is continuing in his confusion and his mixing up issues, and falsely portraying the matter in a way which it isn't, is false and futile and is just playing games.

The Salaf saw that in the Qur'aan there is either khabar (information) or talab (request, i.e. a command or a prohibition). Thus, they saw Tawheed to be either in knowledge or in action. As Ibn al-Qayyim says, "For verily the Qur'aan, is either information about Allaah, and His Names, Attributes and Actions, so this is at-Tawheed al-Ilmee al-Khabaree (the Knowledge-Information Based Tawheed) or it is the call to His worship alone without any partners, and shunning everything that is worshipped besides Him, so this is Tawheed al-Iraadee at-Talabee (the Tawheed of Will and Request), or it (the Qur'aan) is command or prohibition and making obedience binding to Him in His command and prohibition, and this is from the rights of Tawheed and from the things that perfect it..." (al-Madaarij 3/418).

And thus, they explained that Tawheed is only in knowledge or in action, and then some of them merely explained and clarified that Tawheed of knowledge itself is of two types, one that relates to Allaah's uniqueness in actions, such as owning, creating, providing, giving life, taking life, judging, deciding, decreeing, regulating, and so on. And one that relates to His Names and Attributes. And these are not two different and independent classifications, rather it is the same categorisation, except with some additional explanation concerning one of the two categories.

And upon realising this, one can see that one of the earlier or later Salaf did not look in the Qur'aan and see that du'a is from Tawheed and worship, and thus said, "Tawheed ud-Du'aa", and then another looked in the Qur'aan and saw that there was mahabbah, that it is from the requirements of Tawheed and from worship, and thus said, "Tawheed ul-Mahabbah", and then another looked in the Qur'aan and saw that there was khashyah (awe, fear), that it is from the requirements of Tawheed and from worship, and thus said, "Tawheed ul-Khashyah", and then another looked in the Qur'aan and saw that there was dhabh (sacrificing), that it is from the requirements of Tawheed and from worship, and thus said, "Tawheed ul-Dhabh".

And this is actually what the Qutubi is trying to portray and fix in the minds of the readers, and this is deceit and a lie and a false, baseless claim about the Salaf. So inshaa'allaah, the clear difference is now apparent, and the confusion of this ignoramus is also clear and apparent.

Text:

Next, the author brings some quotations from some of the scholars who held that separating the division of Tawheed into four categories; one being Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah, is a reprehensible innovation (Bid'ah) and therefore is objectionable. However, as we've discussed earlier, these terms were not narrated in the Book of Allaah or in the Sunnah of His Messenger or in the terminology of the companions anyway so the arguments of those who call this term an innovation (Bid'ah) are in need of evidence, which was not presented by the author.

Commentary: And these are the quotations that have preceded earlier, from the Permanent Committee, Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan. And the answer to this has already preceded, in that this Qutubi has not understood the difference between the mere terminology in and of itself, and the actual intent behind this terminology, and what the Salaf intended by it, which is to define the overall, inclusive, comprehensive Tawheed that the Messengers came with. They did not intend by their classification to willy-nilly pick out terms and expressions to represent specific independent aspects of Tawheed. Thus, their explanation of Tawheed in this manner is not an innovation, since these terms merely express the da'wah of the Prophets and what they actually called to, and what exactly is the actual Tawheed that has come in the Book of Allaah.

As for the intent of the Ash'ari and Mu'tazili that is Sayyid Qutb, and those who follow him, then it is to deviate away from the da'wah of the Prophets, and the methodology of the Prophets, and to devise their own specific and unique da'wah, that is narrow, restricted, confined, and is aimed at takfeer and overthrowing the current authorities, in order to "establish Tawheed". All of this built upon what they claim is the "most specific and unique feature and characteristic of Tawheed", rather they claim that the meaning of "laa ilaahah ilallaaha" is "there is no haakim but Allaah". So this is extremism and exaggeration, behind which there are certain objectives.

Thus, the da'wah that they envisage, and what they call the common-people to, and what they work towards, is not in agreement with the all-inclusive da'wah that the Messengers came with. And they themselves know this, and they know it is an innovated da'wah.

Text:

However, in the course of quoting these scholars, the author touches upon a relevant fact. Again, quoting from Shaykh Saalih Al-Fawzaan, we read:

"As for Haakimiyyah, then it is true. It is obligatory for us to rule by the Sharee'ah of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. However this is included in Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah because it is obedience to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic."

And this is true and correct because taking ones judgments to Allaah's Sharee'ah is a form of singling out Allaah for worship just as making one's sacrifice and prayer for Allaah, alone, are both singling out Allaah for worship. And all of these aspects are covered in the category of Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah already.

Commentary: What is stated here is actually correct and there is no dispute concerning this, since to refer all judgements back to the Sharee'ah in all affairs that pertain to the deen, then it is from the usool (foundations) from the religion, and is from the rights of Tawheed and what follows on from it.

Text:

So the second question is: "If Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah is already covered within Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah, then what is the point of making it into a fourth distinct category of Tawheed?"

Commentary: Here, he begins the justification for separating out al-Haakimiyyah, into a fourth category. And it is here that we will later see this author falling into a ridiculous contradiction (when he lists his conclusions from his essay), and not knowing where to turn.

