



SalafiPublications.Com
the richest content on the web

GRV070005 @ Www.Salafipublications.Com

Version 1.00

Taming A Neo-Qutubite Fanatic:
A Dialogue With Idris Palmer
The Annihilation of
the Annihilation
PART 1

Contents

Foreword	3
The Accusation of Taqleed.....	9
Suroorism and Qutubism.....	14
The Book “Al-Qutubiyah”	23
Naming with Sunnah and Salafiyah.....	28
Shaikh Rabee’ and Shaikh Muqbil.....	35
Summary Of Part 1.....	56

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 (sallallahu 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 (sallallahu 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.

Reasons for Writing “Taming A Neo-Qutubite Fanatic”

Wrote Abu Zubair al-Kadhdhaabee¹:

A couple of years back, a brother submitted an email, written by Sheikh ‘Ali at-Tamimi where he exposes a destructive movement, that claims to be holding on to the principles of Ahlus-Sunnah/Salafiyah, but in reality, it has innovated many principles and attributed them to Ahlus-Sunnah. Then a brother known as “Abu Khadeeja” tried his best to refute Sheikh ‘Ali at-Tamimi’s post, but only to be refuted and annihilated by brother Idrees Palmer, who not only exposed, but totally destroyed the destructive manhaj of this cult, by giving irrefutable evidences and arguments, that just could not be answered!

The original post by brother Idrees Palmer was about 23 pages long, non-structured and without any subtopics, as one would expect in an email. Therefore in order to make it easier to read and follow, I have divided the post in three sections, and given titles to passages where necessary through out the post.

May Allah reward brother Idrees Palmer for this material, and may He open the eyes of those who have been sucked into the disease of partisanship. (August 28, 2000)

As for the reality of Ali Timimi, then became affected by the Qutubi da’wah and while originally subscribing to the manhaj of the three Imaams of our times and of the Salaf in general on the issues that have been contended by the newly-arisen ones, he then began to imbibe the manhaj of Mohammad Qutb and his sect, and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and his sect, which was not free of extremism and deviation in manhaj. But this discourse is not to explain all of that in detail, since that has been done elsewhere, and shall soon be made available, but the reader may refer to SLF010004 and MSC050003 for general information in this regard.

What is in contention here is what has been claimed by al-Kadhdhaabee:

...where he exposes a destructive movement, that claims to be holding on to the principles of Ahlus-Sunnah/Salafiyah, but in reality, it has innovated many principles and attributed them to Ahlus-Sunnah...

...Then a brother known as “Abu Khadeeja” tried his best to refute Sheikh ‘Ali at-Tamimi’s post, but only to be refuted and annihilated by brother Idrees Palmer, who not only exposed, but totally destroyed the destructive manhaj of this cult, by giving irrefutable evidences and arguments, that just could not be answered!

For this is but a fanciful hallucination which exists only in the mental world of al-Kadhdhaabee and his likes.

As we shall make clear, it is the Qutubi movement that is in actual fact a destructive movement whose destruction that can actually be measured physically, and likewise it is the Qutubi movement which has innovated many false principles in the name of Salafiyah,

¹ Refer to “Tabyeen Kadhib al-Muftaree al-Musammaa bi Abi Zubair al-Azzaami” for an insight into the world of Abu Zubair who feigns Salafiyah, but in fact is poisoned by the partisans of Qutubiyah.

every single one of which has been refuted by the contemporary scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah, foremost amongst them the three Imaams who have passed away (rahimahumullaah)². We shall show the great lie in what al-Kadhhaabee has stated above, inshaa'allaah.

² THE “KHAARIJIYYAH ASRIYYAH” HAVE “OPPOSED MANY OF THE ISSUES OF METHODOLOGY OF THE SALAF”

And the words in quotation marks are from the words of Imaam al-Albaani, in his statement dated 17th Dhul-Hijjah 1417, about this newly-arisen sect who has made the creed and manhaj of the Salaf subject to contention. As for the issues of manhaj for which they were refuted, then they include:

- 1) The bid'ah of al-Muwaazanaah
- 2) The bid'ah of Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah
- 3) Their deviation in the methodology of advising the Rulers
- 4) Their deviation in the methodology of rectifying the society around them
- 5) Their great deviation from the Methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee demolished their adulterated ways, and was supported in all of that by the three Imaams of the Era.
- 6) Their deviation in showing loyalty to the Innovators, Mockers of the Prophets, Revilers of the Caliphs and Mukaffiroon of the Companions and other strayers.
- 7) Their bid'ah of the Multiplicity of groups, being the wicked bid'ah of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, the Innovator of Hizbiyyah.
- 8) Their wicked mannerisms with the People of Knowledge and accusing them with ignorance, senility, lack of understanding of the current affairs, and many other slanders.
- 9) Their accusing the People of Knowledge of propounding the doctrine of the Murji'ah, Jahmiyyah – all of that being based upon their own ignorance of the reality of Irjaa' and the issues related to Imaan and Kufr
- 10) Their innovation and extremism in the arena of political work and politics, since according to them, all of today's societies are societies of kufr due to not ruling by the Sharee'ah of Allaah alone, then they make it obligatory to become involved with political work, within an apparatus which is one of kufr to being with according to their doctrine. Imaam al-Albaani pointed out their great contradiction in all of this. What happened to the Haakimiyyah of Allaah here? Rather, they are the seekers of the thrones of power and authority.
- 11) The unrestricted and generalised takfir of Rulers and Nation states, having been affected by the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb. Their extremism in this regard.
- 12) The reviving the doctrine of the Khawaarij by performing takfir of the Sinners.

And much more. And inshaa'allaah some of these deviations will be addressed in the course of “Taming the Neo-Qutubite Fanatic”. And we will prove that it is they, the Qutubiyyah, who are in fact a destructive sect, with an innovated, adulterated manhaj, in which **NONE** of the major scholars are actually with them. Rather, they only seek support from the generalised statements of our scholars and leave aside their clear and decisive ones, then they claim the Scholars are with them and support them.

BENEFIT: THE KHAARIJIYYAH ASRIYYAH ACCUSE AHL USSUNNAH WITH THE OTHER EXTREME OF WHAT THEY ARE UPON

And this is the way of the Ahl ul-Ahwaa in every generation. When Ahl us-Sunnah follow the middle road, and refute them with knowledge, they accuse Ahl us-Sunnah with the other extreme of what they themselves are upon. And indeed this is what the likes of Mohammad Suroor, Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawaali, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Salman al-Awdah, their loyalists, supporters, partisans and others fell into.

?? So when Ahl us-Sunnah did not agree to the unrestricted, generalised takfir of the Rulers and nation states, and adhered to the tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of judging by other than what Allaah has revealed and the principles of the Salaf concerning takfeer, they were labelled “Murji'ah with the Rulers” and “Jahmiyyah of the Era”. And Safar al-Hawaali actually revived the manhaj of the Mansoori

Kharijites in accusing Ahl us-Sunnah with Irjaa' for not making takfir of the one who leaves the prayer out of laziness and neglect.

- ?? When Ahl us-Sunnah refuted the wicked and evil innovation of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq (as will be discussed in detail in what is to follow) pertaining to his legalising the multiplicity of groups and parties and his justification of the presence and mutual work and collaboration with the sects of innovation, they were labelled "Raafidah with the Islamic Groups". They were also portrayed as making takfir and tabdee' of the Islamic groups, as was explicitly stated by ash-Shayijee, the protégé of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq.
- ?? And when Ahl us-Sunnah defended the Islamic Aqidah and the honour of the Prophets of Allaah, the Caliphs of Islaam and the Companions and the Sharee'ah of Allaah, from the enormities of Sayyid Qutb and other strayers, such as Hassan al-Banna, and those who propounded the adulterated methodologies of the wandering strayers, they were labelled "Khawaarij with the Callers".
- ?? And when Ahl us-Sunnah affirmed the well known manhaj of the Salaf of not collaborating with the Innovators or the sects and groups of innovation or befriending them – in refuting the bid'ah of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq – they were accused of denying "collective work".
- ?? And when Ahl us-Sunnah refuted the exaggeration of the activists in the issue of understanding the current affairs (Fiqh ul-Waaqi'), and the conspiracy theories they had written about and the various "Bogus Promises" they had discussed and bewildered the youth with, they were labelled as "scholars of women's menses and impurities", and "present in body, absent in mind", and "senile" and other such slanders and lies and refer to GRV070004 (Intermediate Qutubism) for a treatment of these issues.
- ?? And when Ahl us-Sunnah (such as Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis and others) correctly expounded the way of the Salaf in advising and correcting the Rulers and the necessity of obeying them in what is good, and not publicising their faults openly, causing commotion and unnecessary turmoil thereby, and when they refuted the various futile arguments the Activists had used in order to justify this open rejection and revilement, they were accused of being "spies" and "paid workers" and "pawns of the government" and other such lies and fanciful hallucinations.
- ?? And when Ahl us-Sunnah (amongst them Imaam al-Albaani) pointed out the great contradiction and bewilderment of the Activists in their declaring all Muslim states to be states of secularism and kufr while they allowed for themselves to work through the political apparatus of these states in order to "rectify the Ummah", and while they enjoined every common person to get involved in Politics and what they called "collective work" they accused Ahl us-Sunnah of denying Islamic Politics.
- ?? And when Ahl us-Sunnah refuted the exaggerated form of al-Haakimiyyah, the Haakimiyyah expounded by Qutb and Mawdudi, and put it in its true and proper context in relation to Tawheed, and when they rejected the bid'ah of Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah, which became the slogan of the neo-Kharijites, they were labelled as "Murji'ah" and "Supporters of the Thrones of the Tyrants" and "the Enemies of Tawheed" and other such wicked lies.
- ?? And when Ahl us-Sunnah refuted the generality of the methodology of Qutb and Banna that had been brought into the ranks of the Salafis at the hands of the Activists and advised adherence to the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and cautioned from the exaggeration in the issues of takfir and haakimiyyah, political work, co-operation with the groups of innovation and the rest of the issues, they were labelled as "Qadariyyah with the Infidels".

And this was the state and condition of the Neo-Qutubites, who had innovated methodologies, ascribed them to the Salafi Da'wah and accused with innovation and misguidance whoever did not agree to their innovations and adulterated approaches and methodologies and their extremism. And whoever desires more in this regard then let him refer to MSC050003 (Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Callers, Raafidah with the Groups, Qadariyyah with the Infidels).

And because some of the confused youth and biased partisans have considered what was written by Palmer to be the truth embodied, it has become necessary to lay bare the truth, for Palmer has not actually defended his own Qutubi manhaj and nor refuted that of the Salaf us-Saalih in what he has written, rather he has merely made an open display of his wanton condition, as shall be explained in what is yet to come, if Allaah wills. And most of these issues have been covered in our coverage of many of the milestones of 2000 when the truth about the neo-Qutubiyyah became more and more apparent, hence much of what can be said in reply to what has been scribbled by Palmer, has already actually been said.

This is similar to when Idris Palmer transmitted the wicked lies of ash-Shayijee around 4 years ago (see below), yet these lies had already been refuted by the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah, it was only a matter of time before the Muslims in the West actually gained more insight into the true and actual orientations of Palmer & Timimi et. al., before realising that what was supposed to be the truth embodied in what Palmer had transmitted [of lies] (from others) was but falsehood and folly embodied, to the core.

And since Idris Palmer is, and has been, amongst the main theoreticians of the Qutubi manhaj in the West, it is necessary to show that the Salafi Manhaj is free of him and his mentors like the freedom of Moosaa (alaihissalaam) from the mockery made of him in the statements of apostasy of Sayyid Qutb – may Allaah forgive him³.

Abul-Fadl Aabaas Ibn Mansoor as-Saksakee (683H), in his powerful Sunni, Salafi treatise said concerning Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah,

“And every sect has called them with a name that is not in agreement with the true reality, out of envy of them and as a fabrication against them. And they ascribed to them (Ahl us-Sunnah) that which they did not hold as their doctrine. So the Qadariyyah labelled them “the Mujbirah”. The Murji'ah called them “the Shakkaakiyyah” (the doubters). The Raafidah called them “the Naasibah”. The Jahmiyyah called them “the Mushabbihah”. The Ash'ariyyah called them “the Mujassimah”. The Ghaaliyyah called them “the Hashawiyyah” (the worthless ones). The Baatiniyyah called them “the Muswaddah”. The Mansooriyyah (a sect of the Khawaarij), and they are the associates of Abdullaah Ibn Zaid, labelled them as Murji'ah due to their saying that the one who abandons the prayer, without rejecting its obligation, is a Muslim based upon the correct view in the madhhab. And they (the Mansooriyyah) say that this saying of their's (i.e. that of Ahl us-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imaan is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them. Rather, they are the Firqat al-Haadiyyah al-Mahdiyyah (the Guiding and Guided Sect) and its creed is the correct creed and the clear and manifest Imaan (faith), that with which the Qur'aan was revealed and which has come in the Sunnah, and that which the Ulamaa of the Ummah from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah have agreed upon.” Al-Burhaan Fee Ma'rifat Aqaa'idi Ahl il-Adyaan, (pp.65-66)

³ NEO-QUTUBITE FANATICS GUILTY OF EXTREMIST IRJAA'

Though the Qutubi Think Tank has attempted to prove that the aqidah of Imaam al-Albaani is Murji' and Jahmi – theoretically speaking – having failed miserably in all of that, walhamdulillaah, the Think Tank itself, alongside its main theoreticians and loyalists are indeed amongst the Extremist Murji'ah, practically speaking. Do you not see O Sunni, how the Qutubiyyah are enraged when Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee refutes the innovations and heresies of Sayyid Qutb, some of them reaching the level of kufr and apostasy. By Allaah, this enrages them more than when the Prophets of Allaah are mocked, and when the Islaam of some of the Companions is negated and when the Caliphs are accused with evil, and when it is claimed that some of the aspects of the Sharee'ah need to be abolished, and that systems of kufr such as Marxist Socialism can improve

the Islamic way of life, and that Islaam is a concoction of Christianity and Communism and shares in some of its ideals.

By Allaah, do you not see how they falsely ascribe to Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee that he said "Shaikh Ibn Baaz stabbed Salafiyyah in the back", a wicked lie indeed, and then they vilify and malign the Shaikh on account of this. And do you not see how whenever they find something to accuse the Salafi Mashaayikh with, they spread all of that in the Eastern and Western parts of the earth. But if what they claimed was true, for argument's sake, then where does that stand compared to mockery of the Prophets, and takfir of the companions and revilement of the Caliph Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and other such wicked actions and statements that emanated from Sayyid Qutb? This shows that the Qutubiyyah are upon Hizbiyyah, Bi'dah and Dalaalah, for if they had merely preached the importance of the Sharee'ah and judging by it alone, and remained upon that, and did not alongside that expound the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb on the issue of takfir, and did not revive the manhaj of Hassan al-Banna, and did not show enmity and hatred against the Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah, then there would be no reason for criticism.

But the issue is not just the issue of their holding a different viewpoint on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, indeed it is also their love of the Innovators and their defence and aggrandisement of them in falsehood, and their adoption of exaggerated and new methodologies, and their belittlement and mockery of the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah and much more. And their great and wicked contradiction, which is all but apparent, until even to the deaf, dumb and blind, in that they accuse with innovation and heresy, some of the notables of the Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah on account of matters, which if even justified to be so – do not reach the level of the statements of kufr and apostasy of their main theoretician and leader, Sayyid Qutb, and who has in fact been refuted by most of the Senior Ulamaa of today, and refuge is from Allaah.

Refer to NDV010001 – NDV010012 to see the refutations of the Ulamaa on the heresies of Sayyid Qutb.

The Accusation of Taqleed

Palmer began:

Assalamu alikum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatu A few days ago, a youth in Birmingham UK forwarded me a post written by another youth in Birmingham, Waheed Alam (also known as 'Abu Khadeejah'), which he entitled "Suroorees Return". What struck me about his post, were two unusual factors, (a) The literary style of his post, which has a banality which is a far cry from his usual polemical tirades which have become a trademark of his writings, and (b) His claim to be replying to a post Ali AlTimimi wrote on Aljazeera over a month ago (Dec. 20, 1998) and (c) His insistence on seeing Ali himself reply.

Had Abu Khadeejah been replying via say, regular (snail) mail or even fax, a delay of a month could perhaps be considered justifiable. Yet in the world of cyberspace, response time to e-mail is usually judged in hours, let alone over a month. This raises a number of questions, specifically whether Abu Khadeejah actually wrote the post, given the fact that Abu Khadeejah and his "Salafi Publications" partner Amjad Rafiq, have in the past, demonstrated themselves to be muqallidoon, who when faced by questions they are incapable of answering, will then pass the questions to their ideologues in via fax, and then post the replies. Insha' Allah, more about this later. In the meantime, this will be a line-by-line discussion of what this ignorant child has written. Hence, my apologies for its length.

Palmer begins by insinuating that Abu Khadeejah was not the sole author of what he had written in reply to Timimi's initial email, and concerning this he is in error. As for the time-delay in responding, then that does not mean that it took a month in writing the reply, for that only took an hour or so. But perhaps what Palmer tries to achieve is to make his audience think that the reply of Abu Khadeejah was constructed for him or dictated to him or taught to him and what is similar to that. And this fits in with Palmer's previous thesis that the likes of Abu Khadeejah and Amjad Rafiq are Muqallidah, as he stated:

This raises a number of questions, specifically whether Abu Khadeejah actually wrote the post, given the fact that Abu Khadeejah and his "Salafi Publications" partner Amjad Rafiq, have in the past, demonstrated themselves to be muqallidoon, who when faced by questions they are incapable of answering, will then pass the questions to their ideologues in via fax, and then post the replies.

What Palmer is referring to here is the occurrences of around the Summer of 96 and in which the separation between the true Salafis and the false pretenders, who in fact imbibed the Qutubi Manhaj, took place. Palmer had been poisoned by the writings of ash-Shayjee, the one who coined the phrase "New Salafiyah" as a result of which Palmer and his associates (the likes of Abu Muntasir, Ali Timimi et. al.) began to show enmity and hatred against those who did not agree to the adulterated teachings of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq – who revived the manhaj of Hassan al-Banna and also became a Shurocrat, encouraging political work within an apparatus and framework, which in the Qutubic ideal, was a framework of kufr to begin with, opposing the methodology of the Prophets in all of that – and also the tumult caused by the likes of Safar and Salman who were in fact pushing the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, via their teachers and mentors, Mohammad Qutb and Muhammad Suroor, from whose direction they had been poisoned.

When the Mashaayikh began to refute and expose the condition of these Activists, and their errors and deviations, and their agenda, much confusion arose. Many were unaware of what was going on. In the midst of this confusion, the partisan Activists, used whatever they could of lies and deception in order to discredit the Madinah Mashaayikh who had begun the Qutubi Inquisition with earnest, foremost amongst them Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee al-Madkhalee, a thorn in the throat of Palmer and all neo-Qutubites. So the Activists claimed that they backbite the Scholars, make tabdee' and takfeer of them, show loyalty to the Rulers, are paid by them, are spies for them and so on. This was the answer to the knowledge based criticisms that were directed at them by the Mashaayikh.

