

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah’s Erudite, Masterful Deconstruction and Silencing of the Barking Hound:



A Discussion of the Erroneous Decisions and Actions of Some of the Salaf Used by the Khārijites, Mu‘tazilah and others to Justify Revolt Against Oppression as An Acceptable, Legislated Methodology.



Introduction

The misguided individual pictured is upon the manhaj of the Khārijites, the Mu‘tazilah and Ahl al-Raī of revolting against the sinful tyrants and makes mockery of the adherents to the Sunnah of the Prophet (ﷺ), treating their actions of adherence to the Sunnah, and thereby the Sunnah itself—in this particular subject area—as “institutionalised bootlicking.” He also describes them with the typical slurs and name-calling used by the neo-Khārijites of the Qutbiyyah, Surūriyyah, and the general precursors and source-fodder for ISIS—labels such as “Madākhilah, Jāmiyyah.” This individual thinks that he can clothe and camouflage the reality of his deception and the way he is structuring his argument, not knowing that the Salaf already saw through it—and we shall bring some of their statements in due course inshā’Allāh, and that the verifiers (muḥaqqiqīn) among the Imāms of the Sunnah who came after the Salaf, such as Ibn Taymiyyah, already addressed the issue in detail and clarified it with words of truth and justice. So here we present a refutation of this barking hound from the erudite, insightful speech of Shaykh al-Islām. And whoever fails to see the truth after this speech and fails to see the clear misguidance of this self-declared—and confused and bewildered—“**Deobandi Ash‘arī Ḥanafī Salafī**” (!!), then that is only because of deficiency in intellect or following desires.

As for his tactic, then it is to present the erroneous actions of some of the Salaf as a “common view among the Salaf”—and this is where his deception lies, using this as a gap-opener and justification for whatever misguidance and desire he is concealing. And this is given away by his abuse and revilement of the Salafīs whose position he knows full well is based upon the Prophetic traditions. No one would revile Salafis in this manner if he acknowledges that their view is the legislated view. **Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah** (رحمته الله) explained the erroneous nature of the actions of some of the Salaf and how their actions were opposed or shunned by the majority of the Prophet’s Companions, or the most senior scholars among them, and how such actions were opposed to the Prophetic traditions which provide clear guidance in this subject area. He stated:¹



For verily Allāh the Exalted sent His Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) for the attainment of the benefits and perfection of them, and for the negation of the harmful things and their reduction. And when one of the khalīfahs took authority, such as Zayd and ‘Abd al-Mālik and al-Manṣūr and others, then either it was said: It is obligatory to prevent him from this authority and to fight him until someone else is given authority—as is held by those who consider it rightful to use the sword.

And this view is corrupt (raī fāsīd), for the corruption in this is greater than the benefit. And there is hardly anyone who

¹ Minhāj al-Sunnah, 4/257 onwards.

revolted against a leader with authority except that what arose from his action of evil, was actually greater than whatever good came from it, such as those who rebelled against Yazīd in Madīnah, or like Ibn al-Ash‘at who revolted against ‘Abd al-Mālik in ‘Irāq, or like Ibn al-Muhallab also, who revolted against his son in Khurasān, and like Abū Muslim, the claimant, and like those who revolted against al-Manṣūr in Madīnah and Baṣrah, and the likes of them.

And their destination is that they are (either) victorious or they are defeated, then their rule (dominion) ceases, and so they do not have any end-result. For ‘Abd Allāh bin ‘Alī and Abū Muslim, they are the ones who killed a great number of people, and both of them were killed by Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr. And as for the people of [the occurrence of] al-Harrah (in Madīnah) and Ibn al-Ash‘at and Ibn al-Muhallab, and others, then they were defeated, and their associates were also defeated. **So they never established the dīn and nor did they allow the dunyā (worldly life) to remain (as it was).**

And Allāh, the Exalted, does not order something on account of which rectification of the dīn and the dunyā is not attained—**even if the one who does that is from the Awliyā of Allāh, the Pious ones (Muttaqīn), and from the People of Paradise.**²

For they are not more superior than Ā‘ishah and Ṭalḥah and al-Zubayr and others, and alongside (what they did), they were not praised for what they fell into of fighting, and the likes of these are of

² This is the difference between those who treat these actions to have been erroneous and who follow the evidence, the truth and guidance found in the Prophetic traditions, and those who follow their desires and turn these mistakes as an acceptable, valid methodology.

greater rank and position in the sight of Allāh, and of better intention than those besides them...³

And al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī used to say: “Verily al-Hajjāj is a punishment of Allāh, so do not repel the punishment of Allāh with your hands, but you must (repel it) with humility and submission. for verily, Allāh the Exalted says: **‘And We had gripped them with suffering [as a warning], but they did not yield to their Lord, nor did they humbly supplicate, [and will continue thus]’** (23:76).”⁴

And the most superior of the Muslims (from the early Muslims) used to forbid revolting and fighting in the times of tribulation, such as ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Umar and Sa‘īd bin al-Musayyab, and ‘Alī bin al-Ḥasan and others, all of them used to forbid, during the year of Harrah, from

³ So when it is the case that those who did fall into fighting in times of tribulation, were of better intention, and more pious and upright than the contemporaries (who wish to seize the thrones of power for themselves), and still they erred in what they did, then what excuse is left for the ignoramuses of today, whose intentions are in fact evil, and to whom the error of these ways is manifestly clear and abundant!