Text:

To answer this, we must reflect upon some historical realities. During the recent eras of colonialism and imperialism and the subsequent bombardment of secularist concepts, several Muslims had been influenced by these ideas and many began to ascribe to the ideology of removing the religion from politics and legislation. This led to wholesale adoption of non-Islaamic laws and accepting and ruling with a multitude of man-made constitutions and fabricated legislations. So it was not uncommon for a person to take his judgments to the laws of France or Britain and being comfortable in doing that, while believing that he was still upon Tawheed. And this was because the essential components of Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah were not all clear to such people. These people understood that prayer and fasting and slaughtering were all to be done for Allaah, alone; however, they did not feel the least bit shy from taking their judgments to, and basing their rulings upon the laws of man, instead of the Sharee'ah of Allaah.

Commentary: As for what occurred in the Muslim lands and the institution of secular laws, then this was indeed something that occurred as a result of the era of colonialism and imperialism. For the laws of the British and French and others were brought and instituted, by way of law courts and other affairs, in the Muslim lands. And this goes back mainly into the period of the nineteenth century. And this historical reality is a great and mighty refutation of those who attempt to use the verdicts of some of the scholars today, who ascribe major kufr to the one who replaces the whole of the deen, from beginning to end, abolishing the Sharee'ah and bringing something new, from top to bottom. So they use the likes of these verdicts and claim that this is what the

rulers of today are guilty of. And this, as is known to the truthful and sincere person, is a lie. For indeed, in the recent times, when what remained of the Islaamic Sharee'ah in some of the Muslim lands, was removed and replaced, it is not known from a single Muslim ruler, or Muslim government that they were personally or individually responsible for this. Indeed, the Kuffar played an instrumental role in this, and unfortunately, the Islaamic laws were found to be less abundant, and restricted mainly to personal issues, while the secular laws of the Kuffar gained prominence.

Once we understand this, then our speech concerning the kufr of the rulers and the common-folk, is to remain within context.

So the rulers in those particular Muslim lands, at that time, who openly welcomed the Kuffaar and the laws of the Kuffar and their being instituted for them, and opened up their hearts to them, aggrandising them, thinking them to be great and decisive, rushing towards them, embracing them, then this no doubt was major kufr for them. So if this is the case, then this is major kufr. And as for all subsequent rulers, who came after this time, after the time that these laws were brought into the Muslim lands, then the situation is different. Because they arrived at a situation, when there existed very little Islamic laws, and the laws of the Colonialists and Imperialists had been entered and instituted by the Kuffar, who brought their own law courts and other affairs.

And from this the deceit of the Khaarijiyyah and Takfeeriyyah in this issue becomes clear, in that they false apply the ruling of some of the scholars concerning the one who replaces the whole deen, from beginning to end, with something else, to a situation that does not accept this ruling, or to put it another way, applying it to the rulers who came after the secular laws of the Kuffar had been brought and instituted by them.

Pay attention to the following conversation between Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen and some Algerians (refer to Fataawaa al-Ulamaa al-Akaabir Feemaa Uhdira Min Dimaa'in Fil-Jazaa'ir p.175):

Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen: "So the truth that is contained within the laws - even though it may be secular - is to be accepted. Not because it is the statement of so and so, or created by so and so, but because it is the truth. As for whatever is in it of error, then it is possible to improve it by the gathering of the people responsible, the Scholars and the directors and to study the laws so as to reject whatever opposes the truth and to accept whatever agrees with the truth. As for performing takfeer of the ruler, then what is this for? Despite this, how long have you remained under French Occupation of Algeria?"

[Questioner]: 'We have remained for one hundred and thirty years.'

Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen: **“One hundred and thirty years, good! Is it possible for you to change this law that the French have enacted [over you] overnight?** No, it is not possible. The most important thing upon you is to put out this fitnah with whatever is at your disposal, with everything that is at your disposal. We ask Allaah to save the Muslims from the evil fitan (trials, tribulations).”

So the intent here is that the Qutubiyyah are deceptive with respect to applying the verdicts of some of the scholars, that replacing the whole deen is major kufr, since the situation that is found today, following on from what occurred in the periods of colonialism, does not fit the one that is found in the verdicts pertaining to this particular issue. Since, historically speaking, there has not been a single case of a Muslim ruler, replacing the whole Sharee'ah from top to bottom (unless we except Kamal Ataturk from this, who was in fact a Jew from Macedonia), following the times of the colonialist and imperialist expansion into our Muslim lands.

And indeed, in what these astray, deceiving beguiled Qutubis often quote from the words of our scholars, is what actually indicates the meaning indicated above, as will be explained now.

Text:

For example, Shaykh Ahmad Shaakir, may Allaah be merciful to him said, "So look, O Muslims, in all of the Islaamic countries or the ones which claim to be Islaamic, in all the parts of the Earth, **to what your enemies from the missionaries and colonists have done to you! They have put upon the Muslims, laws of misguidance, which destroy the etiquettes and the Deen.** European law, which are idols, which were never based upon any Sharee'ah or Deen, rather they were based upon rules that were made by the Kaafir who refused to believe in the Messenger of their era, 'Eesa, 'alayhee salaam. And he remained upon his paganism with what he had from Fisq and Fujoor (i.e. oppression). This person was Justinyaan, the father of the laws and the one who established the basis - so they claim - and an important man from Egypt who - due to oppression - attributes himself to Islaam, and who did not feel too ashamed to translate the laws of that transgressing pagan and he called it 'The Code of Justinyaan,' insulting "The code of Maalik," one of the encyclopedias of Islaamic Jurisprudence, which was based upon the Book and the Sunnah, and which is attributed to the Imaam of Dar Al-Hijrah (i.e. Madinah)! So look at the level of absurdity and shamefulness and recklessness of that man!

