

Khārijite Abū Muḥammad al-Maqdisī: Absolution in Takfīr on the Issue of Obedience to Scholars and Rulers

The Khārijite renegade and Qa'dī ideologue, **Abū Mūhammad 'Iṣām al-Barqāwī al-Maqdisī**¹ - by his own admission – was

¹ Abū Muḥammad al-Maqdisī is the second most influential Takfīrī Khārijite renegade, second only to Imām bin 'Abd al-'Azīz (Sayyid Imām), in promoting the doctrine and methodology of the Khārijites in the modern era. He was nurtured upon the books of Sayyid Quṭb and Mawdūdī whilst in Afghanistan during the mid-1980s, being trained by Jamā'at al-Takfīr, and this forms the foundation of his religious doctrine, at the “beginnings of his guidance” as he states himself. In Kuwait, before he left for Afghanistan, he studied under Muḥammad Surūr for a period before falling out with them. They expelled him from their group. When he returned from Afghanistan, he joined a group of the Juhaymānites. The speech of the Juhaymānites was all about the rulers and politics. They accused him of extremism in takfīr and expelled him from their group. He remained in the company of a few hardcore associates. It was during this period (late 80s early 90s) that he authored works outlining the doctrine of the Khārijites, focusing upon takfīr of the rulers and a framework of jihād built around this doctrine. He would not pray the congregational prayers in the mosques with the Imāms and a group of them would pray the Friday prayer in the desert. He would also steal from policemen and expat workers. It is related that he stole from a foundation in Kuwait and fled to Jordan whereupon he built a house and took a second wife. Whilst in Jordan he would steal from Sikhs and Christians, claiming their wealth was lawful. He never took knowledge from any of the Salafī scholars, rather his nurturing was through Muḥammad Surūr, the Takfīrī jamā'at in Afghanistan and the Juhaymānites. He claims to be an expert on the books of the Shaykhs of the da'wah of Tawḥīd, such as al-Durār al-Saniyyah. However, he never studied these works from any competent, genuine Salafi scholar and takes from these books according to desire and what enables him to promote his doctrine, without referring to other statements

nurtured upon the books of Sayyid Quṭb and Mawdūdī by the Takfīrī Khārijite Egyptian groups in Afghanistan as he states, “The brothers who breastfed us with al-Ẓilāl and Milestones and other books of Sayyid and his brother [Muḥammad Quṭb] and al-Mawdūdī, with a feeding during the period of nurturing with them – I mean here, the beginnings of [our] guidance.”² Al-Maqdisī’s foundational suckling and rearing was through the doctrinal nipple of Takfīrī Khārijite ideology and he never actually sat, studied and took genuine knowledge from the Shaykhs of the da‘wah of Tawḥīd – those in Saudi Arabia – for if he had, he would not be making the absolutions of the Khārijite renegades, stumbling in gross distortions and mistakes and making judgements of takfir on what amounts to sin only. He propounds the absolutions of the Khārijites then cleverly clothes them with broad, generalised statements from the Shaykhs of the da‘wah of Tawḥīd whose clarified details in other places are omitted by him and thereafter, when his Khārijite ideology leads to bloodshed, turmoil, chaos and destruction, being the despicable Qa’dī coward he is, he throws his filth onto the Shaykhs of the da‘wah, claiming he does nothing but cite from them so why should he be blamed. A fraudster of grand proportions.

which clarify and give detail to their generalised or contextually limited statements and rulings. The evaluation of his character is that he is amazed with himself, is very volatile, portrays himself as one who has immersed himself in the books of the Shaykhs of the da‘wah and that only he has understood them. He is a known liar and makes many insinuations without being clear, and is known for concealing his true beliefs. Refer to Tabdīd Kawāshif al-‘Anīd Fī Takfīrihī Li Dawlat al-Tawḥīd (1428H) pp. 17-26.

² Mīzān al-‘īdāl. p. 5.

The Issue of Obedience to the Scholars and Rulers in Sin and in Tahlīl and Tahṛīm

This Khārijite renegade included a chapter in his book, “Kashf al-Niqāb” titled, “Al-Ṭā‘ah Fil-Tashrīḥ Min Aqsām al-‘Ibādah” [Obedience in Legislation is from the Types of Worship] in which he presents what was propounded by Sayyid Quṭb. Subjects who obey the ruler in what is sin and disobedience and who obey the scholars in taḥlīl and taḥrīm are mushriks, disbelievers, absolutely on account of **mere obedience** to them. He cites texts from Kitāb al-Tawḥīd and statements from al-Shanqīṭī’s tafsir, Aḍwā’ al-Bayān, without returning to the explanations of these statements from the same scholars themselves or proper authorities. In another work, al-Maqdisī comments on the verse, “**And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be associators [of others with Him].**” with his statement: “This is an explicit, decisive heavenly text that whoever followed or obeyed other than Allāh in legislation even if a single matter is one who commits shirk (mushrik) with Allāh the Exalted. He has taken the obeyed one as a lord even if he did not prostrate to him, or pray or fast [for him in worship].”³