Amongst those who contributed to this devised attack against the Salafi Mashaayikh in general and Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee in particular was Abdur-Razzaq ash-Shaayjee, one of the Kibaar amongst the associates of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and also one of the main referent points of all those poisoned by Qutubiyyah and Hizbiyyah. In fact even worse, a referent point of pure and outright Khawaarij, like Abdullah Faisal al-Harooree al-Khaarijee, al-Azaariqee who is resident in the UK. One may listen to his tape "the Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafis" to see the extent of his filthy nature and condition. **And he depended on the works of ash-Shayjee in his defamation of the Salafis in that lecture of his.**

Anyhow, returning back to the Autumn of 96 (September and October) some discussions has ensued following Abu Muntasir's posting of some old and outdated verdicts of the Scholars concerning working with the groups of innovation and the parties and sects which exist today. That was also the time when Muhammad al-Mis'ari⁴ had made Hijrah to the land of the Queen, and began to seek an audience on the Internet. When al-Mis'ari came across these fataawaa posted by Abu Muntasir he wrote a scathing attack on the Mashaayikh who had given these verdicts, amongst them Imaam Ibn Baaz and Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen.

As a result of this opening of the door of evil, further discussions ensued in which the issue of the Rulers, their not judging by what Allaah has revealed, takfir of them, giving obedience to them etc. was raised by the various participants. When Amjad Rafiq posted aathaar from the Salaf (about 12 or so) on obedience to the Rulers in that which is good (from the book of Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis), and also the verdicts of Imaam Ibn Baaz on not criticising the Rulers from the pulpit, many of those who were concealing takfir did not accept these narrations and claimed that the likes of these narrations only go to support the "apostate"⁵

⁴ He is the Tahriri, Mu'tazili, the one who established the movement of Hizb ut-Tahrir in the peninsula and stated that was his lifelong commitment and he would never abandon it. Salman al-Awdah was amongst those who gave full support to the concoction of this Tahriri, CDLR. The likes of Safar and Salman would take the faxes of Mis'ari in which would publicise the faults or the sins of the Rulers and would read them out to the people. Of course, loyalty and disownment for the sake of the Salafi Aqidah was thrown out of the window in the case of this Mu'tazili, Tahriri, Heretic, who described Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab as a "simpleton" and those who followed him as "simpletons" and he said about Imaam Ibn Baaz that he was on the edge of kuf – and he also many other wicked statements. Refer to the book "al-Qutubiyyah".

⁵ And indeed their well known reply to the ahaadeeth of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) which enjoin obedience to the Ruler, even if he oppresses and takes the wealth and beats the people, and the absence

Rulers. And that those who had compiled and gathered these narrations and authored in this regard were but pawns for the Saudi government and that these narrations were “truth by which falsehood is intended”⁶.

It was here that what Idris Palmer is making reference to occurred. For in what later ensued, Idris Palmer merely parroted much of the mental refuse of ash-Shayjee. So he began to say that Shaikh Rabe’ bin Haadee claimed Imaam Ibn Baaz “stabbed Salafiyyah in the back” and many other statements that he was quoting verbatim, but without reference to any cassette recording where this could be verified, and checked, though he quoted references for some (i.e. Shaikh Rabe’e’s statements on Ikhwaan and Tabligh – and this will be dealt with in the continuation of this series, inshaa’allaah), he did not quote references for all of what he claimed about the statements of Shaikh Rabe’e’. And nor did he quote any narrators in his chain for what he claimed. And this is the way of the likes of ash-Shayjee, in that they refute, for the most part, by not quoting from sources that can be readily verified and checked.

So when Palmer brought all of this out in the open, then it was something that could neither be denied and nor accepted immediately, but rather required verification. So our reply to Palmer was that these affairs and these claims that he had made about Shaikh Rabe’e’ and Shaikh Abdus-Salaam al-Burjis would be referred back to these Shaikhs themselves so that a confirmation can be made about what was claimed, and that we were not capable of replying to what had been raised. And hence it was said to Palmer by Amjad Rafiq:

I haven’t forgotten your post and do intend to reply. However since I do not have the capacity to answer some of the things you have mentioned in your posts regarding Burjis, Rabe’e and others whom you alluded to (such as Abdullaah al-Farsee etc.) - your messages (and also mine so they understand the course of the discussion) have been passed on to them via fax. I await their response to your emails and the statements you made regarding their manhaj and aqeedah etc... Once I get the reply, I will post it inshaa’allaah. Until then, please have patience. (96-10-15 09:18:19)

For one can only confirm or deny accusations and claims like these if one can verify them and speak about them with knowledge, and in the absence of any of that, one cannot reply.

Now this is what Palmer is alluding to when he claims:

of coming out against him in revolt is that “this is for a Muslim ruler”, and this shows that they in reality conceal and hide absolute and unrestricted takfir, for if they did not, they would not have shown this type of deception which has become their hallmark, and this shows that they are upon extremism with respect to takfir of the Rulers, in that they do not adhere to the tafseel that is required in this regard. What is not disputed is takfir of the Rulers, but it is how to arrive at that, which the Qutubites have made subject to contention, their saying necessitates takfir absolutely and unrestrictedly.

⁶ And as we told the perpetrator of this insult against the Sunnah and the Aathaar, Khalid Hussain al-Jbaihi, that these aathaar, in and of themselves are the truth, and what they indicate is the truth, and whether they are used by someone in falsehood or truth, they still have to be submitted.

This raises a number of questions, specifically whether Abu Khadeejah actually wrote the post, given the fact that Abu Khadeejah and his “Salafi Publications” partner Amjad Rafiq, have in the past, demonstrated themselves to be muqallidoon, who when faced by questions they are incapable of answering, will then pass the questions to their ideologues in via fax, and then post the replies.

And the truth of the matter is that this is not a matter of taqleed. For if we had said to Palmer that in such and such a place on such and such a date, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq said such and such, and in such and such a conference in so and so place Mohammad Qutb had said this, and al-Awdah had said that, then we do not believe that unless Palmer was upon knowledge of these events that he could affirm or deny them immediately, without recourse and investigation. And we are sure that he would not consider himself to be a Muqallid in any of this.

Then what Palmer is attempting to achieve with his words above, cannot be achieved. For if a person does not know, and cannot answer upon sure knowledge of what is being claimed by the opponent and the accusations made, then what is befitting that he says “I don’t know”, then verifies what was claimed and stated, and to then present the answer along with the proof or explanation and so on.

Further, what Idris Palmer had regurgitated was in fact his own taqleed of Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayjee, for he brought nothing from himself, but had blindly followed what ash-Shayjee had fabricated in his two books on “New Salafiyah”, which were in fact directed to Shaikh Rabee’ in particular. And the claims and lies and enormities of Shayjee have been annihilated already, and our response to Idris Palmer, once we learnt that he was merely a Muqallid of ash-Shayjee, was posted on the web page, and it consisted of a specific reply to the fabrications that Idris Palmer had transmitted from ash-Shayjee. For we were unaware that Palmer was transmitting the wicked lies of ash-Shayjee, which had already been refuted by our Ulamaa.

For Palmer was not the originator of these claims, he was merely a Muqallid who conveyed them, and as we subsequently informed him:

So the materials which Br. Idrees posted over last summer regarding ‘Salafiyah al-Jadeedah’ then I understand that these materials were taken from either the works of Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayjee or Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq... Idrees Palmer has merely conveyed the lies of ash-Shaayjee and others and has not brought anything from himself - so he is not worthy of being replied to. (June 1997).

As for the lies of ash-Shayjee, then the reader is referred to NDV100001 – NDV100009. **As for Idris Palmer, then he is a mere Muqallid in his lies**⁷ So the Muqallid is actually Idris Palmer, and he accused us with his own iniquity, and then slowly danced away. And as for us then we neither defended nor found fault with Rabee’ or Burjis, for we at that time could not verify the veracity of what was claimed by Palmer.

⁷ And for a more detailed treatment of what these lies were, refer to what is to come in this treatise and also MSC050003 (Murji’ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Callers...).

And this is similar to what was later to be claimed by Idris Palmer around the end of 1998, when he claimed that Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee had been imprisoned by the authorities (!!). He spread this rumour spreading a report from an unknown source. So we did not reject it and nor did we accept it. In fact it took us quite a while to get a reliable report from the Shaikh himself, before we held a stance on it. So does this mean that we became Muqallidah on account of this?!!

The truth of the matter is that Palmer the Fanatic had been filled with a stock-barrel of lies from ash-Shaayjee's Arson of Lies, which he threw in our direction, and we could not confirm or disconfirm them, and hence did not reply to them until we were upon sure knowledge regarding what had been said. And in what is to follow, we shall demonstrate further, that Palmer is indeed a Muqallid, and a Fanatical one at that too.

Suroorism and Qutubism

Palmer continued:

The titling seems to indicate that Abu Khadeejah is inferring that Ali is a “Suroori”, while Allah says, “wala tanaabazoo bi lalqaab.” (“... nor insult one another by nicknames.”) [49:11] Moreover, for years it is well known that Ali is critical of aspects of Muhammad Suroor’s teachings (as he is of other groups and personalities). If asked regarding that, Ali will unhesitatingly explain as to why. The difference here however, is that this ignorant person and his ilk simply enjoy defaming anyone who disagrees with them by calling them names like ‘Suroori’, ‘Qutubi’, etc. Indeed their dawah is based solely on defamation and insulting others.

If only Palmer had directed this advice to his own mentors and leaders years before. If only Palmer had directed this advice to where it was actually needed when the likes of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah had begun their defamation of the honour of the Scholars, merely reviving the manhaj of the Mu’tazilah of old, who labelled the “thought” of Hasan al-Basri and Muhammad Ibn Seereen as “not extending beyond the torn cloths of menstruation”. It is not our aim here to merely repeat what we have covered elsewhere of the vile and vicious attacks made by the neo-Qutubiyah against the Salafi Mashaayikh⁸, but the point is that it was the neo-Qutubite agenda that required the worth of the Scholars in truth to be reduced, that they be declared ignorant of the “fiqh ul-waaqi”, that they be portrayed as being controlled and forced to make flattery, that they be portrayed as “perfect ignorance” and so on. It was the Qutubi da’wah that was based upon defamation and insulting others. Does Palmer not know how Muhammad Qutb, the mentor of Safar al-Hawali, used to describe the Salafi Mashaayikh of Saudi Arabia. Is Palmer not aware of Qutb’s insults and his belittlement of our Scholars? And what then of the vicious insults of Muhammad Suroor, the mentor of Salman al-Awdah? And indeed it was this manhaj of Mohammad Qutb and Mohammad Suroor that was propounded by the two who became puppets for them in the peninsula. Let Palmer direct this advice to where it is actually due and let him show some sense of justice. The reader is referred to Intermediate Qutubism (GRV070004) and the section entitled “Slaves of the Slaves of the Slaves...” to see the wicked lies, defamation and insults that came from the direction of these ones. Indeed, the da’wah of the Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah depended on this type of defamation and insulting.

Further, when the likes of Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee came to know of the condition of the likes of Safar al-Hawali, and their preaching of the doctrine of the Khawaarij, he began to refute them in open and in private, and he sent them advice by way of cassettes and otherwise. Indeed, in the cassette “Nasihah Ilaa Safar al-Hawaali” there are some mighty truths and an illustration of the affectations of Safar al-Hawali to the Khariji manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, as the Shaikh said to him, openly and clearly, , **“What is all this tumult about the Salafi Aqidah?!... You preach the Salafi doctrine in theory and then you call to the doctrine of the Khawaarij practically?!...”**. The reader is referred to it. Anyhow, when the Shaikh began to scold the newly-arisen ones, the followers of the likes of Safar and

⁸ Refer to GRV070004 (Intermediate Qutubism) for a coverage of some of these slanders and defamations.

Salmaan began to use the label “Jaamiyyoon (the Jaamees)”, in defamation of the Shaikh and whoever was aware of the deviation of Safar and Salmaan and who did not join them in it. Then in addition when Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee began to refute the Reviler of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and the Mocker of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam) and when he also refuted the innovated manhaj of Salmaan al-Awdah, the partisans used the term “Madkhaliyyoon”, the Madkhalis. Indeed, they started this defamation and insult, all in falsehood, and they began the affair by their assault against our Mashaayikh. But Palmer does not wish that you should come to know this, or be reminded of it.

He does not wish that you come to know that this fitnah started when the Activists imbibed the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and then began to preach it to the youth, taking them away from the Major Scholars, belittling them and ridiculing them, and leading them to the preachings of takfir and revolution and all of what is connected to that. He does not wish that you come to know that when the Madinan Mashaayikh came to see all of this from the direction of these ones, that they began to give them sincere advice, which they rejected. Indeed, even the likes of Shaikh Saleem al-Hilaalee, in the very house of Safar al-Hawaali, advised him for around 5 hours or so, and Shaikh Muqbil bin Haadee personally advised Salman al-Awdah by phone on 3 occasions – and whoever wishes to verify this, then the Shaikhs are alive and being sustained, and this is recorded both on cassette (in the case of Shaikh Saleem) and on paper (in the case of Shaikh Muqbil) – so the Mashayikh from outside and inside Saudi advised the Activists, out of sincerity of purpose, but to no avail. Then the affair was reached when the Activists knew that the Mashaayikh would refute them openly, and their affair would be exposed, they began to cause confusion and dissension and this is when they began their propagandist campaign. Many of those who were attached to these activists, due to what they had seen from them of preaching and calling to the religion, became deceived by them, and fell into partisanship, and coupled with their ignorance failed to understand the realities, as they had already been nurtured upon the Qutubi, Suroori da’wah at the hands of the Activists.

So the Forelock of Palmer hates that you should see all things from a historical perspective, and that you should understand the true realities as they expired.

As for them being Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah, then that is indeed the truth embodied, for they have subscribed to and have been affected by the Khariji manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and its various manifestations in modern day times, the most apparent of them being what is propounded by Mohammad Suroor and his sect and also the likes of Mohammad Qutb and his sect, and they are collectively Surooriyyah, Qutubiyyah on account of their influences and on account of their use of the books of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and Mohammad Suroor as the foundations of their manhaj. So they are Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah in truth.

Then Palmer is actually of the same school of thought as Salim Morgan, who had stated recently:

Quite simply: there is no such thing as “Qutbism”. It is a spectre and the fantasy of certain people. It leads them to such idiotic position as to put Sh. Safar and Sh. Al-Awda in the same “bucket” with the likes of At-

Takfeer wa Al-Hijra. May the perpetrators of this nonsense stand before Allah right next to those they have slandered on Qiyama. Oh Allah! Allow me to witness your justice on that day. -- Salim Morgan

And thus what was said in reply to Morgan can actually be said to Palmer:

“And this but illustrates the great depths of his ignorance, ignorance of the true realities, and his ignorance of the Salafi Manhaj. It is as if Morgan [and Palmer] – by his reasoning – is saying that quite simply there was no such man named Sayyid Qutb who authored “Milestones” and “az-Zilaal” and other books propounding the theories of the Khawaarij, and who performed takfir of all contemporary Muslim societies, and of all rulers and nation states, and who called for destructive Jihaads against the Ummah.

It is as if Morgan [and Palmer] pretends to be blind to the saying of al-Qaradawi, “And it was in this period that the books of the Shaheed⁹, Sayyid Qutb appeared, the books that **represented his final thoughts** (in ideology, before his death). Those which **justified the takfir of (whole) societies..** the breaking of all sentimental attachments to society, breaking off ties with others, and **the announcement of a destructive jihad against the whole of mankind. And showing contempt against the du’at who call for lenience and softness, accusing them of idiocy, and being defeatist.** [Saying all of this], in front of the western civilisation. He made this manifest, in the most clear manner in the tafsir, “Fee Zilaal il-Qur’aan”, in the 2nd edition and in ‘Ma’alim fit-Tariq’ (Milestones), and the bulk of it is taken from ‘Zilal’ and ‘Al-Islam wa Mushkilat al-Hadaarah’ and others...”¹⁰

And then perhaps he is also ignorant of the saying of Fareed Abdul-Khaliq, Murshid of the Ikhwaan: “We have pointed out in what has preceded that the spread of the ideology of takfir occurred amongst the youth of the Ikhwaan who were imprisoned in the late fifties and early sixties, **and that they were influenced by the ideology of the Shaheed Sayyid Qutb and his writings. They derived from these writings that the society had fallen into Jahiliyyah (of kufr), and that he had performed takfir of the rulers who had rejected the Hakimiyyah of Allaah by not ruling by what Allaah has revealed, and also takfir of those ruled over (i.e. civilians), when they became satisfied with this.**”¹¹

And perhaps he is also ignorant of the emergence of Qutubiyyah in Algeria – all of which led to the disaster in the 1990s. “And if you are ignorant of the Qutubiyyah – and I do not think that is the case – then come with me that I may give you a small glimpse of them, and this is in reference to the Algerian Qutubis, and the people of Makkah are most familiar with its streets¹². This astray sect (the Qutubiyyah) appeared in the 80s having been influenced by the tafsir ‘az-Zilal’ which was in those days a revered and precious book– and it

⁹ It is not permissible to state “Shaheed So and So” without adding to that, “Inshaa’allaah”, since this is in opposition to the Sunnah and is the way of the Murji’ah. Imaam Bukhari included a chapter in the ‘Book of Jihad’ in his Sahih entitled, “Chapter: It is not to be said, so and so is a Shahid”.

¹⁰ Priorities of the Islamic Movement (p.110)

¹¹ In ‘Ikhwan ul-Muslimoon Fee Mizanil-Haqq’ (p.115)

¹² Meaning a resident of a place is most familiar with the true condition of its inhabitants.

has never stopped being so – which competed with the likes of at-Tabari and Ibn Kathir. A specific and very open type of propaganda was made for this book and it was subsequently sold in all the bookshops and was featured in all the national exhibitions until any student who did not have it in his house was not worth anything...” Abu Abdul-Bari’ Abdul-Hamid bin Ahmad al-’Arabi in his book “Baree us-Saham” in refutation of the Qutubi, ‘Adnan Ar’oor.

And then perhaps Morgan [and Palmer] will feign ignorance of the saying of one of the Qutubite figureheads, Salaah as-Saawee, who said, “**As for the Qutubiyyoon (the Qutubis)**, then their methodology (manhaj) is based primarily upon the issue of legislation (tashree’), explaining its link with the foundation of the religion and explaining that the various flaws that have engulfed the legal structures in our contemporary societies nullify the contract of Islaam and demolish the very basis of Tawheed. **It is also known that the books that represent this particular orientation and which outline its methodology are the books of the teacher, Sayyid Qutb – may Allaah have mercy upon him – in the field of da’wah and public speeches.**” (Madaa Shar’iyat il-Intimaa ilal Ahzaab wal-Jamaa’at al-Islaamiyyah p.171).

And after all of this, the forelock of Morgan [and Palmer] claims that there is no such thing as “Qutubism” [or Suroorism]. And the Madinan Mashaayikh were the first to detect “Qutubism” being preached by the likes of Safar and Salman, and the book “Qutubiyyah” was authored in this regard to uncover this scandal – the book which the Qutubiyyah themselves burned in Dhammaam, Saudi Arabia. And likewise, our Mashaayikh and Imaams confirmed the existence of a “Qutubi Manhaj”, such as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan (refer to NDV010011 for details).

And it is as if Morgan’s [and Palmer’s] forelock has reasoned that unless a person says “I am a Kharijee” that he cannot be adhering to the doctrine or ideology of the Khawaarij, either in part or in whole.