"These laws, which the enemies of Islaam imposed upon the Muslims due to enmity; in reality it is another religion and **they made it a Deen for the Muslims in replacement of their pure Deen** because they made it obligatory upon them to follow it and obey it. **And they put into the hearts, love and adoration for it** to the point where you see upon the tongues and the pens, words like, 'The holiness of the judgments,' or 'The holiness of the courts,' or 'The holiness of the laws,' and words like these, which

they refuse to describe the Islaamic Sharee'ah or the opinions of the Jurists of Islaam with! Instead, they describe it (i.e. the Sharee'ah) with words such as, 'Reactionism,' or 'Stagnant,' or 'Priesthood,' or 'the Sharee'ah of the Jungle,' or other than that from the evils that you see in the newspapers or the magazines or modern books, which are written by the followers of those pagans...

Commentary: So it is clear that these laws were imposed upon the Muslims by the Kuffaar, the Orientalists, and then perhaps there were those who aided them, those who were munaafiqeen and innovators and other than that, and this is the route by which these laws entered the lands of the Muslims. So look and see O Sunni, the great deceit that these neo-Qutubites are upon, knowing that what is found in most of the Muslim lands was brought by the Kuffar, they are the ones who replaced what remained of the Sharee'ah with their own laws, and thus those (rulers and ruled) who came subsequently, found themselves in a situation in which secular law was referred to over and above the Sharee'ah.

Thus, what the Qutubiyah revolve around of the issues pertaining to removal of the Sharee'ah and replacement with secular laws, then know that this is just something by which they wish to arrive at their real objective which is takfir of the contemporary rulers – most of whom came to power in a situation in which there was little Islamic rule and mainly secular law which was instituted and imposed long before they came to power⁶. However, this takfir is worked upon in order to

⁶ And the likes of this explanation and clarification is what exposes the deceptions of the neo-Khaarijiyyah, and their deceptions in the knowledge-based issues, and their falsely applying the verdicts of the scholars that situations that they cannot apply to. And amongst the sayings that exposes them is the saying of Shaykh Ibn Jibreen – one to whom they have great affiliation and attachment on account of the support that he has given to the Harakiyyoon, by way of some of his statements. He said, "It is known that al-kufr al-bawah (manifest, clear kufr) is an open, outward matter, such as when he abolishes the teachings of Islaam, or we see him for example, destroying mosques, or he fights the people of the mosques (i.e. those who frequent them), or he abolishes the [Sharee'ah] law courts, or he abolishes the religious lessons, for example, or we see him burning the copies of the Qur'aan, or that he orders for them to be burnt, and he promotes, assists the books of misguidance, the books of the Christians, and whatever resembles them, and he spreads them and makes reading them to be binding, or we see him erecting those things that are worshipped besides Allaah, such as idols and the likes. This is considered manifest, clear kufr.

As for the [types of] matters in which ijtihaad can enter into, then we alluded to one of these types last night. And this is what the majority of the rulers (wullaat) are upon, from that which is called "judgement by the secular laws" (hukman bil-qawaaneen), such as these laws, overwhelmingly, the affair pertaining to them is that they consider benefit (maslahah) in them, but they did not abolish the Sharee'ah with a complete abolition, such that they do not judge with anything from it at all. Since Allaah said, "And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed they are the disbelievers" (5:44), so the likes of these, when they have this angle of approach, then we do not speak of their kufr, but we consider them to be in error, in this ijtihaad which involves changing something from the legislation, even if it was by the path of ijtihaad. So for example, their permitting of zinaa [i.e. in action, not as a matter of belief], when it is with the consent of both parties, and likes their abandonment (i.e. of things from the legislation), or the abolition of the

justify their khurooj. Without takfir there is no khurooj. And this is why there is a great fuss with respect to this issue and what they speak about of “tawheed ul-haakimiyyah”.

Text:

So due to these realities and due to the fact that the Muslims became virtually swallowed within these laws of Kufr and their courts and legislations; taking their judgments to these fabricated man-made laws whilst not being aware of the Shirk of this action, some of the people of knowledge began to speak with the term "Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah" in order to stress its importance and emphasize the tie between legislation and Tawheed itself, even though they understood that Haakimiyyah was already within the category of Tawheed Al-Uloohiyyah. And this was similar, historically, to the development of the term Tawheed Al-Asmaa' wa Sifaat, due to the people's denial of the Attributes of Allaah, even though this aspect of Tawheed is included within Tawheed Al-'Ilm wa'l-'Atiqaad, as we pointed out earlier in our discussion of the division of Tawheed by Ibn Al-Qayyim.

Commentary: Look here now at the many aspects of confused thinking based upon errors of fact and understanding come together at this juncture, in order to justify this madhhab of the the Mu'tazili Ash'ari, Sayyid Qutb.

However in order to explain this, we need to go through two different trends that are responses to what happened of the domination of the enemies and removal of Islamic law, one which is Qutubi, Mawdoodiyy, Bannaawee and the other which is Sunni, Salafee, Atharee.