In the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah and likewise the shaykhs of the da‘wah from the descendants of ‘Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb is clear, unambiguous detail to this matter and a refutation of al-Maqdisī’s Khārijism. As a pseudo-scholar, he went and started reading these books upon his own evil understanding and never sat and studied and clarified with the actual scholars,

³ Al-Ishrāqah Fī Su‘ālāt al-Sawāqah (p. 16).

those who are genuine inheritors of that knowledge and who understand the statements of those scholars, their verdicts and their circumstances and contexts.

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Āl al-Shaykh Invalidates the Khārijite Doctrine of al-Maqdisī

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Āl al-Shaykh who is from the descendants of Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and more knowledgeable and worthy of clarifying these meanings than pseudo-scholar Khārijites elaborates on the matter:

“And amongst [such matters] is that in the issue of obedience to the polytheists, he [Quṭb] did not understand the detail of the people of knowledge concerning it. So what is understood from his words is that which is in agreement with some of the extremists on the issue of obedience (tā‘ah), that is obedience to the polytheists. Or obedience to the priests and rabbis (i.e. scholars). And from the examples of this is what he has mentioned in Sūrah ul-An‘ām concerning the verse, **“And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be associators [of others with Him]”** (6:121). He says many things about this verse. And amongst them is the issue of the fashion clothing of women and models, which are ‘designed by the fashion agencies in Paris’ using his (Quṭb’s) expression. So he says that those who legislate clothing for the women such that in the morning they should wear such and such type of clothing, and in the evening this type of clothing and in the night this type of clothing, and at work this type of clothing and so on Sayyid Quṭb says, that his group of people, meaning the fashion designers, that they are gods (āliḥah)

because they have made the ḥarām to be ḥalāl and so they are obeyed in that, and they made the ḥalāl to be ḥarām, and so they are obeyed in that. So he says that the Muslim woman who obeys them in this has taken them as objects of worship (ālihah), because she has obeyed them in making what is ḥalāl to be ḥarām and making what is ḥarām to be ḥalāl. And there is no doubt that these words are false. Because when a woman wears forbidden clothes which have come from the direction of those designers, this does not at the same time mean she has believed that they are ḥalāl for her to wear. For the issue of takfīr is in relation to the belief (i'tiqād) that this thing that Allāh the Majestic and Exalted has made ḥarām is actually ḥalāl. So for example, a woman who wears clothing that reveals her bosoms somewhat and her legs in front of foreign men, following the fashion designers in this, then if she believes that this act is ḥarām, yet she is overcome and her faith is weak, then this is not disbelief and she has not worshipped them. So he (Qutb) has made **mere obedience** to be disbelief, and some of the jamā'āt have adopted this saying from him, those who have exaggerated in the issue of ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed, (they have taken from him) in the issue of obedience, that is obedience to the fashion designers and the promoters."⁴

Further Invalidation of al-Maqdisī's Khārijism from Ibn Taymiyyah and the Offspring of Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb

⁴ Cassette: Sharh Kitāb Masā'il al-Jāhiliyyah, 2nd cassette, 2nd side, and it is also in Barā'ah 'Ulamā al-Ummah of 'Isām bin Sinānī (1421H) pp. 76-78, being a compilation of the sayings of the Salafī scholars on the deviations of Sayyid Qutb.

A similar clarification is found in al-Tamhīd li Sharḥ Kitāb al-Tawḥīd⁵ of Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Āl al-Shaykh in which he makes reference to **Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah** in explaining the two levels of obedience to the rulers and scholars. He states the first level is to obey the rulers and scholars in altering the religion (tabdīl al-dīn) which means that when they declare something ḥarām to be ḥalāl, he believes it to be ḥalāl, and venerates what they have done of making what is ḥarām to be ḥalāl and vice versa. So this is now ascribing something false to the religion, namely claiming that something is ḥalāl in the religion when it is actually ḥarām, and then believing in this. So when a person obeys the ruler or scholar like this, believing in his ṭaḥlīl and taḥrīm, then this is major disbelief and major shirk. The second level is that a person obeys a scholar or a ruler from the angle of action only whilst knowing that he is sinful, his heart did not hold the ḥarām to be ḥalāl or vice versa, but he obeyed them out of love of them and their companionship whereas inwardly he knows this matter to be ḥalāl or ḥarām. Thus he has not altered the religion as such but simply followed his desire for a reason amongst the reasons. Ibn Taymiyyah says, “Such a person has his ruling similar to those of the people of sin”.⁶ So this is considered by Ibn Taymiyyah and the Scholars of Tawḥīd from the offspring of Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and contemporary Salafī scholars to be a sin and not something that expels from Islām. The same passage of Ibn Taymiyyah is quoted by **Shaykh Sulaymān bin ‘Abd Allāh bin Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb**, the grandson of Muḥammad bin ‘Ābd al-Wahhāb, in his

⁵ Maktabah Dār al-Minhāj (1436H) pp. 401-402.