Stated Abu Muhammad al-Yamani (d. approx. 550H), “Know, may Allaah strengthen you, that they (the Khawaarij) split into twelve groups: The Azaariqah, the Ibaadiyyah, the Safariyyah, the Baheesiyyah, the ‘Ajjaariyyah, the Fadliyyah, the Najdaat, the Ghawniyyah, the Madbakhiiyyah, the Akhnasiyyah, the Shamraakhiyyah, the Bakaariyyah, the Ma’loomiyyah, the Yazeediyyah, the Bakriyyah, the Abdaliyyah, the Maghaalibiyyah and the Salatiyyah. **All of the sects from these sects are ascribed to their respective Shaikh and to its particular books..**” (Aqaa’id ath-Thalaath Was Sab’eena Firqah, p. 18).

Then, Abu Muhammad al-Yamani looks at the teachings of each one of these groups and the particular person they are named after (having taken him as their Shaikh and his works as their referent point).

So we say, that the Qutubiyyah are an offshoot of the Khawaarij, their Shaikh is Sayyid Qutb and there reference points are his works, such as those mentioned earlier. Qutb propounded the doctrine of the Khawaarij and encouraged takfir and khurooj. And as for the Qutubites themselves, then they are those who promote the books of Qutb and defend him and aggrandise him, such as Safar al-Hawali, and Salman al-Awdah and Muhammad Suroor and

Muhammad Qutb and so on. And it is concerning the likes of these that Imaam al-Albaani said, “the Khawaarij of the Era”(!!) O Morgan [O Palmer], this is what you call “the fantasy of certain people”(!!). And they are but our Mashaayikh and Imaams(!!). Qutubism is Kharijism. It is Khaarijiyyah. Just like Ibaadism, and ‘Ajaarism, and Fadlism, and Bakaarism (i.e. the teachings of those mentioned above) are all Kharijism(!!). [And those who subscribe to the methodology of Qutb are Qutubiyyah!! Whether they call themselves by that name or not!! For the Khawaarij never said “We are the Khawaarij” and nor did the Mu’tazilah say “We are the Mu’tazilah” but they were labelled as such on account of the doctrine they followed or on account of particular characteristics that they had exhibited.]

[As for the Surooriyyah, then they are the sect of Mohammad Suroor. And his books, writings and magazines are the source references for this sect. Amongst those who subscribe to Suroor and his manhaj and his agenda are the likes of Salman al-Awdah who as a youth was recruited by Suroor in Kuwait, back in the early 1980s, and who has since been nurtured under the wings of Suroor and his writings and his doctrines].

And perhaps this ought to lift the madness of Morgan [and Palmer] and his oblivious and perfidious denial of the true realities, and the depths of his ignorance of Islamic history and the emergence and splitting of the sects, [and how the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah exposed them and refuted them and labelled them after their founders and theorists. And this has continued until this day, and will continue until the hour is established.]” End of quote from MSC050003.

Abu Abdullaah Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Mufarraj said, “Abu Ja’far Ahmad bin Awn illaah (d. 378H) would show rejection against the People and Innovation and call them to account, showing extreme harshness against them, utterly humiliating them, always seek to pick out their faults, rushing to damage them, vehemently oppressive against them, chasing them away whenever he was able to, not allowing them to remain. And every one of them (Ahl ul-Bid’ah) used to be frightened of him, and would seek to hide and protect himself from him. He would never compromise with a single one of them, and nor would he allow any of them to remain safe. And if he came across evil and witnessed any deviation from the Sunnah, he would oppose it and would disgrace and humiliate (its perpetrator), and he would announce the affair of this person and declare his own disownment of him by mentioning the evil of such a one in the various public gatherings, and he would incite others against him such that he either destroyed him or caused him to abandon his evil and repugnant madhhab and his evil doctrine. And he would never cease to remain upon this habit, making Jihaad therein, seeking the Face of Allaah, up until he met Allaah.” (Taareekh Dimashq 5/118). And he is the Muhaddith, Imaam, Ahmad bin Awn illaah bin Hudair Abu Ja’far al-Andalusee al-Qurtubee (d. 378H).

Palmer should be grateful that the likes of Shaikh Rabee’ have not gone to these lengths in order to disgrace the Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah, for this was the well-trodden path of the Salaf towards those who abandoned the way of Sunnah and Salafiyyah and began to propound the adulterated methodologies of Ahl ul-Ahwaa. And the greatest fitnah of our times, in the Salafi da’wah, has been brought about by the likes of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Safar al-Hawaali and Salman al-Awdah who have infused the manhaj of Sayyid

Qutb and Hassan al-Banna into the Salafi youth, causing dissension, differing and splitting. And at the same time they mocked and ridiculed our Scholars, accused them of ignorance, not knowing anything of the affairs of the world, until Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq reached the limit of calling Imaam as-Shanqeete, “perfect ignorance” (al-jahl ut-taamm). So there is no doubt that the likes of **these “opposed many of the issues of the methodology of the Salaf”** and became Qutubiyoon, Surooriyyoon.

Safar al-Hawaali, in his doctrinal farce, “Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa”¹³, one of a series of farces that illustrated his departure from the dictates of Sunnah and Salafiyah, quotes Sayyid Qutb on numerous occasions, and then equates him with Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab, when he says, “Indeed those are few, those who when they call to the correction of Imaan and the exposition of its meanings and explain kufr and its manifestations to the Ummah, and its great danger. **We find that in turn, the Ummah stands in their faces and accuses them of making takfir of the Muslims, as occurred with Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and the Shaheed, Sayyid Qutb**”. (Dhaahirah p.83). And using the word Shaheed for someone without making the exception (istithnaa) is from repugnant Irjaa (!!)

Salman al-Awdah, one of the hardened of all of the Qutubites, states “That which I worship Allaah with is that the teacher, **Sayyid Qutb is from the Imaams of Guidance and Religion, from amongst the Callers of Rectification and one of the Carriers of the Islamic Thought (Fikr). He used his thought and his pen to defend Islaam, explain its meanings and to repel the doubts of its enemies, to establish and affirm its beliefs (aqaa'id) and rulings (ahkaam) in a manner that very few people in these times have embarked upon...**”(!!!) (The View of Salman al-Awdah on Sayyid Qutb, written and released 22/6/1421H). How deep is the ignorance (or the feigning of ignorance) of Salmaan of the one whom he praises.

Which aqidah did Sayyid Qutb explain and defend? The aqidah of the Rafidah, the Jahmiyyah, the Ash'ariyyah, the Soofiyyah, the Mu'tazilah?! Or the Salafi Aqidah?! Indeed, the only reason for the attachment of these newly-arisen ones to Sayyid Qutb and his books and his manhaj is because of what they are upon of Revolutionary Takfirism, for their saying is the same as the saying of the Khawaarij of old who exaggerate in the affair of takfir. For the Haakimiyyah of Qutb and Mawdudi is what supports their call, and hence their extraction of their manhaj from the works of these two.

Safar al-Hawali quotes verbatim what has actually been said by Sayyid Qutb: – “What is the core issue on account of which the Prophets, Martyrs and the Righteous fought for?” and he continues a page later, “**...If the reality of worship had been but the mere rituals of devotion**, then none of this would have deserved the sending of a convoy of Messengers and Messages. The Tawheed of Uloohiyyah, the Tawheed of Ruboobiyyah, the Tawheed of Qawaamah, the Tawheed of al-Haakimiyyah, the Tawheed of the source of the Sharee'ah, the Tawheed of the methodology of life, the Tawheed of direction by which the people

¹³ And an excellent refutation of this farce will soon be presented, being based upon the refutation of Imaam al-Albaani of this book, who described it as “the extremity in evil” and who also said about its author, “I did not believe that its author would reach this level”. Refer to “Fitnat ul-Asr” (2 Cassettes) and also “Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah” and refer also to the lecture of Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi in Birmingham 29th July 2000.

conduct their worldly life completely ... this is the Tawheed that is deserving of all the Messengers to be sent (for its sake).!!” (Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa pp. 94-96).

As for the Tawheed of Uloohiyyah, then that is but the rituals of devotion. And as for Ruboobiyyah then that is not differed about. So to Sayyid Qutb and Safar al-Hawali (and also to Mohammad Suroor and Mohammad Qutb), the actual call of the Messengers was to al-Haakimiyyah. It should come as no surprise that the actual supervisor of this work of al-Hawaali was none other than Mohammad Qutb, the one who said, “The meaning of Laa ilaaha ilallaaha is ‘There is no deity but Allaah, there is no Haakim (ruler) but Allaah’”. (Hawla Tatbeeq ash-Sharee’ah pp.20-21). He also stated, **“Certainly, the matter requires that the people be called afresh to Islaam.** Not so because they – in this time – refuse to say with their mouths, ‘Laa ilaaha ilallaaha Muhammad Rasoolullaah’, as the people use to refuse to say it in the very first strangeness [i.e. the call of the Prophet Muhammad]. **But [more so] because they – in this time – reject the principle requirement of ‘Laa ilaaha ilallaaha’ and that is judging to the Shari’ah of Allaah”** (Waqi’una al-Mu’asir p.29).

Stated one of the Kibaar of the Qutubiyyah, Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid, “Reading the books of those who have passed before us has established a strong attachment in our souls for this religion, because they write from a position of strength and superiority. And for this reason we also encourage the people to read the modern books, those which are written by the Muslim with the spirit of superiority, such as the books of Sayyid Qutb (rahimahullaah”. (Cassette: K aifa Taqra’a Kitaaban).

And he also says in his book “Nasihah Li Islaah al-Buyoot” (p.23), “And here, my brother, reader, are some suggestions in this regard: In Tafseer... “Fee Dhilaal il-Qur’aan” of Sayyid Qutb.” And he also said on (p.24), “Just like there are a number of good books on a variety of different issues, amongst them the books of the Teacher, Sayyid Qutb (rahimahullaah), such as “Al-Mustaqbal Lihaadha ad-Deen”, “Haadha ad-Deen”, “Ma’aalim Fit-Tareeq (Milestones)”, “Khasaa’is at-Tasawwur al-Islaami...”.

And Muhammad Sa’eed al-Qahtaanee says in “al-Walaa wal-Baraa” (p215), “And some of the Noble Scholars from the scholars of the Muslims have written on this subject with that which heals and is sufficient...” and then he adds in the footnote to this, “I make mention of some of them, Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, Allaamah Ibn al-Qayyim, Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and his students, and from the contemporaries, the two noble teachers, Abul-A’laa Mawdoodi and Sayyid Qutb” (p.215).

And he also says in the footnote on page 237, “And there are some noble writes who have brought about benefit, amongst them the teachers: Dr. Muhammad al-Bahhee, the teacher Sayyid Qutb, the teacher Mohammad Qutb, and the teacher al-Mawdudi.” On page 347 he says, “The Rabbaani scholar, Sayyid Qutb”.

And the reality is that all of these ones have become affected by the Qutubi manhaj at the hands of the likes of Mohammad Qutb, Mohammad Suroor, Sayyid Qutb and Mawdudi, **and their attachment to these individuals, is not because they are Salafi, Athari, Sunni, in their aqidah and manhaj, but because they are Harakiyy (Activists), Thawriyy**

(Revolutionaries) and du'aat of al-Haakimiyyah, the restricted, narrow Haakimiyyah, as a result of which they have exaggerated in the arena of takfir, as did their mentor, chief and leader, Sayyid Qutb.

And the difference between us and them is that they have thrown aside the rules and principles by which takfir is made of a specific individual and have made absolute their judgement of takfir by applying the apparent meaning of the verses in al-Maa'idah to all the Rulers of today, without exception. And they have built their manhaj around this topic, such that anyone who agrees with them is a Sunni and anyone who disagrees with them, and curbs them is a Murji', Jahmee, wallowing in the beliefs of Jahm Ibn Safwaan.

And we do not deny or negate takfir of the Rulers, but that is based upon the tafseel of the Salaf and subject to the resulting harms and benefits that may arise. But as for them then there way is but bringing about undue commotion and tribulation¹⁴. And inshaa'allaah, this will be explained in detail in a future paper, if Allaah wills.

So in short, indeed they are the Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah and they are **“Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah”**.

¹⁴ Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, “These words are very good (i.e. Imaam al-Albaanee’s). Meaning, that those people pass judgement against the Rulers of the Muslims, that they are disbelievers, what benefit do they achieve by judging them to be disbelievers? Are they able to put an end to them? They are not able. And when it is the case that the Jews have occupied Palestine for around 50 years, yet despite that the Islamic Ummah has not been able in its entirety – Arabs and Non-Arabs alike – to remove them from their place! **How then, after this, can we go and strike those who rule over us with our tongues (i.e. make takfir of them) while we know that we are not capable of putting and end to them, and that blood will be shed, and the taking of wealth will become lawful, and even the honours of people. And then we will not even have achieved the desired result!! Therefore, what is the benefit – such that if a person was to believe – in that which is between him and his Lord – that amongst the rulers is one who is a disbeliever in truth, with the kufr that ejects from the religion - what then is the benefit in announcing this and spreading this, except the kindling of tribulation?!”** (Fitnah of Takfir, p.74).

But this is the way of the Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah, Khaarijiyyah [‘Asriyyah], whose whole manhaj is based around takfir of the Rulers, and announcing that in all the corners of the world and labelling whoever does not agree with their wicked manhaj as being Murji’ah and Jahmiyyah.

Imaam Ibn Uthaimen also said about Imaam al-Albaani, **“Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa’ has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa’...We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji’ – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication. Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!”** Source: Cassette: Makaalmaat Ma’a Mashaayikh ad-Da’wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4).

And indeed the one who spread this affair and who opened up this door of evil was that unfortunate doctor who neither knew the reality of Irjaa’, nor that of the three Imaams of the Era, who in the view of the doctor, are Murji’ah, and nor the limitations of his own self and his wallowing the madhhab of the Khawaarij, have been affected by the Innovators such as Sayyid and Mohammad Qutb.

Now what will the Fanatic say to the words of Imaam al-Albaani, if we were to say that our saying is but the saying of Imaam al-Albaani, the one whose words of old they use to defend Sayyid Qutb and his heretical manhaj, what will this Fanatic now say if we told him that that which we hold about the unfortunate doctor who accused the Ummah with Irjaa', that we hold he is amongst the theoreticians of "**The Khawaarij of the Era**"!!!! Upon whom will the Fanatic's wrath descend?? And what is stronger, labelling them with "Qutubis" and "Surooris" or labelling them with "Khawaarij"?! Let the Fanatic answer in earnest.

So we say that Salman al-Awdah is a Qutubi, Suroori, since his attachment is to the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb whom he aggrandises as an "Imaam of Guidance" who "defended the Islamic aqidah"(!!!) and also because he is upon what Muhammad Suroor is upon, as the latter recruited him in the early 1990s in Kuwait. And whoever wants more details then let him speak to Shaikh Saleem al-Hilaalee who was in Kuwait at the time, and who was approached by Muhammad Suroor, and who also saw al-Awdah there, as a youth, being befriended by Suroor. And as for Safar al-Hawaali, then he too is a Qutubi, at the hands of Mohammad Qutb, who is his mentor, leader, teacher and shaikh, and through whom he imbibed the Khaariji manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, and whose extremism in the issues of takfir and haakimiyyah affected him. And likewise Munajjid, and Qahtanee and others, all of whom are Qutubiyah, Surooriyyah, or if you like, use the expression of the Imaam, the Muhaddith, the Faqeeh, the Aalim Rabbaanee, Muhammad Naasir ud-Deen al-Albaani, "**Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah**" (!!)

May the Qutubi Fanatic become enraged...

The Book “Al-Qutubiyah”

Palmer continued:

[Abu Khadeejah]: I ask brother Ali to fear Allaah and stop trying to agitate the people against their scholars with false paranoid ideas and conspiracy theories....

[Palmer] These ignorant individuals rely on the nonsensical book entitled “Qutubeeyah, Hiyal Fitnah” from which they have placed excerpts on their web page. This book mentions on page 137 (2nd edition) that the Qutubees supposedly have a “secret form” which they use to follow up on the activities of future leaders of the group. However, the author of this book admits that this form (which the author places a photocopy on pages 138-139) is publicly sold in book stores. He then concludes that this form is therefore, “‘alaneeya sirreeya,” or “public-secret.” Thus where is the paranoia in so-called “secret forms” that are sold publicly or in what Ali wrote in his e-mail?

Also regarding conspiracy theories will the ignorant kid and his teachers tell us about their 50 page paper that they sent to the Saudi Ministry of Interior entitled “At-Tantheem as-Sirri al-Aalami bain al-Taakhteet wat-Tatbeeq fil-Mamlaka al-Arabeeya as-Saudeeya: Haqaa’iq wa Wathaa’iq” (The Secret World Order between Planning and Implementation in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: Realities and Documents)? So now who are the REAL followers of “conspiracy theories”?

This is typical of the nature, style and content of the refutations of Ahl ul-Ahwaa against Ahl us-Sunnah, when Ahl us-Sunnah quote verbatim from the cassettes and books of the deviants and refute their sayings and their adulterated methodologies. The book “al-Qutubiyah” is a milestone in exposing the Qutubi and Suroori apparatus present in Saudi Arabia alongside an excellent exposition of its fundamental precepts. To this day, the Qutubiyah themselves have not brought out a single reply to it, save that they accuse the author and others who refute them of being a spies for the government, paid by them, and other such wicked lies. Or save that their refutations are of the same nature as what Palmer has said above, turning aside from the actual knowledge-based issues that have become subject to contention and dealing with little minor side issues.

To illustrate, take Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee’s excellent refutations of Sayyid Qutb. The only reply the Qutubiyah can bring is that Shaikh Rabee’ is harsh and makes takfir of Sayyid Qutb. The first accusation is correct, that he is harsh, but that does not affect the correctness of what he has written, as for the second that he makes takfir, then this is a lie. In any case, this does not change what Sayyid Qutb fell into of statements of kufr, for which Shaikh Rabee’ refuted and exposed him, and for which many of the Mashaayikh also refuted him and used strong words against him (i.e. Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan calling him “an ignoramus who has no evidence for what he says”¹⁵). So as for the book “al-Qutubiyah” then the likes

¹⁵ **SHAIKH SAALIH AL-FAWZAAN REFUTES THE STATEMENT OF APOSTASY OF SAYYID QUTB**

Sayyid Qutb said concerning slavery, “And concerning the slaves, that was when slavery was a world-wide structure and which was conducted amongst the Muslims and their enemies in the form of enslaving of prisoners of war. And it was necessary for Islam to adopt a similar line of practise until the world devised a new

of Palmer and his mentors could not reply to the excellent refutations made against this adulterated manhaj which enjoins the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah (something to be later annihilated by all the contemporary scholars), calls for open rejection of the Rulers upon the pulpits and in the sermons (something also refuted by the scholars), calls for takfir and khurooj (also refuted by the scholars), calls for belittlement of the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah, and those of Saudi specifically and much more, all of which is covered in the book.

code of practise, other than enslavement.” [in 'az-Zilal', Surah Tawbah (3/1669), found also in tafsir of Surah Baqarah (/230), tafsir of Surah Mu'minoon (4/2455), tafsir of Surah Muhammad (6/3285)]

Questioner: “O respected Shaikh, one of the contemporary writers is of the view that this religion, at its inception, was compelled to accept the institution of slavery of the days of ignorance.”

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan: “I seek refuge in Allaah”

Questioner: [Completing his question] “However, he has come from the angle that the doors to the various expiations and other matters which involve the liberation of slaves should be opened (i.e. that these affairs should be encouraged) gradually, until slavery finally ends. And following on from this, that the intent of the Legislator is to gradually end this institution of slavery. So what is your view on this?”