The Qutubi, Mawdoodee, Harakee, Trend of Thought: All of these individuals are driven by the concept of Imaamah (overall leadership), and their background is Ash'ari, Mu'tazili in origin (Mawdudi, Qutb). Their understanding of Tawheed, generally speaking, therefore is restricted to Ruboobiyyah (and which is explained as “the ability to invent, create”), and Uloohiyyah to them is the issue of rulership and authority. They show great confusion between Ruboobiyyah and Uloohiyyah and show confusion with respect to what exactly was the Tawheed that the Messengers called to (Qutb claimed that the Messengers's called to Ruboobiyyah). Anyhow, Uloohiyyah was spoken of as “Haakimiyyah” by Mawdudi, and in reality it meant the concept of Imaamah to him, and in this concept and idea he was strongly influenced by the Raafidah Shi'ah – may Allaah fight and disfigure them

hudood, the punishment for stealing, or the punishment for false slander, or the punishment for drinking alcohol, or permitting alcohol, and announcing the selling of alcohol, and whatever resembles that. There is no doubt, that this is a great sin, however there could be, for example, excuses for them, those in which they consider themselves to be justified (i.e. excused in that). So for example, they excuse themselves from this by saying that in their land they have those people who are not Muslim, and that being severe upon them will make them flee. So when they have an angle of approach, then Allaah will reckon them, but, in any case, there is no doubt that if we judged by the Shar', and implemented its teachings, there would be sufficiency in this and much good.” Cassette: Sharh Lum'uat il-I'tiqaad, No 7, Tasjeelaat at-Taqwaa, Riyaadh.

on top of their disfigurement. Of political inclination, Mawdudi touched upon the issues of rule, rulership and leadership, and developed a thought that portrayed the call of the Prophets and Messengers to be to revolutions and overthrowing current authorities, and that the whole of Islaam, with all its rituals and acts of worship was actually a means towards this end. So given the situation the Ummah was faced with (of domination of the enemies, the removal of the rule of Allaah, the spread of secular laws), the likes of Mawdudi, and after him, Qutb, all wrote and propounded on this concept of Imaamah, Haakimiyyah, and they made it the greatest goal and the uppermost objective, and they tied it to the most exclusive of the affairs of Tawheed. And that their ideology progressed in this direction was because they were Ash'ari, Mu'tazili in their origin, which meant that they were ignorant of the Tawheed that the Messengers were sent with and which the Books were revealed with. Thus, they went in the direction that they did in explaining their da'wah and manhaj. The corruption in the base, led them to corruption in the branch, in otherwords, corruption in aqeedah, led them to corruption in manhaj, or the corruption in their doctrines led them to corruption in the formulation of their da'wah.

And the reality is that they exaggerated in this affair, and this is because being ignorant of the aqeedah of Islaam, and being far away from the madhhab, aqeedah and manhaj of the Salaf, they lacked the insight and deep-rooted understanding with which to tie what occurred to the Muslim Ummah in contemporary times to the Sunan of Allaah in His creation, from a complete and holistic perspective.

Reflect and ponder over what Ibn al-Qayyim (rahimahullaah) said: “..And due to this, knowledge (ma'rifah) of Allaah has two vast doorways: **The first:** reflection and contemplation over all of the verses of the Qur'aan, and attaining a specific understanding (of them) by way of Allaah and His Messenger. **The second:** Reflecting upon His signs that are observed and witnessed, and contemplating over His wisdom (hikmah) therein, His power (qudrah), His kindness (lutf) and benevolence (ihsaan), His justice ('adl) and His establishing justice with the creation.

And the combining of all of that leads to understanding (fiqh) of the meanings of His Beautiful Names and Lofty Attributes, and their perfection, and His being singled out with all of that. Also, [an understanding of] their relation to the creation (i.e. the judgements and will of Allaah in the creation) and the command (i.e. the judgements and will of Allaah with respect to the Sharee'ah). Hence, a person becomes a faqeeh (one who understands [the underlying wisdoms]) of His Commands and Prohibitions, a faqeeh of his Decree and Pre-determination, a faqeeh of His Names and Attributes, a faqeeh of His judgement pertaining to the religion and sharee'ah and the judgement relating to the creation and pre-determination, [as Allaah says] “**And that is the bounty of Allaah, He gives it to whomever He wills, And Allaah is the possessor of great bounty...**” End of quote (al-Fawaa'id p.221).

And Qutb and Mawdudi did not acquire their understanding of the Book and the Sunnah by way of Allaah and His Messenger, since they were Innovators, Ashaa'irah, Mu'tazilah and spoke with the sayings of Jahm, and the aqeedah of Jabar and other affairs of innovation, and they were ignorant of these affairs. And thus with the absence of this knowledge (of aqeedah), which is the root and foundation of a Muslim's understanding, outlook and perspective, they were not granted success in gaining fiqh with respect to the link of Allaah's Names and Attributes to the creation, to His decree and judgement, to His commands and prohibitions, and to the affairs of the Sharee'ah and the world, and to His Sunan in the creation, from a comprehensive, holistic perspective. This was because they were ignorant of the Tawheed that the Messenger's brought, and instead, due to their Ash'ari, Mu'tazili background, brought an innovated understanding of Tawheed, that was restricted, confined and narrowed-down. And built upon all of this, they then propounded thoughts and ideologies that represented methodologies of reform that were far astray and far removed from the methodology that was propounded and enacted by the Messengers of Allaah. And this was actually the birthplace and origin of the concept of Imaamah, first propounded by Mawdudi and then taken on board and developed by Qutb as "Haakimiyah". This concept and idea was born in the residences of the Innovators, the Asharite Mu'tazilites who were ignorant of Tawheed, this was its birthplace and this was its origin, and it was in the homes of the Innovators, that this concept and idea was reared and nurtured. So know and realise the origins of innovation!