⁶ Refer to Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā 7/70.

explanation of Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, “Taysīr al-‘Azīz al-Ḥamīd”⁷ and likewise ‘**Allāmah Ibn Qāsim** in his commentary on this chapter. Similarly, **Shaykh Ibn Bāz provides** the same tafṣīl (detail) in his commentary on this chapter of Kitāb al-Tawḥīd wherein he says, “Whoever obeyed the scholars and rulers in making ḥalāl what is ḥarām and vice versa with the belief that this is permissible alongside his knowledge that it opposes the legislation of Allāh, then this is worship of them and disbelief. As for when he follows them out of ignorance or due to an ijtihād, this is not worship of them and it does not come under the threat.”⁸ **Shaykh Muḥammad bin Ṣāliḥ bin ‘Uthaymīn** has a very good tafṣīl (detail) in his commentary upon the same chapter⁹ which demolished the Ḥarūrī Khārijite ramblings of al-Maqdisī and other fraudsters like him.

The Statement of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah

This is the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah referred to previously and its detail is very clear: “And those who have taken their priests and rabbis as lords – when they obeyed them in making ḥalāl what Allāh had made ḥarām, and making ḥarām what Allāh had made ḥalāl, then they are of two types: the first of them: that they know that [the priests and rabbis] have made tabdīl (alteration) of the religion of Allāh **and hence they follow them in this tabdīl believing (ya‘taqidūna) that what Allāh had made ḥarām is ḥalāl and that what Allāh had made ḥalāl is ḥarām**, following

⁷ Dār al-Fikr (1412H) pp. 414-415.

⁸ Refer to al-Jāmi‘ al-Farīd Fī Sharḥ Kitāb al-Tawḥīd (1429H) 2/351.

⁹ Al-Qawl al-Mufīd. Dār Ibn al-Jawzī (1424H) 2.157-158.

their leaders in that alongside their knowledge that they have opposed the religion of the Messengers, then this is kufr (disbelief), and Allāh and His Messenger have also made it shirk – even if they (the followers) do not pray or prostrate to them. Hence, whoever followed other someone else in something that opposes the religion **while knowing that it opposes the religion, and believes (i'taqada) in what he said, as opposed to what Allāh and His Messenger said, then such a one is a mushrik, just like them.** And the second type: that their belief (i'tiqād) and faith (Īmān) in the making ḥalāl what is ḥalāl and making ḥarām what is ḥarām is established, however, they follow them (the priests and rabbis) in disobedience to Allāh, just as a Muslim does when he commits a sin and believes that he is a sinner, so these ones have the same ruling as those like them from the people of sin.”¹⁰

From the above citations, and more can be brought, one can clearly see the difference between what Ibn Taymiyyah, the Shaykhs of the da‘wah of Tawḥīd and all contemporary Salafī scholars are upon and what the Khārijite Abū Muḥammad al-Maqdisī is upon of lies, pseudo-scholarship and fraud. He tries to throw his Khārijite filth onto these scholars through an elaborate scheme of generalised, selective quoting, when in reality he has been suckled – by his own frank admission – upon the ideology of Quṭb and Mawdūdī and is simply trying to validate that ideology through deception and dishonesty.

¹⁰ Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā 7/70.

Abū Muḥammad al-Maqdisī Makes Takfīr by Way of Sin and is From the Khārijites

Al-Maqdisī does not cease to promote his older works in which there is takfīr by way of sin and this is one of the hallmarks of the Khārijite renegades. Ibn Taymiyyah said: “They [the Khārijites] have two well-known distinguishing qualities by which they separated from the main body of Muslims and their leaders: The first is their departure from the Sunnah and treating what is not a sin to be a sin, or what is not a good deed to be a good deed.”¹¹ As we shall indicate elsewhere – inshā‘Allāh – al-Maqdisī treats as disbelief what is not even a sin, let alone treating what is not a sin to be a sin. Thus, anyone who knows and understands the very basics of Salafism knows that this individual cannot be a Salafī – it is impossible by definition.

Abu ‘Iyaad Amjad Rafiq ♦ kharijites.com ♦ @abuiyaadsp
5 Muharram 1438 / 6 October 2016

¹¹ Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (19/72-73).