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan: “**These are words of falsehood (baatil) – and refuge is from Allaah – despite the fact that many of the writers and thinkers – and we do not say scholars - repeat these words. Rather we say that they are thinkers (mufakkireen), just as they call them. And it is unfortunate, that they also call them ‘Du’at’ (callers).** And this (type of statement) is found in the tafsir of Sayyid Qutb in Dhilaal ul-Qura’aan. He says, “Islaam does not affirm slavery, but it only allowed it to remain out of fear that the people may turn to despotism, that they may disapprove of it’s abolition since they had been accustomed to it. Hence Islaam has allowed it to continue out of courtesy to the people” Meaning, as if Allaah was being courteous to the people, and then he alluded to its gradual removal until it is completely finished.

These words are falsehood and (constitute) deviation (ilhaad) – and refuge is from Allaah. This is deviation and a false accusation against Islaam. And if it had not been for the excuse of ignorance [because] we excuse them on account of (their) ignorance, so we do not say that they are Unbelievers because they are ignorant and are blind followers who have merely quoted this saying without reflecting upon it, hence we excuse them on account of ignorance. **Otherwise, these statements are very dangerous and if a person said them deliberately he would become apostate and leave Islaam.** However, we say that they are ignorant people because they are but literary writers who have not learnt the knowledge. So they found this statement and rejoiced on account of it and then refuted the Unbelievers by it. Since the Unbelievers say that Islaam empowers some people (over others) and that it enslaves the people and that it... and that it... So they intended to refute them with this ignorance. And when the ignoramus refutes the enemy then he only increases the enemy in evil and hence the enemy holds more tightly to his falsehood. Refutation occurs by way of knowledge. It does not occur by way of sentiments or by ignorance. Rather it occurs by knowledge and evidence. Otherwise, it is obligatory for a person to remain quiet and not to speak in dangerous matters about which he has no knowledge.

So these words are falsehood and whoever says them deliberately then he is an Unbeliever. As for the one who says them out of ignorance or due to blind following (of others), then he is to be excused due to his ignorance. And ignorance is a killing catastrophe – and refuge is from Allaah. Islaam has affirmed slavery and slavery is ancient and existed prior to Islaam and was present in the revealed religions prior to it. And it will continue so long as Jihaad in the path of Allaah exists.”

Source: Cassette Recording dated 4/8/1416 and subsequently verified by the Shaikh himself with a few minor alterations to the wording. Refer to “Baraa’ah Ulamaa il-Ummah Min Tazkiyaat Ahl il-Bid’ah wal-Mudhammah”, which has been checked by both Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, and contains the refutations of the Salafi Mashaayikh against Sayyid Qutb. Contrast this with the praise and aggrandisement made for Sayyid Qutb by neo-Qutubite theoreticians such as Safar al-Hawaali, Salman al-Awdah, Muhammad Saalih al-Munajjid and Muhammad Sa’eed al-Qahtani.

So they could not reply to any of this which was covered in “al-Qutubiyah”, but instead wandered and strayed in their warm-fuzzies, and instead use ridiculous modes of argument in order to discredit the sum whole of the book.

And this book continues to be a thorn in their sides, which is why a group amongst the Qutubiyah burnt this book in Dhammaam, and also made arson attacks against bookstores which stored this book as well as many of the cassette recordings which expose and refute this Qutubi cult, the most notable of them being Tasjeelaat Sabeel ul-Mu’minoon in Dhammaam.

As for the Qutubi fanatic’s claim about a 50 page document sent by “our teachers” to the Saudi government, then let him give us the list of names of those whom he is referring to. Then as for him declaring what was written to be the illustrative of following “a conspiracy theory”, then whether it is a theory or not, depends on the facts. We have never read this so-called report which is supposed to have been written by “our” so-called “teachers” whom Palmer has not even mentioned as to who exactly he is referring to¹⁶. Perhaps he is referring to Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee, or Shaikh Rabee’ or others who became an obstacle in the Qutubi agenda. So let Palmer give the names of those whom he is accusing so that this can be verified. But even if we accept for argument’s sake that such a report that Palmer references was written, then that does not necessarily make it a “conspiracy theory”, for that depends on to what extent the document proves what it asserts, and whether what it asserts can be verified, and what evidence has been collected to justify the assertions and so on.

But is important to note here that the vast majority of Palmer’s Polemic is of this nature, in that his counter-argument is weak and flimsy, and is far removed from the real issues, for he hates that the true nature of those for whom he has partisanship should be known. This is why he ridiculed and mocked the idea of “conspiracy theories” and then tried to discredit his opponents by claiming they too are guilty of indulging in these theories, so that the audience would think this is just an issue one group accusing the other of the same thing that it itself falls into, therefore it must be wrong(!).

But in reality, what Palmer wishes to hide is that his mentors and leaders based their da’wah, largely on what they called their brand of “fiqh ul-waaqi”, which they had acquired from the magazines and news reports of the Disbelievers. And as for what they claimed was supposed to have happened or occurred, or is supposed to happen, then none of that has materialised. And hence, their brand of fiqh ul-waaqi was largely based upon conjecture and dhann, devoid of Sharee’ah principles, taking the words of the Infidels, in their writings, magazines and newspapers as gospel. Indeed, it was only from his study of the Tawrah and the writings of Christian And Jewish fathers and erudites and other infidels of contemporary times, that

¹⁶ And this style of speech is not uncommon with the Qutubis, for this is exactly what they did when they said that the “doctrinal leader” of the Salafis was able to go to preach in the Batini Apostate State of North Africa or words to that effect (see later below), but without mentioning who. Then some time later, they made their intent clear by stating that it was Shaikh Rabee’ and this actually turned out to be a lie, as we shall explain in due course.

al-Hawaali was able to speak of “Kissingers’s Promise”, for in the Book and the Sunnah, he and the sayings of the Salaf he found nothing.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, “Then the ‘Fiqh ul-Waqi’ about which it is said is the actual ‘Fiqh ul-Waqi’ (i.e. the only one), then what is it based upon? It depends upon the magazines, radio announcements, and newspapers. And how abundant is the circulation of all of this in the newspapers, magazines and announcements. **Therefore, the ways and means of acquiring information in these days cannot be depended upon... When the intelligent person reflects upon the various events that have taken place over the last twenty years, it will become clear to him that all of the events that were supposed to take place did not actually occur. For this reason, we consider that occupying the youth away from understanding the religion of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic and taking them to being occupied with understanding the current affairs and analysing the magazines, newspapers and broadcasts and what resembles that... we consider that to be an error in manhaj.**”¹⁷

The true conspiracy theorists, as Abu Khadeejah alluded to, then were the likes of Safar and Salman and their followers¹⁸ for that is what they nurtured the youth upon in the Gulf Crisis, the Afghan Crisis and the Algerian Crisis, and they authored and spoke in this regard, bewildering the youth, such that the youth took to the newspapers, magazines and journals of the Infidels in order to acquire their brand of “fiqh ul-waqi” and the books of bid’ah and zandaqah in order to set the “sahwah” ([Qutubi] Awakening) in motion. It is for this reason that we saw many of the Scholars refute this deviation in manhaj, amongst them Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Imaam Ibn Uthaimen and others, all of whom refuted this exaggeration and extremism of the callers of “Fiqh ul-Waaqi”. This is a matter well-known, that is the refutations of the People of Knowledge against these people. For what reason did they turn the attention of the youth to the newspapers, magazines and broadcasts of the Infidels other than what they had indulged in of conspiracy theories? **And as for al-Hawaali, then he could not find a verse in the Qur’aan, and nor a hadeeth in the Sunnah, until even a fabricated one, and nor any words from the Salaf, and not even any words from a Soothsayer, so instead he went and tired himself and studied the Tawrah, the magazines and writings of the Infidels, and the books of the Jews and Christians and then constructed his writings on the conspiracy of “the Promise” and starting specifying time limits for what he thought was going to occur.** And all of this is but shooting in the dark, and speaking about affairs which are affairs of the unseen, and which cannot be proven with certainty. But this is what the Activists occupied the youth with as more than one from the People of Knowledge have noted about them, such as Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz and others.

As for the examples that the forelock of Palmer has given above in order to accuse us of being “paranoid” and following “conspiracy theories”, then that in reality, is a pathetic

¹⁷ From the Cassette “Meeting of Abul-Hasan al-Ma’rabi with the Two Shaikhs, Ibn Baz and Ibn Uthaimen”.

¹⁸ And indeed we shall see later Palmer’s fanciful conspiracy theory that all independent da’wah efforts around the globe are being consumed and eaten up so that they can be under the direct supervision of the Saudi Regime and the designs of the New World Order!!

attempt to hide what is with the Qutubiyah of building a new and adulterated manhaj based upon exactly that, conspiracy theories and paranoia, in addition to reviving the extremism of the Khawaarij on the issue of takfir on account of major sins and takfir of the Rulers in absolute terms.

Naming with Sunnah and Salafiyyah

Palmer continued:

This is one of the characteristics of this group, where they love to fashion themselves with names like “asSalafi” or “al-Athari.” Yet has Sh. Ibn Baz, or Sh. Ibn Uthaimen, or Sh. al-Albani ever appended the title “as-Salafi” or “al-Athari” to their names? Then why do these kids feel such a need to do so? Salafiyyah is more than latching on to a label; it is a manhaj which extends to beliefs, worship, morals and behavior, in both the public and the private realm of individuals and societies. These youth however, have been deceived by Satan, since they continually refer to themselves as Salafis, Ahlu-Hadeeth, al-Firqa an-Najiyah, at-Ta’ifa al-Mansura - they then begin to believe that they are just that, and do not realize the long distance they need to traverse in order to truly achieve that for which they strive.

In fact, it is directly due to their emblazoning themselves with the title “Salafi” while at the same time exhibiting despicable conduct, that large numbers of average Muslims have now associated Salafiyyah with the actions of these youth, and Sufis have capitalized on this to then promote themselves as “the true bearers of Ahlus Sunnah wal Jama’ah.”

As for labelling with “Salafi” or “Athari” or “Salafiyyah” then labelling oneself with it is to distinguish one’s manhaj from that of others. And when it is done for this purpose, then there is no harm in it, when one is being truthful in that. What the Fanatical Qutubi does not realise is that ascription to Salafiyyah is from the perspective mentioned in the hadeeth of the splitting of the sects, namely, that only one has been promised safety, and that is the one that traverses upon what the Companions were upon¹⁹.

¹⁹ Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked, **“Is Salafiyyah a hizb (party) from amongst the parties. And is ascribing to them (i.e. the Salafis) a blameworthy thing?”**

To which he replied, **“As-Salafiyyah (i.e. the Salafis) is the Saved Sect, and they are Ahl us-Sunnah wal Jamaa’ah. It is not a hizb (party) from amongst the various parties, those which are called “parties” today. Rather they are the Jamaa’ah, the Jamaa’ah upon the Sunnah and upon the Deen (religion).** They are Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah. The Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) said, *“There will not cease to be a group from my Ummah manifest and upon the truth not being harmed by those who forsake them neither by those who oppose them”* and he (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) also said, *“And this Ummah will split into seventy-three sects, all of them in the Hellfire but one”*. They said, which one is this O Messenger of Allaah? He replied, *“They are those who are upon what I and my companions are upon today”*. **Hence Salafiyyah is a group of people (i.e. the Salafis) upon the madhhab of the Salaf, upon what the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and his companions were upon and it is not a hizb from amongst the contemporary groups present today.** Rather it is the very old Jamaa’ah, from the time of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) which inherits (this way) and continues, and which never ceases to be upon the manifest truth until the establishment of the Hour, as he (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has informed (us).” (Cassette: “at-Tahdheer min al-Bid’ah” second cassette, delivered as a lecture in Hawtah Sadeer, 1416H).

Shaikh Saalih Aal ash-Shaikh, Minister of Islamic Affairs of Saudi Arabia, stated, **“Muslims are of two groups: Salafis and Khalafis. As for the Salafis, then they are the followers of Salaf us-Saalih** (first three generations of Muslims). And as for the Khalafis, then they are the followers of the understanding of the Khalaf and they are also called Innovators - since everyone who is not pleased and satisfied with the path of the Salaf us-Saalih, in knowledge and action, understanding and fiqh, then he is a khalafi, an innovator.” (Haadhihi Mafaahemunaa, Chapter on Ascription Salaf and Salafiyyah).

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the Qutubiyyah is that they hate ascription to Salafiyyah or labelling with Salafi, since that goes against the principles of the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah that they innovated into the religion, the bid'ah whose main goal is to gather all and sundry into a lump²⁰.

Imaam al-Albaani stated "...and there is no doubt that the very clear, unambiguous, distinguishing and manifest label (tasmiyah) is that we say: "I am a Muslim upon the Book and the Sunnah upon the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih", and this can be said in summary by the phrase, **"I am a Salafi"**. (al-Asaalah 9/86-87)

Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728H) - rahimahullaah - said: **"There is no criticism for the one who proclaims the way (madhhab) of the Salaf, who ascribes himself to it (intisaab) and refers to it. Rather, it is obligatory to accept that from him by unanimous agreement (Ittifaq) because the way (madhhab) of the Salaf is nothing but the Truth (Haqq)." (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 4:149)**

And when one adds "asSalafi" to the end of one's name, it means just what Imaam al-Albaani has explained, that "I am a Muslim upon the Book and the Sunnah upon the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih". And in our labelling ourselves with "Salafi" and appending it to our names, which is but a manifestation of our ascription to Salafiyyah, it is necessary for you to accept that, by unanimous agreement, because the way of the Salaf is nothing but the truth, O Palmer, as opposed to the way of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Muhammad Suroor, Muhammad Qutb and others who have strayed, while claiming Salafiyyah!!

In the verdict of the Permanent Committee, No. 1361 (1/165) there occurs, "Salafiyyah is an ascription to the Salaf, and the Salaf are the Companions of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the Imaams of Guidance from the the first three generations (may Allaah be pleased with them), those whose goodness has been testified for by Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), *"The best of people are my generation, then those who follow after them, then those who follow after them, then there will come a people whose testimony will precede their oath and their oath will precede their testimony."* Reported by Imaam Ahmad in his Musnad and also by al-Bukhaari and Muslim. **And "the Salafis" (Salafiyyoon) is the plural of "Salafi", which is an ascription to the Salaf, and its meaning has already preceded. And they are the ones who traverse upon the minhaj of the Salaf, from amongst the followers of the Book and the Sunnah, those who call to them both, and to acting upon them, as a result of which they are from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah."**

Stated 'Abdul-Azeez bin Abdur-Rahmaan Aal as-Sa'ood, **"Indeed I am Salafi, my aqidah is Salafiyyah**, by whose requirements I traverse upon the Book and the Sunnah". (Stated during the pilgrimage of 1965, 'Al-Mushaf was-Sayf' p.135).

²⁰ Imaam al-Albaani said, "Then if Salmaan, who we are speaking about at the moment and at other times, if we say that he is not Ikhwaanee, and are speaking truly, then that does not extract him from being Ikhwaanee in his manhaj. This is where one should beware, that he is not Ikhwaanee, yet his manhaj is the manhaj of the Ikhwaanul-Muslimeen. So I ask you now, do you perceive that he gathers the people into an organisation, he gathers the youth into an organisation, and he incites their emotions upon the like of what the Ikhwaanul-Muslimoon incite them upon, their helpers and their followers etc. I said in the previous lesson, the manhaj of the Ikhwaan is: 'Gather the people into an organisation, then instruct them - then nothing.' There is nothing except blind-gathering of people into an organisation, without any teaching." (Cassette: What the People of Knowledge Say About Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq) and refer to NDV110001.

Allaamah, ‘Abdul’Azeez Ibn Baz – the [former] mufti of Saudi Arabia was asked: What do you say about the one who calls himself ‘Salafi’ or ‘Athari’? Is this is a tazkiyah (purification) of his own self? So he replied – may Allaah have mercy upon him – **“When he is being truthful [in his claim] that he is Salafi or Athari then there is not harm in that, [this is] similar to what the Salaf used to say, ‘So and so is a Salafi’, ‘So and so is Athari’. This is a tazkiyah (commendation) which is necessary, a tazkiyah that is obligatory.”** (Cassette: Haqq ul-Muslim 16/1/1413 Ta’if)

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzan was asked **“Is the one who gives himself the title of ‘as-Salafi’ considered to have set up a ‘hizb’?”**. To which he replied, **“There is no harm in labelling oneself with Salafiyyah when it is in truth.** However, if it is merely a claim then it is not permissible to label oneself with Salafiyyah, whilst one is upon a manhaj other than that of the Salaf.”²¹ (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah p.16)

²¹ Such as the sect of Muhammad Suroor, the likes of Salman al-Awdah and others, may Allaah sever them, or the sect of Mohammad Qutb, the likes of Safar al-Hawali and others, may Allaah sever them, or the sect of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and others, may Allaah sever them all and protect the Muslims from their fitnah - all of whom have deviated in manhaj and chosen a path other than that of the Believers, but rather chosen the path of the Heretical Innovators, due to becoming poisoned by them and their books and writings.

BENEFIT: YOUR MANHAJ IS THAT OF THOSE WHOM YOU PRAISE AND SUPPORT AND DEFEND AND SEEK EXCUSES FOR

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked, “Whoever opposes the usool (foundations) of Salafiyyah from amongst those (contemporaries) who are around us [such as the Qubutiyyah Jadeedah, Surooriyyah, Turaathiyyah and others, Trans.] and assists and supports other methodologies [such as those of Sayyid Qutb or Mohammad Suroor, or Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and so on, Trans.], such that he praises their founders [such as Sayyid Qutb, Trans.] and their theorists (mufakkiroon) [such as Mohammad Qutb, the Mufakkir, Harakiyy, Trans.] is it obligatory to associate him with them in order that the people may take caution from him and so that they do not become deceived by his manhaj?”

He answered, **“Whoever opposes the manhaj (methodology) of the Salaf and praises the methodologies which oppose the manhaj of the Salaf and praises those who are upon it, then he is considered to be upon the actual opposing methodologies himself...”** (al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah, p.105).

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, **“It is obligatory to punish everyone who ascribes himself to them – the people of innovation – or who defends them, or who praises them, or who reveres their books, or who detests that they should be talked about, or who begins to make excuses for them by saying he does not understand what these words mean or by saying that this person also authored another book and what is similar to these types of excuses, which are not made except by an ignoramus or a hypocrite. Rather, it is obligatory to punish everyone who knows of their condition and did not assist in repelling their evil, for repelling their evil is one of the greatest of evils.”** Majmoo ul-Fataawaa (2/132).

WHOSE MANHAJ IS ADULTERATED? READ THIS BOOK TO FIND OUT!

NOTE: The book “al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah” is a collection of the Fataawaa of Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan on issues of methodology. The fataawaa were compiled by Jamaal bin Farihaan al-Haarithe, and the whole book, alongside the compilers excellent additional footnotes, were checked by Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan himself, before being printed. This book is actually a destruction and annihilation of the Qutubi and Suroori Manhaj, so refer to it!