Thus as a result of this outlook we see these people focusing the main thrust of their da'wah upon the rulers and pointing all the fingers at them, and making the removal of Allaah's Sharee'ah to be the greatest aspect of Shirk in the current times (over and beyond the Shirk of the graves and in supplication and in worship and so on), and seeing that overthrowing them is the way to salvation and betterment of the Ummah. And so you see them attempting to argue for this manhaj and writing and seeking proof for this manhaj by way of Shubuhaat that are with them surrounding the issues of takfir of the rulers, and make rebellion against them.

The Sunnee, Salafee, Atharee Understanding: And this clear and manifest, as it is what occurs in the Book and the Sunnah and the words of the Salaf, that what occurred of the domination of the enemies, and the removal of Islamic law from most Muslim lands, and the gradual emergence of fear and insecurity, and the onset of tribulations and harms – then all of that is tied to the weakness of the Muslims themselves and their departure from their obligations to their Lord, from the rights of Tawheed, and obedience to Allaah and His Messengers, and from worshipping Him alone and from worshipping Him with only what He legislated of the affairs of worship, and their turning to innovations and sins and disobedience, and their making tabdeel of their religion, replacing the teachings of the Book and the Sunnah with innovations and false ideas, beliefs and actions, being content and occupied with the world, and abandoning striving for the sake of Allaah. And this is

what brought the punishment and humiliation that the Ummah currently lives in – namely what the hands of men have earned.

And if you were to look in all the lands in which the likes of these affairs occurred (i.e. replacement of the Sharee'ah), you will see that they are lands in which there is the greatest deviation from Tawheed, and the aqeedah of the Salaf, and indulgement in innovation and the greatest degree of open, manifest sin and vice. And if you look in the lands where there is the clear Salafi aqeedah, and very little occurrence of Shirk, be that in Allaahs' Names and Attributes, or be that in His Ibaadah, then you will see that Allaah has favoured them greatly with peace, sanctity, security, wealth and otherwise. And so long as they remain upon that, then so long will Allaah's help and assistance remain. Indeed, only those who are blind to Allaah's Sunan and blind to the affairs of Tawheed and Aqeedah can fail to notice this glaringly obvious fact.

And thus, from the above, because Ahl us-Sunnah are upon the correct aqeedah, and have the correct understanding, outlook and perspective and have the correct understanding of the Book and the Sunnah and relate His Names and Attributes to the creation in the correct way, then they treat the condition that the Muslims are in, in light of what the Book and the Sunnah demands, and so their methodology of reform and their da'wah is based around the Book and the Sunnah, from all angles. Thus, it is a comprehensive da'wah, and is all-inclusive, and it addresses, with the relevant priorities, all the various problems and situations, beginning with the base and foundation that is Tawheed and Aqeedah. It does not treat symptoms as causes or causes as symptoms, and it is not a reactionary da'wah that reacts to events and situations that arise (i.e. methodologies are formulated based upon reactions to events – which is in fact the da'wah of the likes of Tableegh, Ikhwaan, Tahreer, Qutubiyyah, Takfiriyyah and others). Rather, this da'wah calls to returning back to the Book and the Sunnah in all affairs beginning with Tawheed and Aqeedah, and in one's ibaadah, and ones' manhah and in one's mu'aamalah and siyaasah and so on, without being restricted to one particular outlook or perspective.

Thus, this outlook necessitates that in those places such as Egypt, or Turkey, or Syria or otherwise, where there is found the Major Shirk, Tasawwuf, Soofism, Ilm ul-Kalaam and many other innovations, as well as open vice and sin, then the way to reform in these places is not clashing with the authorities and bringing further destruction, but to begin where the Prophets began, of calling to Tawheed and the Sunnah, and having patience upon this, and bearing harms upon this, and remaining steadfast upon this, until, with the proliferation of Tawheed and the Sunnah, by Allaah's permission, a people will arise who are nurtured upon the Book and the Sunnah upon the Manhaj of Nubuwwah. So this is the da'wah that is needed in the likes of these countries that are plagued with Shirk and Ilhaad and Zandaqah and Ilm ul-Kalaam and Tasawwuf and other such things.

The strange and amazing thing is that the birthplace of the call of Haakimiyyah, Egypt, you see many of these Asha'ri Mu'tazilis calling to the Haakimiyyah of Allaah and calling for revolution and clashing with the authorities, and in their very midst are the graves of Hussain, Badawi, Sinjar, Tusooqi, Zainab and others, all of which are flocked to, worshipped and called upon – and there are millions who are engulfed in this Shirk, and they do not begin with this, and nor do they make it the major part of their da'wah, rather a fair portion of them (like Hassan al-Banna himself) actually witness this in front of their eyes, and it does not move them to make their da'wah revolve around this as a matter of priority. Then, their da'wah fails, which is takfir and rebellion and assassinations and plots and coups, and when they are oppressed and repressed, and hardship comes upon them (and countless innocent people as well), because they oppressed and wronged themselves by leaving the Book and the Sunnah, and innovating new methodologies and abandoning the rectification of that which should be rectified first, they forget their own oppression and what their own hands have earned, and take to complaining and ungratefulness. And this does not necessitate that the oppression against them by the rulers and authorities is justified, but it is to illustrate their blindness to understanding of the Salaf and of the Sunan of Allaah in His creation.