And perhaps in what Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan has mentioned is the actual reason and answer as to why the likes of Palmer hate that the Salafis identify themselves as Salafis, as opposed to himself and those with him. This is because their manhaj is other than the manhaj of the Salaf. Now O Sunni, what are the issues that have been subject to contention by the neo-Qutubites? The issue of mentioning the good points of the Innovators. The issue of working with the groups of innovation. The issue of the methodology of advising the Rulers. The issue of publicising the faults of the Rulers in the sermons, upon the pulpits and elsewhere. The issue of public demonstrations and rallies. The issue of using the political apparatus within countries to establish the Sharee'ah. The issue of fiqh ul-waaqi'. The issue of the correct methodology in calling to Tawheed²². The issue of Haakimiyyah and following from it, the issue of takfir. And much more.

Now ask yourself a question. In all of these issues, were the Qutubiyah upon the manhaj of the Salaf? Or were they upon the manhaj of the Khalaf?

Coming back to the point of Palmer, we reply to him in the same way that we would reply if asked whether we are Believers (Mu'minoon). If what is meant by it is belief in Allaah, His

²² TAMING THIS NEO-QUTUBITE FANATIC WITH THE WORDS OF IMAAM IBN UTHAIMEEN CONCERNING SHAIKH RABEE' BIN HAADEE

And amongst the greatest of humiliations and expositions of the Qutubiyah and their hatred of the true Salafi Manhaj is what was said by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen concerning Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, may he remain a prickly thorn in the neck of this Qutubi Fanatic.

"Indeed we praise Allaah, Free is He from all imperfections, the Most High, that He makes it easy for our brother, the Doctor, Rabee' bin Haadee al-Madkhalee to visit this region. **[So that] the one to whom certain matters are not apparent may come to know that our brother, may Allaah grant us and him success, is upon Salafiyyah, the way of the Salaf. And I do not mean here that Salafiyyah is a hizb (party) which is set up to oppose the Muslims outside of it, but I mean by Salafiyyah, that he (i.e. Shaikh Rabee') is upon the path of the Salaf in his Manhaj. Especially in the field of actualising Tawheed and throwing aside what opposes this [manhaj]. And all of us know tht Tawheed is the basis for which Allaah sent the Messengers upon them be peace and prayers...**

The visit of our brother, Shaikh Rabee bin Haadee to this region, our city, Unaizah, no doubt will have a good effect **and it will also become clear to many of the people what used to be hidden from them due to the scare-mongering and rumour-mongering and also letting loose the tongue [of discord]. And how numerous are those who are remorseful about what they said concerning the Ulamaa, when it becomes clear to them that they (the Ulamaa) are upon the truth.**"

Then one of those present at the gathering says, "There is a question concerning the books of Shaikh Rabee'?"

To which the Shaik replied, "It is apparently clear that this question is not in need of my answer. **And just as Imaam Ahmad was asked about Ishaq bin Raahawaih - rahimahumullaah - and he replied, "Someone like me is asked about Ishaq! Rather, Ishaq is to be asked about me."** And I spoke at the beginning of my speech about that which I know about Shaikh Rabee', may Allaah grant him success, and what I mentioned has never ceased to be what I hold about him in my soul, up until this time. And his arrival here and his words that have reached me, then no doubt, they are such that they will increase a person in his love for him and in his supplication for him." End of quote. (Cassette: "Ittihaaf al-Kurraam Bi Liqaa al-Uthaimen Ma'a Rabee al-Madkhalee wa Muhammad al-Imaam")

What is your reply O Palmer? Repent and desist from your wicked lies against the Scholars.

Angels, His Books, His Messengers, the Last Day and so on, then yes indeed, we are Believers. And if what is meant is that whenever Allaah's name is mentioned that our hearts tremble and shake, then we hope and pray that Allaah makes us amongst them, but we are not from them, but we pray that Allaah makes us amongst them.

So similarly, if what is meant by ascription to Salafiyah and appending "Salafi" at the end of one's name is that a person is upon the creed and methodology of the Companions, of the Salaf after them, right up until this day of ours, and the manhaj of the three Imaams who have passed away, then yes indeed, we are Salafis, upon their manhaj. But if what is meant by this ascription is that we have their piety, and awe of Allaah, their mannerisms and excellencies, then we hope and pray that Allaah makes us amongst them, but we are not from them.

So this is what is hated by Palmer and his likes, such as Morgan²³ and others, they hate that we should make our manhaj clear and known, that it is Salafi, and not Qutubi or Harakiyy, and that we associate with the Salaf of the past and those of the present, as opposed to them, who show apparent love and attachment to our Scholars, but their manhaj is a world apart from the Salaf, those of the past and those of the present. And the clearest of evidences is that in all the issues of methodology that have been subject to controversy in recent times, **they (the Qutubites) have been in error**. This is why Imaam al-Albaani said "**they have opposed many of the issues of the methodology of the Salaf**" in the famous tape "the Surooriyyah are the Khawaarij of the Era" in which he labelled this Qutubi Cult as "**the Khawaarij of the Era**", something from which neo-Qutubite Apologeticism has still not come to terms with or even recovered from. Our refutations of the Qutubiyah and the Ahl ul-Ahwaa in general are based upon the words of the Ulamaa, the Imaams, we actually quote from them on the issues that have been subject to contention. And where there may be differences amongst them, we reconcile and try to understand the basis of the difference and how it ought to be resolved and so on. As for the Qutubiyah, then they cannot do that, and they have never done that. And even when they have found some amongst the Scholars in whom they can find some support for what they are upon, they merely blindly-follow in that and do not research further. And a perfect example of that is their use of the sayings of Shaikh Ibn Jibreel and Shaikh Bakr Abu Zaid concerning Sayyid Qutb. They have thought their saying is the truth, and they have no evidence for any of that, and nor is there any evidence presented in the saying of the two Shaikhs. So this proves that Palmer and his likes are the Muqallidah in truth, who only utilise the words of the scholars when it will benefit them, even if it entails blindly following these words, without thought and reflection...

And so we say again to Palmer, indeed we are Salafis, we are Atharis, we are upon the way of Ahl ul-Hadeeth, that of Firqat un-Naajiyyah and Taa'ifat ul-Mansoorah, for their signs have been explained and their way made clear, and that is but the adoption of the Sunnah in all the affairs. However, we do not claim that this is a ticket to Paradise, for being guided to Islam is one thing, but being guided to the way of the Salaf is something else. And further,

²³ Refer to MSC050003 ("Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du'aat...") for "A Dialogue with Salim Morgan" and who is of the same school of doctrine as Palmer.

being guided to the way of the Salaf in creed and methodology is one thing, but being guided to their way in piety and fear of Allaah and mannerisms is something else.

But what we do not doubt in, O Palmer, is that being guided to the way of the Salaf in creed and methodology, while lacking in other respects is far superior than having piety and good manners, while being adulterated in creed or methodology.

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked: "Is [entry into] Paradise and Hellfire **dependent upon the correctness of one's Manhaj** (methodology)?"

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

This is what Palmer and his likes hate and detest, that clarity should come from the Salafis, that the affairs should be explained as they truly are. That the distinction between us and them should be made clear and known.

Sa'eed bin Jubair said, "That my son accompanies a sinful and cunning scoundrel who is a Sunni is more beloved to me than that he accompanies a devoutful and worshipful Innovator." (al-Ibaanah no. 89).

Imaam Al-Barbahaaree said, "However, if you see a person whose manner and opinion is despicable, he is wicked, sinful and oppressive, yet he is a person of the Sunnah, accompany him and sit with him, since his sin will not harm you. **If you see a man who strives hard and long in worship, is abstemious, being continual in worship, except that he is a person of innovation, do not sit with him, do not listen to his words and do not walk along with him, since I do not feel safe that you will not eventually come to be pleased with his way and go to destruction along with him.**" (Sharh us-Sunnah no. 149).

Imaam Ahmad said, "The graves of Ahl us-Sunnah from those who committed the major sins are like gardens. And the graves of Ahl ul-Bid'ah from amongst their abstemious pious ones are hollow and empty. The sinners of Ahl us-Sunnah are the Awliyaa' (Friends) of Allaah and the abstemious pious ones of Ahl ul-Bid'ah are the Enemies of Allaah." (Tabaqaat ul-Hanaabilah 1/184).

So perhaps the forelock of Palmer may now understand, and realise the ignorance in his own words. And even if he may find fault with us for every thing related to other than our manhaj and our aqeedah, that still does not bring him any closer to the Salafi manhaj and nor does it distance him from his own Qutubi manhaj and neither does it take us away from our Salafi Manhaj, walhamdulillaah.

Revisiting the saying of Palmer:

In fact, it is directly due to their emblazoning themselves with the title “Salafi” while at the same time exhibiting despicable conduct, that large numbers of average Muslims have now associated Salafiah with the actions of these youth, and Sufis have capitalized on this to then promote themselves as “the true bearers of Ahlus Sunnah wal Jama’ah.”

Indeed it was the wicked hizbiyyah promoted by the President of JIMAS, Abu Muntasir, that led to many average Muslims associating Salafiyyah with the actions of the youth who were taught “how to revive the Sunnah” with such boldness and courage that bordered on, if not actually falling into, arrogance. The extremism that Palmer is alluding to existed way back in the beginnings of the last decade (from the 1990s onwards) and large numbers of people had associated Salafiyyah with the behaviour and camaraderie exhibited by the youth of JIMAS. In fact, prior to 1995, the Sufis and many others (Young Muslims, Hanafis etc.) had begun to capitalise on this to promote their own da’wah. Even while we were with Abu Muntasir, many complaints would come us of the extremism exhibited by many of those nurtured under the wings of JIMAS, and all of that was associated with “the Salafis”, for ascription to Salafiyyah was present with JIMAS and its siblings, and the despicable behaviour of the “Jimmies” with elders and the respected people was well-known at that time. And those in the UK, who witnessed those times, will in fact witness to the truth of what we have stated.

Indeed, any independent da’wah efforts were actually scorned by Abu Muntasir and those who decided to make their own da’wah efforts were treated as Renegades by the President of JIMAS himself, as if they separated from the Jamaa’ah and thrown of the yoke of Islaam from their necks. It is thus strange that Palmer should speak of his conspiracy theory about a movement claiming Salafiyyah but which seeks to destroy independent da’wah work, in keeping with the designs of the “New World Order”.²⁴ It is more befitting that we describe the empire of Abu Muntasir as attempting to destroy any independent da’wah efforts (set up without his knowledge or involvement), **in keeping with the designs of JIMAS of total control and monopoly of ALL da’wah efforts.**

And speaking about despicable behaviour with others, then perhaps there is no one who can be better characterised by it than Abu Muntasir himself, for he was well-known, as he himself readily admits, to have a chronic problem with backbiting. In the years that we were with him, and when others wanted to make their own independent da’wah efforts, the amount of scathing attacks that Abu Muntasir would launch on others who had not behaved in accordance with the “interests of JIMAS” were too many to be counted. We abandoned and fled from this hizbiyyah, walhamdulillaah.

So in short, this behaviour that you are talking about actually existed before you made an open display of your Qutubi manhaj and before you graduated from Shayjее’s School of [Qutubi, Suroori, Hizbi, Taqleedi] Doctrine, and before you separated from the manhaj of the Salaf and of the contemporary Scholars who follow in their way.

²⁴ As Palmer said, “On the contrary, you and others with you, have become entangled in a movement which claims Salafiah as its way, yet which seeks to destroy independent da’wah work on a global level, and put it under the direct supervision of the Saudi regime and the designs of the New World Order.”

Shaikh Rabee' and Shaikh Muqbil

Palmer continued, only increasing in his folly:

[Abu Khadeejah] As for Shaykh Muqbil and Shaykh Rabee, then Shaykh AlAlbaanee has mentioned that the ones who criticises them is a person following his desires (hawa).

[Idris Palmer] This shows the ignorance of this person. Are Muqbil and Rabee prophets and hence infallible from error? And does this mean that Bakr Abu Zaid and Ibn Jibrin are people following desires? If so, then this would mean that Al-Albani himself is also following his desires as he criticizes what Rabi has written about Sayyid Qutub when Adnaan Aroor read him a section of that book.

Al-Albaani then goes on to praise Sayyid Qutub's tafseer and suggests that all Salafis should read a chapter from Milestones. Will the ignorant one follow Sh. al-Albaani's advice and place that chapter on his website or is this just another example of them claiming to follow the shuyookh but in reality only taking what follows their own perverted desires?

Indeed, in what Palmer has stated above is a sign and a lesson for anyone who has a heart that understands. Firstly, O Sunni, just take a short while to read once more what Palmer has written above. Remember it well, reflect over it, then come with us that we may scold Palmer and send him to bed without giving him supper:

Palmer's forelock is one that does not understand. A distinction must be made between him and his associate, Ali Timimi, who at least displays intellect and understanding. But as for Palmer, he is one who simply does not understand and cannot partake in a rational argument.

Firstly, what was the context in which the statements concerning Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee were made by Imaam al-Albaani?

The first of Imaam al-Albaani's statements is in the course of his discussion concerning the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah (the essence of one of the main teachings of Salman al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, which was but a revival of the manhaj of Hassan al-Bannaa). After refuting and scandalising this bid'ah of Muwaazanah with powerful words, he then said, "...In short, I say: Certainly, the carrier of the flag of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel today, in the current times - and in truth - is our brother, Doctor Rabee'. **And as for those who refute him, then they do not do so on the basis of knowledge ever.** And the knowledge is actually with him. Even though I always say, and I have said these words to him on the phone many times, that if only he was soft in his approach it would be more beneficial for the people regardless of whether they are with him or against him. **But as from the point of view of knowledge, then there is nothing for which the man can be criticised absolutely,** except what I have just mentioned regarding his severity and harshness. But as for the claim that he does not weigh matters correctly (i.e. be just), then this is an extremely weak (meagre) saying. **No one says such a thing except one of two people. Either an ignoramus and it is desirable that such a one be taught, or a deviant and we have no control over such one**

except that we supplicate to Allaah that he guides him to the Straight Path. This is the answer to the question, and perhaps this is sufficient, and all praise is due to Allaah.” (Cassette: “Man Haamil Raayah al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel Fil-Asr al-Haadir”).

Another of his statements is following the question of Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Ma’rabi to Imaam al-Albaani, “**Question:** O Shaikh. You know the position of Shaikh Muqbil - hafidhahullaah - and likewise Shaikh Rabee’ - hafidhahullaah ta’aala - with regard to fighting against innovations and the deviant sayings. Some of the youth call into question the standing of these two shaikhs, so if you were to say a word about these two shaikhs - even if it is very brief - by which Allaah may bring benefit and which may be a defence of these two from many peoples tongues - who in speaking against them intend to find fault with the way which they are upon.”

Imaam al-Albaani replied, “We, without doubt praise Allaah - the Mighty and Majestic - that he has provided for this righteous da’wah, which is firmly founded on the Book and the Sunnah upon the methodology of the Pious Predecessors, a number of callers in the Islaamic lands who establish the duty that is obligatory for some to fulfil and which is established by very few people in the Islamic lands today. **So belittling these two shaikhs who call to the book and the Sunnah and what the Salafus-Saalih (Pious Predecessors) were upon, and fight against those who oppose this correct methodology is, as will not be hidden from one and all, is something which emanates only from one of two people: Either from an ignorant person or a follower of desires. As for the ignorant person, then it is possible to guide him, since he thinks that he is upon some knowledge - so when the correct knowledge becomes clear then he is guided. But as for the follower of desires then there is nothing we can do with him unless Allaah - the Blessed and Most High - guides him. So these people who speak against the two shaikhs - as we have mentioned - are either ignorant and so should be taught, or (they are) followers of their desires - and we should seek refuge from the evil of such a person, and we ask Allaah - the Mighty and Majestic - that He either guides him or breaks his back.** What I have seen in the writings of Shaikh Dr. Rabee’ is that they are beneficial, and I do not recall having seen a mistake he has made, or any departure from the methodology upon which we are united with him and he with us. However with regard to Shaikh Muqbil - I have not read a great deal of his work - contrary to the case with our brother Rabee’. As for Rabee’ it seems that his efforts in writing are greater than those of Shaikh Muqbil, and vice versa; Shaikh Muqbil in da’wah and mixing with the people and calling them to the Book and the Sunnah, and admonishing and guiding is much involved, more than Shaikh Dr. Rabee. However I have said to him (Shaikh Rabee’) on more than one occasion in a telephone conversation between us that if you were to be more gentle in the use of some words, particularly when the one upon whom you are replying maybe one who has gone onto the Reckoning of Allaah, and His Favour, Mercy and Forgiveness. Then that person (who you are refuting), from another angle, may have influence, and may have a group who attach themselves to him with the fanaticism of the days of ignorance (not based upon knowledge). So because of this, and not because the one (you are refuting) has passed on to the Mercy of Allaah - the Mighty and Majestic - I believe that he (Shaikh Rabee’) should be gentle in replying to those who have gone against our Salafi Methodology. **As for the scholarly aspect, then he is in that, walhamdullillaah, very strong** (Recorded upon a tape in the series ‘Silsilatul-Hudaa wan-Noor’. (no.851/1) among

the questions of Abul-Hasan Mustafaa ibn Isma'eel al-Misree put to the Scholar Shaikh al-Albaani, dated 9/7/1416H)

So after you have now understood the context of what was stated and the actual reality of what was stated, let us start scolding in earnest:

Palmer stated:

...This shows the ignorance of this person. Are Muqbil and Rabee prophets and hence infallible from error? And does this mean that Bakr Abu Zaid and Ibn Jibrin are people following desires?

Ayyuhal-Jahool! Firstly, you are aware that the reason for our saying that the one who criticises Rabee' or Muqbil is a person of desires is based upon the words of Imaam al-Albaani. You know that very well and you are familiar with all of that. And then Imaam al-Albaani stated that two types of people criticise these two Shaikhs. Firstly, those who are ignorant (of the true realities) and so they are taught and informed and so they correct themselves. And we believe that Shaikh Bakr Abu Zaid and Shaikh Jibreel are upon other than the truth concerning their criticism of Shaikh Rabee' and we also hold that they are not fully aware of the reality of Sayyid Qutb, due to their lack of acquaintance with Qutb's writings and his heresies. And Bakr Abu Zaid himself readily admits this and confesses to this. (Refer to NDV010012 to see details of this). Rather Shaikh Bakr Abu Zaid now calls for the curses of Allaah to be upon the one who spreads his four page letter to Shaikh Rabee', sine as he says, it was taken without his permission from his study and spread and published without his permission, so he curses the one who distributes it!! (Refer to NDV010012).

Now pay careful attention to the following statement made by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, "The visit of our brother, Shaikh Rabee bin Haadee to this region, our city, Unaizah, no doubt will have a good effect **and it will also become clear to many of the people what used to be hidden from them due to the scare-mongering and rumour-mongering and also letting loose the tongue [of discord]. And how numerous are those who are remorseful about what they said concerning the Ulamaa, when it becomes clear to them that they (the Ulamaa) are upon the truth.**"

Then one of those present at the gathering says, "There is a question concerning the books of Shaikh Rabee'?"

To which the Shaikh replied, "It is apparently clear that this question is not in need of my answer. **And just as Imaam Ahmad was asked about Ishaq bin Raahawaih - rahimahumullaah - and he replied, "Someone like me is asked about Ishaq! Rather, Ishaq is to be asked about me."** And I spoke at the beginning of my speech about that which I know about Shaikh Rabee', may Allaah grant him success, and what I mentioned has never ceased to be what I hold about him in my soul, up until this time. And his arrival here and his words that have reached me, then no doubt, they are such that they will increase a person in his love for him and in his supplication for him." End of quote. (Cassette: "Ittihaaf al-Kurraam Bi Liqaa al-Uthaimen Ma'a Rabee al-Madhkhalee wa Muhammad al-Imaam")

So it is the case that many people hold onto views about the Shaikh which are incorrect, and this is what we hold that Shaikh Bakr Abu Zaid and Shaikh Ibn Jibreel are not upon the truth in this matter.

But what is intended by Palmer is to discredit what was actually said by Shaikh al-Albaani in praise of Shaikh Rabe'e bin Haadee by using the same scare-mongering tactics that are characteristic of the Qutubiyah. He said, "And does this mean that Bakr Abu Zaid and Ibn Jibrin are people following desires?". So he puts into the mind of the readers an exaggerated conclusion to divert their attention from the real underlying issues.

And the real underlying issues are that Shaikh Rabe'e bin Haadee utterly annihilated the bid'ah of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and Salman al-Awdah, that is the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah, before even the senior Imaams such as al-Albani, Ibn Baz and Ibn Uthaimeen refuted it. And in light of this refutation he exposed the great deception and treachery of neo-Qutubite theoreticians, such as al-Awdah, al-Munajjid, al-Qahteene and others, in portraying the Mocker of Moosaa (alaihissalaam), the Reviler of Uthmaan (radiiallahu anhu) and the Mukaffir of Banu Umayyah, as being one of the "Rabbaani Scholars" and an "Imaam of Guidance" and other than this of exaggeration and extremism in praising and aggrandising the Innovators.

Also the neo-Qutubites had begun to propound the doctrine of the Khawaarij by exaggerating on the issue of takfir, making takfir of the sinners, and also applying the apparent meaning of the verses in al-Maa'idah in absolute terms to the Rulers of today, fleeing from the tafseel of the Salaf. They also began to use the example of the Father of the Khawaarij, Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi, in justifying their methodology open rejection of the Rulers, upon the pulpits and in the sermons. In short, the Salafi Mashaayikh, came to know of the reality of these ones who had been poisoned from the direction of Mohammad Suroor and Mohammad Qutb. So the Mashaayikh gave sincerity of purpose to the people and began to expose the affair of these activists. Indeed, it was precisely on account of the deviation of the neo-Qutubites on all of these issues that Imaam al-Albaani stated that they are "**the Khawaarij of the Era**", as we have already made not of.

As a result of this, the same neo-Qutubite theoreticians then started an organised and concerted propaganda campaign in order to discredit the Shaikh's (i.e. Rabe'e's) knowledge and integrity. So some of them claimed he is a spy for the government, others claimed his knowledge of hadeeth was weak, others claimed that he was given to backbiting and defaming the scholars and so on. And when this rumour-mongering had become widespread, **even some of the people of knowledge and excellence became affected by it**²⁵.

²⁵ And Shaikh Zaid bin Muhammad al-Madkhalee replied to what was said by Shaikh Ibn Jibreel concerning Shaikh Rabe'e's refutations of Sayyid Qutb and the New Hasan al-Banna of our times, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq. And if Allaah wills, it will be translated and presented. And the Shaikh made note that Shaikh Ibn Jibreel's involvement with the CDLR of Mohammad al-Mis'ari, and those who supported the CDLR for a short while gave him an incorrect perspective on the books of Sayyid Qutb and the Shaikh thought that the books of Sayyid Qutb and his errors were just like those of an-Nawawi or Ibn Hajar or Ibn al-Jawzee and other, while not being aware of what is with Qutb of the Takfiri and Rafidi manhaj, his statements of apostasy, his calls to the adoption of Socialism and the abandonment of aspects of the Sharee'ah because they are not suited

The Qutubites even attempted to get a statement out of Imaam Ibn Baaz to discredit Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee and to reduce his worth in the eyes of the people, only because they knew that he and the Madinan Mashaayikh in general had become aware of their true orientations and their goals. Eventually, they got something, but their plot fell back upon

to the times, his rejection of Ahaad hadeeth in aqidah, his denial of the miracles of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), his speakinh with the aqidah of the Ash'ariyyah, Jahmiyyah and so on.

And as for the claim that Sayyid Qutb is like the scholars of the past who erred, like Nawawi and Ibn Hajar, then this has been refuted by more than one from the People of Knowledge.

And also Jamaal bin Fareehaan al-Haarithee says in his notes to the fataawaa of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan (and which were subsequently checked and approved by Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan), "So if it is said: Why are an-Nawawi and IbnHajr excused and that which occurred from them, yet Sayyid Qutb and al-Bannaa and Mawdoodi are not excused, then the answer is from two angles: **First:** That there is a great difference between the two groups, for that which is with an-Nawawi and Ibn Hajr of firm grounding in knowledge, benefit for the Muslims actually negates and covers what occurred from them of errors. And the people of knowledge have explained these errors, have warned from them. Hence, the danger of that has ended by this notification by the people of knowledge. As for Sayyid Qutb and Bannaa, then they do not have a firm grounding and an abundance of knowledge, and neither do they have abundance of action [that is in accordance with the Sunnah], and nor do they have the benefit brought about by the likes of an-Nawawi and Ibn Hajr and others from the senior scholars. Second: Ibn Hajr and an-Nawawi never called to their errors and nor did they call to partisanship, or the takfir of Muslim societies, or to uniting the ranks (of Ahl us-Sunnah) with the Rafidah (Shi'ah) or the Christians, or the Magians, or any of the astray sects. And the society was not harmed by their errors (i.e. those of Ibn Hajr and an-Nawawi), as opposed to those of Sayyid Qutb and Bannaa and others. For they (Qutb and Bannaa) never saw any difference between the futile, false doctrines (aqaa'id), rather doctrines of kufr, and between the correct and sound doctrines. And nor did they see any difference between a Raafidee, or a Christian and others and between a Muslim. And they brought about a lot of harm to the Muslims (by their methodologies) and did not actually rectify their condition. And many of the people have shown partisanship towards their ideas that oppose the Book and the Sunnah and they also show enmity towards Ahl us-Sunnah, and this is one of the greatest of harms." (al-Ajwibah al-Mufeedah, pp.124-125)

And Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan also said about Qutb, "**Sayyid Qutb is a Jaahil who does not have any evidence for what he says...**" (Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah Min Tazkiyat Ahl il-Bid'ah wal-Mudhammah), and refer also to this book which indicates that Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan is aware of many of the heresies of Sayyid Qutb.

Also Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen was asked about the beliefs of Sayyid Qutb, he replied "My investigation of the books of Sayyid Qutb has been very little, and I do not know of the condition of the man, however some of the Scholars have written about what occurs in his tafseer "Dhilaal ul-Qur'aan", so they wrote observations about it, amongst them Shaikh Abdullaah ad-Duwaish – rahimahullaah – and our brother, Shaikh Rabee' al-Madkhalee, he has written some observations upon it, and upon Sayyid Qutb and his tafsir and other than his tafseer, so whoever wishes to refer to them then let him do so." (Cassette: Al-Liqaa al-Maftooh ath-Thaane Bayna ash-Shaikhain al-Uthaimen wal-Madkhali bi Jeddah, dated 24/21421H) And the Shaikh stamped his approval of this when it was quoted by the author of "Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah").

The point here is that the Qutubites use whatever they can find to assist them in their agenda, until even if it means resorting to blameworthy taqleed – as they have done in this case – using the words of Shaikh Ibn Jibreen, and abandoning the words of the Imaams Ibn Baaz, al-Albaani and Ibn Uthaimen and other than them, who are more aware of the heresies of Sayyid Qutb, though some of them admit, that they have not investigated or looked into the affair (such as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen). Nevertheless, they are aware. So we say tha the likes of Shaikh Ibn Jibreen, they are not aware of the reality of the situation and they have mistakingly held the notion that Qutb and Bannaa are like the scholars of the past, whereas the reality is far different from this. But this proves that the Qutubi Fanatic whose condition we are currently discussing is in fact a Muqallid embodied, for that is what his behavioural condition makes as clear as the daylight sun.

themselves and they were humiliated and disgraced when Imaam Ibn Baaz made a number of clarifications about what he had originally stated.²⁶

²⁶ As we have explained above, when these activists came to realise that the Salafi Mashayikh came to know of their true reality, they began to fear lest they were exposed in front of the Senior Ulamaa and the general folk. So they began to strive to cause doubt about them and began to accuse them of being spies for the government, of being paid and employed by the government and of speaking against the du'aat for reasons of envy, hatred and jealousy. And that by this act of theirs they are causing divisions within the Ummah and pillaging its unity so that the enemy finds it easier to defeat it. So they strived in all of this, with great cowardice and whatever other strengths they had in deception and causing confusion so that no trust may be placed in them and that no one may listen to their words or advice.

And of their political machinations and acts of cowardice was that they strove hard to obtain a statement from Shaikh Ibn Baz – rahimahullaah – concerning the Salafi Mashayikh and their criticism and refutations of the political activists. Yet they only managed to do so after much persuasion. Hence Shaikh Ibn Baz issued a statement of advice that was general to all the Du'aat.

After this they began to interpret this general advice as being specifically intended for the Salafi Mashayikh in general and Shaikh Rabi bin Hadi in particular. And they made the general folk think that Shaikh Ibn Baz's intent was to defend the honour of the du'at, meaning themselves, since they had been spoken ill of. This was their claim.

And amongst such deceivers were the likes of ash-Shayjee, Salman al-Awdah, Muhammad Saeed al-Qahtani, and Safar al-Hawali.

In his book, "Adwaa 'alaa Fikr D'uaat as-Salafiyyah al-Jadeedah" (p10), ash-Shayjee states that the statement of Shaikh Ibn Baz was specifically intended for the Shaikhs of Madinah and Shaikh Rabi bin Hadi in particular.

Salman al-Awdah stated in his lecture, "Tahrir ul-Ard Am Tahrir ul-Insan", **"My dear brother... the statement which I have just read to you, we have been proposing to Shakh 'Abdul-Aziz bin Baz for three months (to make this statement) and he was happy to issue it. However, the Shaikh's various engagements made this very difficult. ... I have full knowledge of it, from the time that this statement was just merely an idea, when it was given the go ahead, how it was composed, when the Shaikh actually made it, and what is related and not related to it!!! And those who were intended by it are the sedition makers in Madinah"**

And a person then asked, **"Why did he not complete it... exposing the individuals who have spoken against the Ulamaa and the Du'at so long as they are upon this falsehood?!"** To which Awdah replied, **"It is sufficient for you that Allaah has blackened their faces in light of this statement of Shaikh 'Abdul'Aziz..."**

And Muhammad Sa'eed al-Qahtani said in his lesson, "Mukhtasir Ma'arij ul-Qubool" in the city of Jeddah, **"...Those foolish ones come along and they circulate cassettes filled with revilement... and they are only a small band – and all praise is due to Allaah – and they are known as such, but we will not make this gathering impure by mentioning their names. They are well known. And they rejected the Shaikh's advice and the Shaikh – may Allaah protect him - continued in this matter with them (i.e. continued to advise them), but they only persisted in their obstinacy, and their publicising of faults, and causing doubts. So he wrote – may Allaah protect him – this advice..."**

So this was the manner of these cowards, who after having admitted their ignorance of the true understanding of the state of affairs and who retreated into their snake burrows, then began, in order to save face, to spread lies and fabrications against those who had full knowledge of their situation and who had exposed them.

Yet their plot was uncovered and their humiliation increased and the inner and hidden realities were brought to the forefront. The Shaikh and Allaamah 'Abdul-Aziz Ibn Baz – may Allaah have mercy upon him – was asked about his intent in the statement that he had issued earlier. So he replied on 27/7/1412 in Makkah (and this is recorded on cassette),

But this in fact became the behavioural condition of the neo-Qutubites over the years to come, they tried whatever they could of lies and deception to discredit the Ulamaa who had actually become aware of their great deviations, away from the Salafi Manhaj, all in the name of the Extremist Haakimiyyah of Sayyid Qutb, an exaggerated form of Fiqh ul-Waaqi, and the Promise of Henry Kissinger, the Bogus Promise.

To illustrate with another example, the neo-Qutubites attempted to discredit a number of books that had become thorn in their throats, and a stake in their adulterated manhaj. Amongst them “The Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah” and also “Jamaa’ah Waahidah” which was a refutation of the Bannaawi doctrine that Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq had revived, the manhaj that justified the accommodation of all and sundry, Bid’iyy and Hizbi alike. So the partisans sought to get a verdict out of Imaam Ibn Baaz which they could use to discredit Shaikh Rabee’ once more. They succeeded and here is its text:

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Office of the Presidency of Islamic Research and Legal Verdicts, The Office of the General Mufti

From ‘Abdul’Azeez bin ‘Abdullah Ibn Baaz, to the respected and honourable sons from the callers to Allah - Glory be to Him - in the country of Kuwait, may Allah assist them in that which contains His Pleasure, and increase them in knowledge and Imaan, Ameen.

Salaamun ‘Alaikum wa-raHmatullahi wa-barakaatuhu, to proceed.

“In the Name of Allaah, Full of Mercy, Ever-Merciful (to His Believing Servants). All Praise is due to Allaah and may Allaah send prayers upon His Messenger, his family and his companions. To proceed:

The statement that was issued by me, the intent behind it was to invite everybody, all of the du’at and the scholars, to make constructive criticism and not to criticise specific individuals amongst their brothers from the du’at. Rather everyone should offer sincerity of purpose to Allaah and His servants. And when he comes to know of an error of his brother, he should advise him for the sake of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, by writing or orally, without criticising him on cassettes or printed media and their likes. So that the hearts may remain upright and continue to have love and loyalty and that there may be co-operation upon righteousness and piety. However, the statement was not intended for our brothers, the people of Madinah, amongst the students of knowledge, teachers and du’at. And nor were those besides them in Makkah, Riyadh or Jeddah intended. Rather the advice was general.

And our Brothers, the well known Scholars in Madeenah, we do not have a doubt about them. They are possessors of a sound aqeedah and they are from Ahl usSunnah walJamaa’ah, such as Shaikh Muhammad Amaan bin Alee, Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, Shaikh Saalih bin Sa’d asSuhaimi, Shaikh Faalih bin Naafi’, Shaikh Muhammad bin Haadee [al-Madkhalee] - all of them are known to us to have Istiqamah, knowledge and sound aqeedah. We ask increase in every good for them from Allaah and success in what pleases Him. **However the callers of falsehood (du’aat ul-baatil) and the people who hunt (others) in murky waters, they are the ones who cause confusion amongst the people and who speak in these matters and they say: ‘The intent was this and that’, and this is not good.** It is necessary to take the words in their best possible light. And the intent [behind the advice] was co-operation upon birr and taqwaa, and to purify the hearts and to warn against backbiting which causes rancour and enmity. We ask Allaah for guidance and success for all.”[The Tape: Explanation of Shaikh Bin Baaz of his Statement].

And this is one illustration of many of the mischief and machinations of the political activists.

Your beneficial letter dated 7th of Rajab 1416 AH has reached me, may Allah reach you to the rope of guidance and the ability. And all that you have mentioned in it [the letter] was known, particularly what you mentioned regarding the book of ash-Sheikh Rabee' bin Haadi Madkhali, and what he mentioned regarding his eminence ash-Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan 'Abdul-Khaaliq, and what you also mentioned about his eminence ash-Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan 'Abdul-Khaaliq, and his vigour in ad-Da'watis-Salafiyah and your criticism of what his eminence ash-Sheikh Rabee' bin Haadi mentioned about him.

And what I see, is the continuity from you, and his eminence ash-Sheikh 'Abdur-Rahmaan 'Abdul-Khaaliq, in Da'wah to Allah - Glory be to Him - upon the Manhaj of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah and enthusiasm in that, and encouragement of all the callers amongst you, **to adherence to the Madhhab of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, and conducting the Da'wah to Allah - Glory be to Him - upon what is evident from the Book of Allah - the Mighty and the Majestic - and the Sunnah of His Messenger - upon him be the Salaah and Salaam - while being heedful of what Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah has mentioned and maintained, by following the companions of the Messenger of Allah - may the Salaah of Allah and Salaam be upon him, and may He be pleased with them - and the ones who followed their methodology, like the Imaams: Maalik, al-Awzaa'i, ath-Thawri, Ibn 'Uyainah, Ibn al-Mubaarak, Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, ash-Shaafi'i, Ibn Khuzaimah and others besides them from the Imaams of Sunnah - May Allah have mercy upon them. And upon the methodology, those who came after them from Ahlus-Sunnah, like Sheikh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyah and his student Ibn al-Qayim, al-Haafidh Ibn Katheer, and those who came after them from the Imaams of Sunnah, like ash-Sheikh Muhammad bin 'Abdil-Wahhaab and his students, and his followers from Ahlis-Sunnah, and to turn away from whatever besides it. And it [similarly] includes bringing about unity, to aid the Sunnah, to cooperate upon righteousness and piety, and to enrage the people of innovation, to halt them at their limits, and to expose their false madhaahib [pl. of Madhhab], that are contradictory to that which is evident from the Book and the Sunnah and the Manhaj of the Salaf of the Ummah.** May Allah guide you all to the right path, and may He bless you in your struggle, may He increase you in your understanding of His religion, may He aid with you His party and the callers to Him, and may He humiliate the enemies of Islaam through you, indeed He is the most Generous and the most Bountiful.

And as for ash-Sheikh Rabee', then I shall write to him and advise him Inshaa`Allah. We ask Allah for ourselves, you and him, guidance and forgiveness from [all] possibilities of going astray due to trials, and [we ask Allah for] the ability to [do] all good, indeed He is the most Generous and the most Bountiful.

WasSalaamu 'Alaikum wa-rahmatullahi wa-barakaatuhu

General Mufti of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. And the Head of the Council of Major Scholars. And the Office of the Presidency of Islamic Research and Legal Verdicts. Number: 1928/Kha Dated: 11/9/1416. End of verdict.

The Hizbiyyoon, upon receiving this, then began to exclaim with the might of their tongues that this was a criticism of the book “Jamaa’ah Waahidah” by Shaikh Rabee, and this was but a fanciful hallucination. It is common practice amongst the Hizbiyyoon to ascribe to our Ulama matters that they are free of. When one reads the letter again, there is nothing to support the Hizbiyyoon at all. Rather Imaam Ibn Baaz stated that he was aware of the issues and the matters for which Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq was criticised for (since Imaam Ibn Baaz himself refuted Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq on the issue of multiplicity of groups around a year and a half earlier).

Then Imaam Ibn Baaz advised with the continuation of da’wah **upon the manhaj of the Salaf, that which the Companions were upon and which the Salaf after them were upon, the likes of al-Awzaa’ee, Maalik, Ahmad and others were upon.** And their methodology is not hidden to any Salafi (!!). He also advised with abandoning whatever opposes it (from the newly-invented matters and methodologies). And likewise he advised with engraving the Innovators, and to refute them, and to halt them at their limits, and to explain their false madhaahib. (but Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq hates all of this, as we shall soon see, since he innovated Hizbiyyah into the religion of our Lord, and it was precisely on account of these matters that he showed enmity to Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, when the latter refuted him on these points). **And all of what Imaam Ibn Baaz mentioned and advised the Kuwaitis with, is the very Manhaj of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, word for word, letter for letter.** Then finally the Imaam said he would write to Shaikh Rabee’ with some advice.