And how strange and amazing it is that when the likes of these events unfold in front of the eyes of those who are upon the da'wah of these Asha'ri Mu'tazilees, from amongst the Takfeeris and Qutubis, that they do not learn a lesson and they do not realise that the Salafee da'wah and manhaj is nothing but the truth and that they ought to repent and abandon the da'wah and manhaj they took from the Ash'arite Mu'tazilites, Qutb and Mawdoodi, and Soofee Mufawwidhs, like al-Banna, and instead return to the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah.

After all of that let us comment piece by piece upon the words, to illustrate the ignorance and confusion that lies therein:

So due to these realities and due to the fact that the Muslims became virtually swallowed within these laws of Kufr and their courts and legislations; taking their judgments to these fabricated man-made laws whilst not being aware of the Shirk of this action, ...

As for his saying, “whilst not being aware of the Shirk of this action”, then this is an ambiguous generalisation that indicates that this individual is actually influenced by the thought of Qutb and Mawdudi and other Innovators like them.

Firstly, in the situation described, where the Imperialists and Colonialists imposed the secular laws upon the Muslims in their lands, and that these laws became established in these countries and were referred to, then there is tafseel (detail to this matter): If the person judged to these laws thinking them to be better, or equal to Allaah's law, or that they are permissible or lawful, or that Allaah's law is backward and no longer suitable, then this is major disbelief for these people, who take their disputes to these laws. And if they did so, due to desire, or seeing that

they would get a favourable decision in their dispute, or due to wanting to oppress the disputant, or the one judging wants to oppress one of the two disputants or due to a bribe or whatever is like these affairs - while their belief in Allaah's law is established and they acknowledge their sin, then all of this is major sin.

...some of the people of knowledge began to speak with the term "Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah" in order to stress its importance and emphasize the tie between legislation and Tawheed itself,

No, in reality, some of the Innovators, Mu'tazili and Ash'ari in their background, ignorant of what Tawheed actually is, ignorant of the Aqeedah, revilers of the Caliphs, Mockers of the Prophets, Raafidee towards the Sahaabah, they gave birth to Imaamah and Haakimiyyah, and formulated innovated methodologies of reform around it, arguing for revolutions, coups, assassinations and the likes, all of which worked towards takfir upon other than Sharee'ah principles, to enact the route through which the objectives of this methodology can be realised. As for the talbees of this Qutubi here by saying, "...some of the people of knowledge began to speak..." then in reality they are not the people of knowledge, rather they are the Qutubiyah, Bannaawiyyah, like Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq, and Safar al-Hawali and others who took their da'wah of reform from the Mu'tazilis and Ash'aris and Soofee Mufawwidhs – the generality of the Ikhwaan.

And this was similar, historically, to the development of the term Tawheed Al-Asmaa' wa Sifaat, due to the people's denial of the Attributes of Allaah, even though this aspect of Tawheed is included within Tawheed Al-'Ilm wa'l-'Atiqaad, as we pointed out earlier in our discussion of the division of Tawheed by Ibn Al-Qayyim.

And this is falsehood and a lie, and a deception as has already preceded in this discourse. Because firstly, our Salaf explained, by these terms, the overall, all-inclusive Tawheed, that which the Books were revealed with and the Messengers sent with, and it was explained by those Salafee in aqeedah, and who had no innovation or false methodology attached to them. As for this issue of Haakimiyyah and the methodology of reform built around "Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah", then its origin and development came from the Ash'ari Mu'tazilees, jaahil of the aqeedah of the Salaf, jaahil of the affairs of da'wah, Raafidee towards the Sahaabah, Jahmee in Sifaat, Mu'tazili and Ash'aree in aqeedah, Jabaree in Qadr, Asha'aree in his definition and understanding of Tawheed (that it is the ability to invent, create), rejector of Ahaad ahadeeth, denier of the miracles of the Messenger, interpolater of Allaah's attribute of Istiwaa and what is additional to that – and he had with him and adulterated evil manhaj, that served as the basis of the revival of the madhhab of the Khawaarij. And he did not intend to classify the Tawheed that the Books came with and what the Messengers brought, and nor to explain it, since he was Jaahil of the Tawheed that the Messengers came with, (rather he fell into the Shirk of Ta'teel himself, by his adoption of the views of

Jahm regarding the Sifaat and Speech of Allaah⁷) - but rather, coming from this Ash'arite, Mu'tazilite background, he formulated a doctrine and idea that was restricted in scope and vision. And then some false claimants to Salafiyyah took this doctrine on board in later decades, as part of their dawah (which was essentially an extension of that of Qutb and Mawdudi).

And it is as if this Qutubee who wrote these words here is trying to pull a fast one over the reader. First of all trying to justify the reason why the term "Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah" was coined, and then in the same paragraph, trying to lighten the affair by saying, "even though this aspect of Tawheed is included within Tawheed Al-'Ilm wa'l-'Atiqaad", so that the impression left with the reader (and indeed this is the same thing that he does at the very end, when he summarises his article with some points), is that there is no harm with people speaking of this "Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah" independently, and arguing for the corrupt methodology of reform that is built around it.

Then, there is a quote from Shaykh Abdullaah al-Ghunaymaan⁸ indicating the redundancy of separating al-Haakimiyyah as a separate category, followed by a justification from Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq for the new independent category of Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah. And the reply to this justification is in what has already been quoted above from the words of the scholars and explanation of the falsehood behind this. And in reality, this whole article is actually based upon the attempt by Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq to justify the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna, in his speech concerning the justification of Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah.