The Biased Partisans, took this to mean a refutation and criticism of the book of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee. Then Ahl ul-Hadeeth wal-Athar, around 2 weeks later, went back to the Imaam for clarification and here are the Shaikhs words, translated directly from the cassette: **Question:** In the name of Allah and all praise is for Allah. Today is the 27th of Ramadaan 1416H. The Question to be put to you is that we wish the noble Shaikh ‘Abdul Azeez ibn Baaz may Allah increase his life-span -the father, some people say that Shaikh ibn Baaz sent a treatise to some students of knowledge in Kuwait, explaining in that treatise that Shaikh Rabee’ in his book entitled :”Jamaa’ah Waahidah Laa Jamaa’aat “ is a book containing error, and is a cause of discord amongst the youth, so did this or anything like this proceeded from you ?

Answer: In the name of Allah, all praise is for Allah, and may Allah extol and send blessings of peace upon Allah’s Messenger and his followers and companions who followed his way. To proceed:..... Rather this is a lie, and the book of Shaikh Rabee’ : “Jamaa’ah Laa Jamaa’aat” - until now I have not read it .

Question: We hear O ‘Shaikh about the Jamaa’atut-tableegh and the da’wah which they carry out, do you advise to go off with this jamaa’ah . I hope for guidance and advise and may Allah give a great reward .

Answer: Whoever calls to Allah is one who conveys the message. Whoever calls to Allah is one who conveys the message. “Convey from me even if you only a single Aayah”. So the well-known Jamaa’atut Tableegh of India have some innovations and matters of SHIRK, so it is not allowed to go out with them except for a person who has knowledge to go out with

them.... them to teach them as for his going out with them following them, then no since they have false beliefs and they a deficiency in knowledge. But if Jamaa'atut Tableegh upon insight and knowledge, then he may go out with them to call to Allah. Or a person who has insight and knowledge and goes with them in order to and censure and to guide them to good and to teach them - so that they may abandon the futile position and come to the position of Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamaa'ah .(From the cassette 'Aqaa'id wa Afkaar Mashaayikhit-Tableegh)

Of course, what the partisans attempted to achieve was taken away from them. Then to increase them in their sorrow and their woes, six of the Mashaayikh actually wrote an introduction to Jamaa'ah Waahidah, including Shaikh al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ahmad bin Yahyaa an-Najmee and others, from those who had read the book, and they made note of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq's assault against the Salafi Mashaayikh, and these assaults have been detailed in "Intermediate Qutubism" (GRV070004) so refer to it, and if you can refer to the book "Jamaa'ah Waahidah (One Jamaa'ah [Only])" and also "Nasr ul-Azeez 'Alaa ar-Radd al-Wajeez" which is Shaikh Rabee's subsequent annihilation of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq's devised methodology of lying and deceiving the Kuwaiti Youth, and taking them to the doors of Hellfire, by reviving for them the manhaj of Hassan al-Banna and the Ikhwaan and indulging them in the ways of the Infidels in his political work and his "Shurocracy"²⁷.

²⁷ **BENEFIT: ABDUR-RAHMAN ABDUL-KHALIQ PERSISTS IN INNOVATION**

Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, when Bannaawism began to slowly take over his person, spoke with the multiplicity of groups and parties, i.e. justified the existence of all the various Islamic groups present today, despite their differences in aqidah and manhaj and their falling into the acts of kufr and shirk (in the case of some). This being in direct conflict with the Book and the Sunnah, the Ulamaa began to refute him and advise him. And this continued for a number of years. When Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq did not listen, one of the students of knowledge from Kuwait took some of the errors of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq to Imaam Ibn Baaz (amongst them, his saying about the multiplicity of groups). Imaam Ibn Baaz refuted these claims and advised the latter to correct himself.

Following this, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq made an open display of his supposed repentance and that he had taken it all back. His open supposed repentance took place on 20th September 1994, in an article called "Tanbeehaat wa Ta'aqqubaat" in which he glorified the Permanent Committee and called them "my fathers" and so and he also made many lies against the Salafi Mashayikh such as Shaikh Rabee' (refer to Jamaa'ah Waahidah of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee) . His repentance was somewhat exaggerated, and while previously he had called our Ulamaa, "mummified, absent in mind and present in body", "perfect and complete ignorance", "their da'wah does not mean anything" and other such great calamities (which we have documented elsewhere, GRV070004), he then showed the outward love and respect.

Then in a cassette, which is at least 15 months after his open repentance, there occur a number of questions and answers, in which the great deceit of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq is uncovered and his persistence in innovation and heresy laid bare. Stated Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee:

"The questioner asks him (Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq) about the verdict of Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Bin Baaz which was in al-Muslimoon magazine (23rd December 1995) and which also contained the refutations of al-Qaradaawi, the Straying Innovator, against it. He answered the question by giving a diplomatic answer which indicated that he was not actually pleased with this fatwaa (i.e. of Ibn Baaz) and this was after his recantation by a long time since his recantation took place on 14th Rabee' ul-Awwal 1415H, corresponding to 20th September 1994. Then the questioner said to him, "O Shaikh, in relation to the multiplicity of Islamic groups in the Islamic world and their abundance, such as al-Ikhwaan ul-Muslimoon, Jamaa'at ut-Tabligh, Hizb ut-Tahreer and

others, we hear two views. One saying this is a good thing because the good points (of this multiplicity) outweigh the bad points. Another orientation which says that this is differing and splitting and this is not allowed because its bad points are greater than its good points?" To which Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq replied, **"Indeed this is a good thing absolutely and there are no negative points in this at all, in splitting and differing. This is not correct..."** The questioner said after, "There is an orientation which states that evil of the multiplicity of groups in the Islamic world outweighs the good, what is your view on this?". To which he replied, **"This is destruction (hadm), destruction, destruction this is. This is an action of destruction"**.

This is how Abdur-Rahmaan acts, and does not care at all about his recantation in front of the esteemed Shaikh Ibn Baaz and nor in front of the others from the Ulamaa and understanding ones, those in front of whom he announced publicly, in front of them, his recantation... and Allaah knows best whether he considers the people and their Scholars to be "a battalion of mummified people"... So where is the respect of Abdur-Rahmaan for Ibn Baaz and the Hai'ah Kibaar ul-Ulamaa, which he claims he does, when it is the case that he does not even give respect for other Scholars and other people..." (an-Nasr ul-Azeez, pp. 163-164)

BENEFIT: IKHWAAN AND TABLIGH FROM THE SEVENTY-TWO SECTS

And that which puts and end to all the loyalists of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and those entrenched in his innovatory principles, is the following statement of Imaam Ibn Baaz.

The Noble Imaam, Ibn Baaz was asked, "May Allaah be benevolent to you, the hadeeth of the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) concerning the division of the Ummah, "My Ummah will soon split seventy-three sects...", so is the Jamaa'at ut-Tabligh, alongside what they have of acts of Shirk and innovation, and likewise the Ikhwaan ul-Muslimeen, alongside what they have of partisanship, splitting the ranks, using force against the Wullaat al-Umoor, and not hearing and obeying (the Rulers), so do these two sects enter (into those sects mentioned in the hadeeth)?

He replied, **"They enter into the seventy-two sects. Whoever opposes the aqidah of Ahl usSunnah enters into the seventy-two sects.** The intent behind his saying, "My Ummah..." means the Ummah that has responded to his call (Ummat al-Hjaabah), meaning they have responded to the call and have made apparent their following of him, and they are the seventy-three sects. The saved and secure one is the one that follows him and shows steadfastness (istiqamah) upon his religion. And as for the seventy-two sects, amongst them is the disbeliever, the sinner and the innovator, they are of various types."

The questioner then said, "Meaning, these two sects (Ikhwaan and Tabligh) are included within those seventy-two sects?" The Shaikh replied, **"Yes, from those seventy-two sects. And so are the Murji'ah and others. The Murji'ah and Khawarij, some of the People of Knowledge consider them to be from the Unbelievers, however, they are actually from the generality of the seventy-two sects."** End of the Shaikh's words. This exists in the Shaikh's lesson on "Sharh ul-Muntaqaa", recorded on cassette, in Taa'if in the year 1418H.

CONSIDER THIS WELL

Allaah the Most High says, "And be not of Al-Mushrikun (the disbelievers in the Oneness of Allah, polytheists, idolaters, etc.). **Of those who split up their religion (i.e. who left the true Islâmic Monotheism), and became sects, [i.e. they invented new things in the religion (Bid'ah), and followed their vain desires], each sect rejoicing in that which is with it.**" (Ar-Rum 30:31-32).

And from al-Irbaad ibn Saariyah (radiallahu anhu) who said: "Allaah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) gave us an admonition which caused the eyes to shed tears and the hearts to fear, so we said, "O Messenger of Allaah, this is as if it were a farewell sermon, so with what do you counsel us?" So he said: "I have left you upon clear proof, its night is like its day, no one deviates from it except one who is destroyed, and whoever lives long from amongst you will see great controversy. So stick to what you know from my *Sunnah* and the *Sunnah* of the orthodox, rightly-guided caliphs - cling to that with your molar teeth, and stick to obedience even if it is to an Abyssinian slave, since the believer is like a submissive camel, wherever he is led, he follows" (Ahmad (4/126), Ibn Maajah (no. 43), al-Haakim (1/96) and others - Hasan).

Anas bin Maalik reported that Allaah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) said, "This Ummah will split into seventy-three sects, all of them in the Hellfire except for one." They asked, "And what is that sect?" He

And after the partisans began to use and misinterpret and misapply what had been said by Shaikh Ibn Baaz, Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee wrote an excellent reply showing that what Shaikh Ibn Baaz had written was actually a refutation of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, not of Shaikh Rabee', for Shaikh Ibn Baaz asked for adhering to the manhaj of the Salaf of the past (which Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq considers antiquated and irrelevant to the times)²⁸ and also enraging the Innovators and halting at their limits (which is the exact opposite of what Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq was preaching and was the very reason for which he and his intimate student, ash-Shayjee, poured their wrath upon Shaikh Rabee' and accused him of making takfir of the Jamaa'at and so on).

The Imaam, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen was asked, "Are there any texts in the Book and the Sunnah which allow the multiplicity of groups and parties?". The Shaikh replied, "**There are no texts in the Book or the Sunnah which permit the multiplicity of groups and parties. Rather in the Book and the Sunnah is that which forbids that...**" then the Shaikh quotes

replied, "Those who are upon what I and my companions are upon today". (Tabaraanee in Mu'jamusSagheer no. 724, Tirmidhee, 2641, al-Haakim, 1/125).

Abdullaah bin Mas'ood reported, "Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) drew a line for us, then he said, "This is Allaah's way." Then he drew lines to the right and to the left and said, "These are differing ways, upon each of these ways is a devil (Shaytaan) calling to it." Then he recited, "**And this is My Straight Path, so follow it, and do not follow (other) paths, for they will separate you away from His Path.**" (a-An'aam 6:153)." (Ahmad 1/435 and at-Tayaaleesee no. 244).

Stated the Lord, Owner of Majesty and Splendor, "**Surely, Shaitân (Satan) is an enemy to you, so take (treat) him as an enemy. He only invites his Hizb (followers) that they may become the dwellers of the blazing Fire.**" (Fatir 35:6)

And these texts are by way of example only, since there are scores of their likes in the Book of our Lord and the statements of our Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam).

Then there comes this Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq with his Bannaawi da'wah and says that what Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) have said "**is not correct**" and is but "**destruction**" and that other than what Allaah and His Messenger have said is "**absolute goodness**". And all of this after the hujjah was established against him and after he had made a "public repentance" for speaking with the permissibility of the multiplicity of groups and parties, and from Allaah is the refuge.

²⁸ We see 'Abdur-Rahman 'Abdul-Khaliq sharing the same kind of views and thoughts in his statements such as his claim in his book, 'Manhaj al-Jadid Li-Diraasaat it-Tawhid', that the books of the **Salaf "are not suitable for explaining the matter of Tawheed in this era"**, and **that "these books [the earlier books of 'aqedah] are not free from complexities and intricacies in wording"** and also **"and that they are filled with great doubts and weak refutations of these doubts which would throw the reader into confusion, and doubt"**

Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul Khaaliq also centres his explanation of Tawheed around the names which are related to tashree' (legislation) and **Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah**. Following in the footsteps of the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hassan al-Banna, Muhammad Suroor, he has tended towards interpreting Tawheed as being Tawheed al-Haakimiyyah.

As for the book as-Siraat, and Shaikh Ibn Baaz's praise for it, then as has been pointed out by the likes of Abdullaah as-Sabt, the version that was taken to Shaikh Ibn Baaz was other than the one that had already been published and distributed far and wide, and it does not contain the errors and deviations that the first one contains. And we shall cover this, inshaa'allaah, when this issue comes up for discussion, in a future installment of "Taming a Neo-Qutubite Fanatic".

the verses which condemn splitting in the religion. (Cassette: al-Kalimaat an-Naafi'ah Fil-Fitan al-Waaqi'ah).

But as for Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and his sect, speaking with the words of Imaam Ibn Uthaimen is “**destruction**” and is “**not correct**”, rather to Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, it is as if the words of Allaah and the words of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) are “**destruction**” and “**not correct**”. By Allaah, if only the biased partisans and straying wanderers who are infatuated with the “Contemporary Salafism” of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq took a moment to reflect upon what they are actually upon of repugnant and filthy doctrines.

And then to give another example of the lowliness of the partisans, they wrote a book attempting to illustrate the weakness of Shaikh Rabee’s knowledge in the field of hadeeth, entitled “al-Mi’yaar”, twisting and distorting and confusing the common-folk, in pretty much the same way as asSaqqaaaf, the Arch-Liar did with his documentation of the “lies” and “errors” of Imaam al-Albaani. And Shaikh Rabee’ replied to them in his “Bayaan Fasaad al-Mi’yaar, Hiwaar Ma’a Hizbi Mutasattir”, and illustrated the depths of their ignorance of the subject, walhamdulillaah.

The point that is being made here, is that Palmer does not wish that the Salafi youth who have become confused – due to this great fitnah that was entered into their ranks by those who imbibed the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Bannaa – that they should come to know of the reality of the background to the praises made by the likes of Imaam al-Albaani and Imaam Ibn Baaz and Imaam Ibn Uthaimen and Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab al-Bannaa and many others for Shaikh Rabee’, in particular the praises of the one who was “**the most knowledgeable of the hadeeth of Allaah’s Messenger under the sky**” (as described by Imaam Ibn Baaz), that is the Imaam and Muhaddith, Shaikh Muhammad Nasir ud-Din al-Albaanee, the greatest specialist in the field. And a praise from a specialist is indeed a mighty thing.

So Palmer is enraged, and furious, frantic and delirious about all of this. But why? Because Palmer and the rest of the neo-Qutubites use some old words of Imaam al-Albaani in praise of Sayyid Qutb – **which are outdated, and were based upon an incomplete knowledge of the reality of Sayyid Qutb and his “ignorance and deviation from Islaam”**.

So now Palmer is in a dilemma. [Because he is a Muqallid who blindly follows whatever will support his Qutubite Manhaj and his hatred of the Salafis and their Mashaayikh]

Imaam al-Albaani, the specialist in the field of hadeeth, has given a mighty and great tazkiyah to Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee. So as a result of this, the neo-Qutubite Fanatic flees from looking at what this tazkiyah is actually about, what is its background, and who are the people who criticise Shaikh Rabee’ and who are to be blamed and rebuked for that, as indicated by Imaam al-Albaani. Indeed, it is the followers of Salman al-Awdah, Safar al-Hawali, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Muhammad Salih al-Munajjid and others, who are upon the Qutubi, Bannaawi Manhaj and who criticise the Shaikh since he was instrumental in exposing their manhaj. Indeed, it is the ones about whom Imaam al-Albaani himself said,

“they have opposed many of the issues of the methodology of the Salaf”, and that they are “the Khawaarij of the Era”.

But as for the likes of Shaikh Ibn Jibreen, then we say that they have made an incorrect ijtihaad, and they are upon other than the truth and the evidence in this matter, and nor do they entertain the Qutubi, Bannaawi manhaj like those mentioned above, who have been nurtured in the Madrasah of Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah. And some from the people of knowledge have rejected what has been claimed by Shaikh Bakr Abu Zaid, such as Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others, and likewise some of the people of knowledge have also replied to Shaikh Ibn Jibreen’s statements, such as Shaikh Zaid bin Muhammad al-Madkhalee, indicating that they are devoid of evidence and based upon incomplete knowledge of the heresies of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna – who have been criticised by other senior scholars for their deviation and heresies and ways of innovation, such as Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan and others.

In the recent three cassette series “Kashf ul-Lathaam an Mukhaalafaat Ahmad Sallaam” (dated around July 2000), there occurs the following conversation between the questioner and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen: **Questioner:** “What is your advice concerning the one who forbids the cassettes of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee [from being distributed] with the claim that they cause fitnah and that they contain praise of the Wullaat ul-Umoor of the Kingdom, and that his praise of them emanates from nifaaq (hypocrisy)?”

The Shaikh replied: **“We consider this to be a great error and mistake. Shaikh Rabee’ is from the Ulamaa of the Sunnah, and from the people of goodness. His aqidah is sound and his manhaj is strong and sound. However, when he began to speak about some of the symbolic figureheads of some of the people, from amongst the latecomers [i.e. Sayyid Qutb et. al.] they began to tarnish him with these faults.”**

So the truth of the matter is that despite the fact that some of the people of knowledge have found fault with Shaikh Rabee’, the sincere researcher and seeker of truth, will realise that their criticism is based upon incomplete knowledge and their lack of familiarity in this field. But as for the Qutubiyyah, then they take from the sayings of the Mashaayikh what will aid and assist their agenda of pulling down the people of Sunnah and Salafiyyah, and promoting Bid’ah and Qutubiyyah, and will shove everything else under the carpet.

And indeed in all of this, the Neo-Qutubite Fanatic has in fact displayed himself an extreme Muqallid – and refuge is from Allaah. He accused us of his own iniquities, and then slowly huddled away. Ask yourself O Sunni, has he researched and followed the evidences, or has he merely made taqleed of the saying of one or two scholars which are based upon incomplete knowledge and do not even contain a shred of evidence? Only because it will support what he is already upon of the Shayijite School of Doctrine.

But the Fanatic made his own wantonness even more apparent when he stated:

...And does this mean that Bakr Abu Zaid and Ibn Jibrin are people following desires? If so, then this would mean that Al-Albani himself is also following his desires as he criticizes what Rabi has written about Sayyid Qutub when Adnaan Aroor read him a section of that book.

So look at the way of argumentation of this Fanatic. For he knows of a surety, that Imaam al-Albaani is the one who made the praise of Shaikh Rabee' and said that whoever criticises him is a follower of desires. And anyone with a bit of intelligence will see the stupidity of the argument of Palmer. He is trying to ridicule and explain away what was actually stated by Imaam al-Albaani by making an absurd conclusion. That this praise of Imaam al-Albaani itself necessitates that he himself is a follower of desires, since he criticised Shaikh Rabee' many years ago. And the truth of the matter is that that criticism was in reference to a particular paragraph of a book, not in reference to the person of Shaikh Rabee' himself. But that was when Imaam al-Albaani was not fully acquainted with the true and real nature of Sayyid Qutb. What then will Palmer, the Qutubi Fanatic say about the following:

The Muhaddith and Imaam, al-Albani – rahimahullaah – said, commenting upon the book 'al-Awaasim Mimmaa Fee Kutub Sayyid Qutub Min al-Qawasim' of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, **"Everything with which you have refuted Sayyid Qutb is the truth (haqq) and is correct (sawab).** And it will become sufficiently clear from this refutation to every one who has read anything from "The Islamic Heritage" **that Sayyid Qutb had no knowledge of the Usool (fundamentals) or the Furoo' (subsidiary matters) of Islaam.** So may Allaah reward you with the best of reward, **O brother Rabee' for fulfilling the obligation of explaining and uncovering his ignorance and deviation from Islaam."**

This statement was made in early 1999! To see a copy of the original message sent to Shaikh Rabee' refer to NDV010011, and also to the book "Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah Min Tazkiyat Ahl il-Bid'ah wal-Mudhammah", another stake in the heart of the Qutubi Heresy.