Then the charlatan makes his conclusions:

Text:

So from what we have discussed above, in the course of this clarification, we understand the following:

⁷ Refer to Ibn al-Qayyim's explanation of the types of Shirk as occurs in al-Jawaab al-Kaafee.

⁸ And Shaykh Abdullaah al-Ghunaymaan is amongst those who have lenience and inclination towards the Qutubiyah and Surooriyyah, as has been pointed out by the other people of knowledge, and amongst them, Shaykh 'Ubayd al-Jaabiree, who said that he is "surooree khateer" (dangerous surooree). And the words of Shaykh al-Ghunaymaan concerning Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah contain a form of lenience and accommodation of the Harakiyyoon, and his word are not of the same clarity that is found in the words of Shaykh al-Albaani, Shaykh Ibn Baaz, Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen, Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan and others, who expose the Harakiyyoon and the Innovators, and what they really intend by this "Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah". So take note of this.

Further, this statement has been addressed in MNJ070005.

1. The terminology, which was developed from the scholars in order to explain and classify the different sciences of the Sharee'ah knowledge, is not from the legislated terminology that Allaah and His Messenger came with. And due to this, it cannot be restricted to particular methods of explanation.

This is the foundation used to enter the Qutubi deception into the midst of Ahl us-Sunnah. As for the phrases used to explain Tawheed and it being divided into either two or three categories, then the Salaf were never divided upon its explanation to begin with, such that this point holds true. Rather the Salaf were united upon its classification, and that some separate out and distinguish between Ruboobiyyah and Asmaa was-Sifaat (both of which come under the Tawheed of Knowledge) does not make it a different classification. Rather it is the same classification, but with an additional detail. And all of the Salaf past and present were united upon this, until the blind, astray, innovators of Bane Qutb, and Aal Mawdudi, Ash'arite, Mu'tazilite in origin came along and innovated into the deen of our Lord and took to the ramblings of the Philosophers in devising adulterated methodologies – due to their actual ignorance of Tawheed – and entered the bid'ah of Imaamah, that they took from the Raafidah (i.e. as was done by al-Mawdoodi), to be reformulated by Sayyid Qutb al-Ash'aree as “al-Haakimiyyah”. Thus, the understanding of Tawheed in this manner, is actually an Ijmaa' as indicated by Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan, and is not something that is subject to the ijtihaad of an Ash'arite Ignoramus of the twentieth century, that is Mohammad Qutb, the Ash'ari Innovator.

Text:

2. The above rule extends to the categorization and classification of Tawheed, as we have seen that some of the scholars and the Salaf, such as Ibn Al-Qayyim and Ibn 'Abee Al-'Izz and other than them, used two categories of Tawheed or explained Tawheed interchangeably between three categories and two for the benefits of explaining and emphasizing its aspects and their importance.

This is baatil and a lie, and Tawheed was not classified for the purpose of “explaining and emphasizing its aspects and their importance” exclusively as this Qutubi tries to deceive the reader, but it was done in order to explain what actually was the overall comprehensive Tawheed that the Messengers came with. However, this is a subtle form of deception by which justification is intended of the Ash'arite, Mu'tazilite refuse in manhaj that came from the ramblings of Aal Qutb and Bane Mawdudi.

Text:

3. Those who claim that using the term Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah is an innovation (Bid'ah); it is upon them to bring the evidence that these terms: Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah, Tawheed Ar-Roboobiyyah and Tawheed Asmaa' wa Sifaat were used by the first three generations of Muslims (i.e. Salaf As-Saalih), otherwise the claim has no basis.

Indeed, this term “Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah” and what is intended by it, by the Innovators, is a bid’ah, even if the noses of the followers of the Asharees and Mu’tazilees who coined it are rubbed and dragged on the ground. This is because the Salafees are upon baseerah with respect to these Innovators, these false claimants to Salafiyyah, who are in reality upon the manhaj of the Ash’arees and Mu’tazilees, of takfir and khurooj.

Text:

4. Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah is not a separate independent category of Tawheed with no link to any other classification, rather it falls beneath the category of Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah as parts of it fall beneath Ar-Rooboobiyyah and Al-Asmaa' wa Sifaat.

If there is anything in the whole of this article that exposes this Jaahil, Ahmaq, then it is this last statement of his, which indicates his foolishness and confusion and bankruptcy.

For the whole of this article, he has been trying to explain and prove that the various terminologies and classifications of Tawheed are subject to Ijtihad and are not restricted to whatever has come from the Salaf of either two or three categories, and that there is no objection or criticism to be shown towards extracting a part of Tawheed and making it a separate classification, and here he totally destroys what has preceded in his discourse and renders it null and void by saying, “Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah is not a separate independent category of Tawheed with no link to any other classification, rather it falls beneath the category of Tawheed Al-'Uloohiyyah as parts of it fall beneath Ar-Rooboobiyyah and Al-Asmaa' wa Sifaat.” And it is more clearer now that his intellect also is not to be depended upon, let alone his knowledge. However, the reality of this last statement is just a political machination, which is that this Qutubi Charlatan knows that the Salafee Scholars have refuted this baatil and this falsehood that came from the Ash’aree Mu’tazilees who invented this terminology and this manhaj, and so in order to portray that he is in conformity with them, he put this point as one of his conclusions. However, this deception is not hidden to us, O foolish one, because what you really intend is to subtly try to play down the seriousness of the whole issue and to play down the fact that it is indeed a bid’ah and is one of the slogans of the Khawaarij of our times, which is why he wrote this pathetic composition, in which he has completely exposed himself right at the very end, and made his whole article completely pointless, for in this point of conclusion, at the very end, is what makes everything he said earlier to be utterly baseless and not even worth writing in the first place!

Text:

5. Due to historical events, some of the people of knowledge began using the term Tawheed Al-Haakimiyyah in order to give emphasis to this aspect of Tawheed and demonstrate its importance and its essential link to the overall Tawheed of Allaah.

Likewise, the Khawaarij of old, due to historic events, they made their slogan, “Verily the judgement belongs to Allaah”, in order to give emphasis to this aspect of Tawheed and to demonstrate its important and its essential link to the overall Tawheed of Allaah. And they exaggerated in this regard and made it the basis of their overall manhaj, and were led to takfir and revolution by way of it. And similarly, the Asha’rees and Mu’tazilees who revived this manhaj in recent times, they coined this phrase, and their whole da’wah is built around it, and nothing but takfir and ideas of revolution have followed from it, and this is what is know and proven by historical realities, such as those of Syria, Egypt, Algeria, and also the Qutubiyah of Saudi Arabia, who were entered into this manhaj by Mohammad Qutb al-Ash’aree.

Closing Remarks

Exactly the same as the opening remarks!

Stated Safar al-Hawaalee, Majnoon Sayyid Qutb al-Mu'tazilee al-Qadaree, actually quoting word for word, the saying of Sayyid Qutb:

“Indeed, the meaning of this announcement is to snatch away the misappropriated authority of Allaah and return it back to Allaah and repel those who usurped it, those who judge the people by way of legislations from themselves, or who lay down for them methodologies of worship and coming closer (to Allaah) besides those that Allaah legislated. And hence, they take the position of Lords towards the people and the people take the position of worshippers towards them... Indeed, its meaning is to demolish the kingdom of mankind in order to establish the kingdom of Allaah upon the earth, or to use the Qur’anic expression, “He is in the Heavens an Ilaah and in the Earth an Ilaah, and He is all-Wise, all-Knowing”.”

And Qutb al-Mu'tazilee also said, “And the establishment of the kingdom of Allaah upon the earth and ending the kingdom of mankind, and snatching the authority from the hands of the usurpers amongst the servants and returning it back to Allaah alone, and giving authority to the Divine Sharee’ah alone, and abolishing the human laws ... all of that cannot be completed by mere tableegh (conveying) and bayaan (explaining), since those who enslave the servants, those who usurp the authority of Allaah in the earth, they will not submit in their authority, with mere tableegh (conveying) and bayaan (explaining).”

Quoted from the book “adh-Dhaahirah” of Majnoon Qutb al-Mu'tazilee al-Qadaree, otherwise Safar al-Hawaali.

The author of “Kashf Akhtaa’ Safar al-Hawaali” says, “I say: Even if he quoted these words from the books of Sayyid Qutb, then he has mentioned them in order seek evidence and argument, and support by way of them. And this speech is not just mere (soo’ ul-adab) bad behaviour towards Allaah, just as some of them have said, “Every disbeliever, every hypocrite, every mushrik, every innovator and every sinner has shown bad behaviour towards Allaah”. Rather this gives evidence to a great corruption in aqeedah, and indeed whatever follows on from this of corruption in the understanding of Tawheed contains a great deal of danger, since it actually indicates an i’tizaali intellect that wallows in I’tizaaal (the aqeedah of the Mu’tazilah). For I do not know any of the sects that have combined between takfeer and qadr except the Mu’tazilah:

So this speech is not just a mere slip of the pen or slip of the tongue, rather it is a firm belief and which is indicated by the actual understanding of tawheed of the person who uttered this speech (and the one who argues by way of it). And no one utters the likes of this speech, or whatever resembles it, except one of the Qadarite Negators. And “al-Qadr is the arrangement (nidhaam) of Tawheed” as has been

said by the Salaf. And when we look into the aqeedah of al-Hawaali, we find that he venerates the Command and Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahee) by way of his veneration of the outward actions, and he makes them to be a pillar from the pillars of Imaan [i.e. upon the way of the Khawarij and Mu'tazilah). And when we add to his extremism in takfeer this matter (i.e. that of al-Qadr) we find that this is pure, hardcore I'tizaaal. Since the Mu'tazilah are Extremists in Takfeer, they venerate the Command and Prohibition, and they do not believe in the good and bad of al-Qadr". End quote.

The essence of the matter:

Takfir and Khurooj! And methodologies aimed at clashing and removing the current authorities, which are set in motion by way of takfir, which is based upon a corrupt understanding of Tawheed (i.e. the understanding of Sayyid Qutb al-Mu'tazilee).

Sayyid Qutb al-Mu'tazilee al-Qadaree stated: "They (the Arabs) used to know the meaning of "ilaah" from their language, and the meaning of "laa ilaaha illallaaha", they used to know that al-Uloohiyyah means "al-Haakimiyyah al-'Ulyaa". They used to know that "Laa ilaaha illallaaha" is a revolution (thawrah) against the earthly authority that has usurped the most special of the characteristics of Uloohiyyah and it is a revolution (thawrah) upon the various structures that are based upon the principle of this usurpation, and it is a rebellion (khurooj) upon the various powers that judge by legislations from their own selves and for which Allaah gave no authority" (az-Zilaal 2/1005).

Alhamdulillah, the Sunnah has been aided and the Innovators exposed and humiliated, and their Asha'rite, Mu'tazilite, Qadarite roots obliterated!

Prayers and peace be upon Allaah's Messenger, his family and companions.