So what will the Qutubi Fanatic say now, and what will be his answer. Die in your warm fuzzies, and perish in your rage!! And this is the way of all the Ahl ul-Ahwaa, they display two-faces, and two scales, one for them and another for others. One time they will resort to taqleed and enjoin it upon the people, then another time, they will enjoin research and investigation. And they take from each of these two aspects what will support their innovation and their agenda.

So when it suits them, they will use the (old and outdated) praise of Shaikh al-Albaani for a piece of writing of Sayyid Qutb, for example, or his (old and outdated) praise and defence for al-Hawali and al-Awdah, and then they will flee from his most recent statements, like that concerning Shaikh Rabee's refutations of Sayyid Qutb, or like his declaring this newly arisen sect as **"the Khawaarij of the Era"**. This is their state and condition. By Allaah, a despicable and wanton condition, indeed. This proves that they are Muqallidah, and they enjoin taqleed when it suits them, then they enjoin research and investigation and the absence of taqleed when it suits them and their desires, for no reply have they brought, and nor will they ever bring a sound reply to the recent statements of Imaam al-Albaani about their mentors and leaders.

Then Palmer continued:

[Abu Khadeejah] Shaykh al-Albaanee also described Shaykh Rabee as the Imaam of Jarh and Ta'deel (the Imaam of knowing the narrators and the one who disparages and praises them, Albaanee in fact has written the introduction to his new edition of Manhaj al-Anbiyah (now available in english).

[Idris Palmer] So what? What does this have to do with the topic at hand? Rabi asked Sh. Abdur-Rahmaan to write the introduction to the first edition of the book which appeared in the mid-80's. Also just because al-Albaani views "Shaykh Rabee as the imaam of jarh and tadeel" this does not mean he is infallible. The true imaams of al-jarh wat-ta'deel like Imaams Ahmad, Ibn Ma'een, an-Nisaa'i, Ibn Hibban and others mutually corrected and refuted each others comments on certain narrators of the Prophet's hadeeth (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam). Where they then followers of their desires? What sheer ignorance.

Indeed, what sheer ignorance and stupidity and foolishness, O Palmer! On your behalf that is! O Sunni, as you will learn later on in the continuation of this discourse, Palmer enjoined upon us to print and publish the book "as-Siraat" of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq that had been praised by Imaam Ibn Baaz. The Fanatic would later argue that we should therefore publish and distribute it or spread it or words to that effect. Now, if this Fanatic considers that a praise of the book warrants that this praise be used in order argue the case for the book and for its author, then it is indeed strange that the Fanatic should exclaim "So what? What does this have to do with the topic at hand?" at being told that Imaam al-Albaani has written the introduction to the book "Manhaj al-Anbiyaa" of Shaikh Rabee', the very book that gave every Revolutionary Takfiri endless nightmares and cold shivery-shakes. Indeed, at being told of Imaam al-Albaani's saying that Shaikh Rabee' is the "Imaam of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel", since this is more far-reaching than praising a specific book of Shaikh Rabee', rather it is a tazkiyah and praise of the knowledge and manhaj of Shaikh Rabee' as a whole. For the mere praise of a book does not necessitate the total uprightness of its author.

By Allaah, the behavioural condition of this Fanatic is indeed beyond comprehension. There is one standard for his Qutubi manhaj and another standard for everything else.

The Qutubi exclaims, "What does this have to do with the topic at hand?", and yet he does not recall that what started this whole discussion off was that Ali Timimi argued the case for the Qutubi manhaj by using the praise of Shaikh Ibn Baaz for the book "as-Siraat". So what Abu Khadeejah said in his reply above had everything to do with the topic at hand, for Palmer and the rest of the Qutubiyah know that they detest the book "Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa" of Shaikh Rabee'(and also his book "Jamaa'ah Waahidah").

Now pay attention O Sunni, concerning this book of Shaikh Rabee', Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaaliq falsely accused [Shaikh Rabee'] of "**emptying**" Tawheed of the concept of Rulership of Allah - this was what Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaaliq said in his book "Ar-Radd Al-Wajeez", p.15,16 (This book was published in 1996, First edition). While Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaaliq said in 1986 in his introduction to the first edition of Shaikh Rabee's book, "**The whole book centres around a concentric essential issue which is briefly (Tawheed is the starting point of da'wah to Allah and it's goal). Every da'wah which does not place Tawheed as it's foundation and concrete then it is not a call to Allah, no matter what**

name it takes on. That is because the da'wah of all the messengers, and at the head of them all our prophet Muhammed, sallallaahu 'alaihi wasallam, was to the Tawheed of Allah, to start with as their goal and as their end... Therefore, every da'wah to be worthy of this title must first correct the 'Aqeedah of it's personnel and followers...' [p.11]. Then he [Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaaliq] further added, **"It is completely forbidden that the da'wah to Allah turns into a political party like any worldly party like any worldly party by giving up or compromising it's 'Aqeedah or part of it for the sake of gathering followers, pleasing deviants and reaching sovereignty and rulership. Therefore by that, it will be emptying Islam from it's content and da'wah from it's truthfulness or reality"** [p.13].

Note the contradiction between what he said in 1986 and 1996!! To note the contradiction even more clearly, we see at the end of Abdur-Rahman's [Abdul-Khaaliq] introduction where he said, **"I ask Allah to benefit the Muslims with this wonderful book"!!** And his saying later [in 1996], **"Shaykh Rabee' Ibn Haadee wrote a book in order to establish the false criterion which he called the "path of the prophets in calling to Allah."** [Ar-Radd Al-Wajeez, p.16].

And this is the state and condition of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, one of the mentors and leaders of the Qutubi Fanatic whose condition we are currently discussing. So indeed what Abu Khadeejah stated above **has everything to do with the topic** because the essence of the original email of Palmer's associate, Ali Timimi, was to argue for the case of the book "as-Siraat" because Shaikh Ibn Baaz had praised it, and indeed, Ali Timimi stated at the end of it, "

...And now we have what I hope in Allah will bring an end for once and all to these teachings Ibn Baz's praise of Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq's book as-Sirat and his recommendation that the book is worthy of being published and distributed...

So this was what the whole issue revolved around. But alas, the forelock of Palmer is given to confusion and bewilderment and he understands not. This is why what was stated by Abu Khadeejah was pertinent and apt, and it just goes to show that when Imaam al-Albaani said about this new sect that they are "the Khawaarij of the Era" and that they "have opposed the Salaf in many of the issues of methodology" and also when he made lavish praises of Shaikh Rabee', calling him "the flag-bearer of al-jarh wat-ta'deel" and defending him against those who accuse him of falsehood, in falsehood, or out of ignorance, and when he writes the introduction to the book "Manhaj al-Anbiyaa" which gave Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and his sect sleepless nights, that no sincerity of purpose was given to all of this by the likes of this Qutubi fanatic and his cohorts.

Then the Fanatic reveals his behavioural sickness even further when he says:

...Also just because al-Albaani views "Shaykh Rabee as the imaam of jarh and tadeel" this does not mean he is infallible.

Maashaa'allaah. And just because Shaikh al-Albaani praised a passage or a part of one of Sayyid Qutb's does it mean that Qutb is infallible, the while he made mockery of Moosaa

(alaihis-salaam), made takfir of Banu Umayyah, reviled and slandered Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), called for the abolition of parts of the Sharee'ah and other statements of kufr and apostasy, then he is not infallible. And Rabe'e is to be declared a heretic and astray merely because he defends the honour of the Prophets and the Companions and the Islamic Aqeedah?!

What are the actual issues here O Fanatical one.

Why O why, then, O Qutubi Fanatic, did you make your wrath descend upon Shaikh Rabe'e bin Haadee when he said about Sayyid Qutb exactly what you have just said about Shaikh Rabe'e, that he is not infallible. Indeed, you had no right whatsoever, to defend this Raafidee Heretic, who persisted in his attacks upon the Companions, even though the proof was established against him by Mahmood Shaakir in numerous writings that appeared in the public domain, in the newspapers, back in 1952 (1372H). You had no right then to defend one who distorted the Islamic Aqidah and merely conveyed the innovations of most of the sects in his tafseer, one that is based upon mere opinion and poetical expression and is far removed from the actual true tafseer, as more than one from the people of knowledge have explained.

You see O Sunni, this is the extremist practical Irjaa' that we alluded to earlier. They are the Murji'ah in truth, for their behavioural condition is the greatest of indicators of that. Reflect O Sunni, they use an old and outdated praise of Imaam al-Albaani for a piece of writing of Sayyid Qutb, and therefore, this is now a tazkiyah for the adulterated manhaj and aqidah of Sayyid Qutb, and they spread this in the corners of the Earth, rejoicing what is with them of fanaticism. Then when Imaam al-Albaani says what he says about Shaikh Rabe'e bin Haadee, how do they respond? And how do they judge? And how do they traverse the earth? And how do they make ta'weel of this praise? And what sophistry do they use to deny the import and implications of this tazkiyah.

Do you not also see O Sunni, how this Fanatical Qutubi and his likes spread the lie about Shaikh Rabe'e that he said, "Ibn Baaz stabbed Salafiyyah in the back", and then he used it to vilify the Shaikh and ascribe misguidance to him?! Let's say that that was true, that Shaikh Rabe'e did say that, for argument's sake. Now which is worse. Mocking Moosaa (alaihis-salaam), reviling and lying upon Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), making takfir of Banu Umayyah, accusing Mu'aawiyah and Amr Ibn al-Aas of hypocrisy (nifaaq) and deception (ghish) and treachery (khiyaanah)??! How confused is the forelock of this Fanatical Qutubi Murji'ite and how great is his contradiction and how ridiculous and hypocritical is his argument. For he finds fault with Shaikh Rabe'e on account of a mere lie, and then his behavioural condition and the tongue of his disposition defends the statements of kufr and apostasy that emanate from his sayyid, hating that they should be exposed and warned against. Otherwise, why did he become a muqallid and follow anyone who found fault with Shaikh Rabe'e, upon other than the truth and other than knowledge and other than evidence?

Then the Qutubi Fanatic disgraced himself, and made a laughing stock of himself:

...The true imaams of al-jarh wat-ta'deel like Imaams Ahmad, Ibn Ma'een, an-Nisaa'i, Ibn Hibban and others mutually corrected and refuted each others comments on certain narrators of the Prophet's hadeeth (sallallaahu alaihi wa sallam). Where they then followers of their desires? What sheer ignorance.

Again, this Qutubi Fanatic has not understood the background, the reality and the import of the praise of Imaam al-Albaani for Shaikh Rabee' and his stating that anyone who criticises this Shaikh is a follower of desires. This is because when Shaikh al-Albaani made that statement (in 1417H) he is aware of what is taking place that many of the partisans are attacking this Shaikh in falsehood, and refuting him in falsehood, as has preceded. Shaikh al-Albaani is not talking about mutual correction and refutation which has its basis in knowledge. Rather, he is talking about those whom in the same year he labelled **'the Khawaarij of the Era'** and those who **"opposed many of the issues of methodology of the Salaf"** – indeed the very issues of methodology concerning which Shaikh Rabee' authored books, such as the innovated methodology of al-Muwaazanah, the innovated methodologies of calling to Allaah, the innovated methodologies that allow working with and sheltering the Innovators and so on. So for all these reasons, many attempted to refute Shaikh Rabee' and tried to cast doubt on his strength and expertise in the field of hadeeth.

The Sunni, Salafi, Athari will be aware that the reason why Shaikh Rabee's honour was attacked was precisely because he refuted the chief theoretician of "the Khawaarij of the Era", Sayyid Qutb. This was alluded to by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in what we have quoted from him earlier on, **"We consider this to be a great error and mistake. Shaikh Rabee' is from the Ulamaa of the Sunnah, and from the people of goodness. His aqidah is sound and his manhaj is strong and sound. However, when he began to speak about some of the symbolic figureheads of some of the people, from amongst the latecomers [i.e. Sayyid Qutb et. al.] they began to tarnish him with these faults."**

And it is from this perspective that we understand the reality of those who refute Shaikh Rabee' and whose refutations have their basis in hawaa (desire) not true knowledge, as Imaam al-Albaani stated, while bearing in mind that some from the people of knowledge who hold positions against Shaikh Rabee' then they are held due to their own incomplete knowledge in the arena of the heresies of Sayyid Qutb.

But as for the Qutubi disgracing himself in what he has stated above, then it is from this perspective: Those whom he mentioned from the leading scholars of the past such as the Imaams Ahmad, Ibn Ma'een, an-Nisaa'i and Ibn Hibban, were upon one creed, one methodology and one way.

One of them did not entertain the notions or heretical doctrines of Sayyid Qutb, and nor did they toy with the innovations of Hassan al-Banna, the Innovator of Hizbiyyah and neither did they allow working in an apparatus that they considered to be kufr to begin with – illustrating great contradiction in all of that –using the excuse of rectifying the affairs, as was the unfortunate condition of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and his strange,

wonderful, new methodology that he concocted²⁹. Neither, were they at variance in the methodologies they employed to rectify the people and so on. Their refutations of one another were not rooted and determined by what particular manhaj they were holding onto. Their refutations were not based upon desire and the likes, since their refutations were to establish the truth pertaining to the ahaadeeth and its narrators.

As for the partisans who refute Shaikh Rabee', then they refute him in order to discredit him and to make him fall in the eyes of the people, only because he stood to perform an obligation which no one else has stood to perform, or has been able to perform. That is, uncovering the machinations of those who had been poisoned by the Qutubi doctrine, and who had begun to spread the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna into the ranks of the Salafis. So when he stood to perform this, the Hizbiyyoon stood to refute and to discredit him and to harm him and to revile him.

Now the Fanatic must be asked: Did Ibn Ma'een speak with the saying of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq that Ikhwaan, Tabligh and Hizb ut-Tahrir, that the existence of these groupings (or their equivalents in those times) is manifest goodness for the Ummah? Now did an-Nasaa'i used to visit the shrines and tombs and celebrate the Milad and perform tafweed of the Attributes of the Lord Most High? And did Imaam Ahmad mock the Prophets of Allaah and revile the Caliph of Islaam, Uthmaan (radiiallahu anhu) and speak with the saying of the Jahmiyyah. And did Ibn Hibbaan, knowing all of this, hate that they should be refuted and exposed, and instead of refuting them for what they fell into, began to refute those who refuted them!!! – may Allaah pardon us for writing these words – but pray tell, O Fanatic one, was this the actual reality, such that you want to explain the reality of today by it, in that even though they refuted each other, they did not call each other “persons of desires”?! Or was it the case that they were all upon one creed and one

²⁹ **RENOUNCING KUFR, BUT AGREEING TO WORK BY ITS PRINCIPLES: THE UNFORTUNATE CASE OF ABDUR-RAHMAAN ABDUL-KHAALIQ**

...And if 'Abdur-Rahmaan were to be asked, and he was a student of mine in the Islamic University, if he were asked or if I had the opportunity to meet him, 'Do you say that the goal justifies the means?' Then he would say, 'No,' because this is a principle of kufr. But if we direct his attention to the fact that he acts in accordance with it, and his life, and what he declares permissible, and that which he clearly states to be permissible from some of the forbidden things, then this is implementation of this principle which is such that no Muslim can consent to it. So he must reject it. But we say, 'What is the benefit of saying one thing and doing something else?'...

... So now, is there something of this group organisation and this gathering of the youth? This was happening in Kuwait before that which occurred with them. So 'Abdur-Rahmaan and those around him were preoccupied away from cultivating and educating and training (tarbiyah) them upon Islaam - **because of this partisanship and group organisation. And this is one of the effects of blind-hizbiyyah.**" (Cassette: What the People of knowledge say About 'Abdur-Rahmaan 'Abdul-Khaaliq)

This, O Sunni, was the cause of the fitnah in Kuwait, when Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq began to preach his new and innovated manhaj that was merely an extension of the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna. So the Ulamaa refuted him and this was when he began his propaganda campaign that would later create turmoil in the ranks of the Salafis. This is why Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee stated, **"To proceed: Perhaps amongst the severest of tribulations that Allaah's Messenger warned us against is the fitnah of 'Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, in this time, who has made his fitnah revolve around the Salafi Da'wah and its students..."** (An-Nasr ul-Azeez, p.52).

methodology and refuted each other and corrected each other matters that had no relation whatsoever to creed or the Sunnah, but matters that came down to personal circumstances and conditions that cannot be helped. Maybe one of them did not have full information on a narrator, maybe another one was in error concerning the death date of another narrator and thus wrongfully presumed him to have not been able to narrate from another reporter, whereas the truth could be otherwise. Maybe one of them considered a person to be strong in memory whereas another had evidence to indicate he was poor in memory. So which of the two types of issues was it that they refuted each other in? Answer in truth O Beguiled, Fanatical one.

Then as for today, Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee has refuted those who have fallen into the likes of these innovations and statements of kufr, and he was refuted by others on account of their partisanship and their innovated methodologies and their allegiance to the Innovators. They tried to bring his integrity into repute, and they labelled him a spy, and a paid worker, and a pawn of the government, until they even went to the level of writing a critique of his works on hadeeth, intending to discredit him altogether, failing miserably in all of that and illustrating their own depths of ignorance. It is the likes of these that Imaam al-Albaani is alluding to.

So the Qutubi Fanatic has not made good estimation of the words presented to him and nor was his limited intellect able to grasp the realities, and nor did the throes of Hizbiyyah depart from his forelock, the while he wrote his pathetic response, which is but darkness upon darkness and foolishness upon foolishness. Indeed, we repeat the advice you were given, continue to refute the Nation of Islaam, but leave aside these matters, for they are not in need of your likes and your mental decrepitude.

Summary Of Part 1

And this concludes the first of a multi-part series in taming the neo-Qutubite Fanaticism that has let loose the reins of discord and tribulation, leading the Sunni, Salafi, Athari youth into confusion and bewilderment.

As one has observed Palmer is a fanatical Qutubi whose contradiction, bewilderment, sophistry and ignorance (or the feigning of ignorance) is all but apparent. He is the one who dances around the issues, uses ridiculous, meaningless arguments, never ever discusses the actual issues from a knowledge-based perspective, wallows in the taqleed that he accuses us of, has merely taken his doctrine, style and content from Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayjee's "New Salafiyyah" farce – and after all of that he portrays himself as one who adheres to the manhaj of the Salaf(!)

In this instalment we have but covered a handful issues to illustrate the true nature of the Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine from which Palmer has graduated. But in what is to come there is even further insight into this Qutubi Cult that has hijacked Salafiyyah and torn apart its unity.

And may the prayers and peace be upon Allaah's Messenger, his family, his companions and those who follow him upon Tawheed and Sunnah till the affair is established.