⁴ Stated al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī: “Know, may Allāh pardon you, that the tyranny of the kings is a retribution (niqmah) from among the retributions of Allāh the Most High. And Allāh’s retributions are not to be faced with the sword, but they are to be faced with taqwā and are repelled with supplication and repentance, remorse (inābah) and abstention from sins. Verily, when the punishments of Allāh are met with the sword, are more severe. And Mālik bin Dīnār narrated to me that al-Hajjāj (Ibn Yūsuf) used to say, “Know that every time you commit a sin Allāh will bring about a punishment from the direction of your ruler (sulṭān)”. And I have I have also been told that a person said to al-Hajjāj, “Do you do such and such with the Ummah of Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ)?” So he replied, “For the reason that I am the punishment of Allāh upon the people of ‘Irāq, when they innovated into their religion whatever they innovated, and when they abandoned the commands of the their Prophet (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام) whatever they abandoned.” Adāb Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, of Ibn al-Jawzī, pp.119-120).

the revolt against Yazīd, and just as al-Hasan al-Basrī and Mujāhid and others used to forbid from revolt during the tribulation of Ibn al-Ash‘at.⁵ And it is for this reason that it is firmly established with Ahl us-Sunnah to abandon fighting in times of tribulation due to the authentic ahādīth that are established from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), and they began to mention this matter in the course of (authoring their works) on their ‘aqīdah.⁶ They would command with patience towards the oppression of the leaders, and the abandonment of fighting against them—even if a fair portion of the people of knowledge fought against them during the tribulation.

⁵ The contemporary Takfīrī groups ignore the fact that the vast majority of the Salaf prohibited from this type of revolt, even though some of the notables from the people of knowledge fell into this. So out of deceit, they attempt to justify this manhaj of revolt in the current times with the excuse that there is a precedent from the people of knowledge from the Salaf— illustrating thereby, their blindness in both vision and insight and that they are not followers of what constitutes actual evidence in the Sharī‘ah, and instead followers of their desires. Al-Khaṭṭābī said: “And Ikhtilāf (difference in a matter) is not a proof, **rather the explanation of the Sunnah is a proof against the opposers, whether they be from the first (Muslims) or the later ones.**” A‘lām al-Ḥadīth 3/2093). And al-Ḥāfiẓ Abu ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said: “**Ikhtilāf (differing opinion) is not a proof in the view of anyone that I know from the Jurists of this Ummah, except the one who has no vision, and who has no knowledge, and who has no proof in his saying.**” Jāmi‘ Bayān al-‘Ilm (2/229). Thus, the one who claims that there was a difference among the Salaf on the issue of rebelling, and thus rebelling is a legitimate opinion (on account of their actions, and not on account of evidence), then he is an ignoramus.

⁶ Thus, this was considered a matter of ‘aqīdah, because of the clear statements of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) in this particular subject area and thus it became a point of distinction between the followers of the Companions, the Salaf and a) the Khārijites, b) the Mu‘tazilah, c) the People of Opinion (Raṭ).

And the topic of fighting against the people of oppression (baghiy) and commanding good and prohibiting evil resembles fighting during fitnah (tribulation), and this is not the place to elaborate on it. But whoever reflects upon the authentic aḥādīth that are established from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) concerning this topic, and also considers with the consideration of those with insight and deep knowledge, will know that that which the Prophetic Texts have come with is from the best of all affairs.⁷

And for this reason, when al-Ḥusayn (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) desired to go out to the people of ‘Irāq when they wrote many letters to him, many of the people of knowledge, such as Ibn ‘Umar, Ibn ‘Abbās, Abū Bakr bin ‘Abd al-Raḥmān bin al-Ḥārith bin Hishām hinted to him that he should not go out, and their overwhelming belief was that he would be killed... and they were actually desiring to give sincere advice to him, and were seeking what was beneficial and better for him, and for the Muslims in general, and Allāh and His Messenger, verily, they only command with rectitude, not with corruption. However, opinion can sometimes be correct and can sometimes be wrong.⁸

⁷ Hence, these ḥadīths are clear evidences and they are the criterion by which he who is a true follower of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), a true follower of his guidance, can be distinguished by the follower of his desires—from those who use the erroneous actions of those who rebelled against the sinful tyrant and turn it into an acceptable methodology which clashes directly with the command of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). Today, the Khārijites, Taḥrīrīs, and sympathesizers of ISIS and their likes are the ones who use this argument.

⁸ The major companions such as Ibn ‘Abbās, and Ibn ‘Umar gave the pledge of allegiance and came under Yazīd’s authority, voluntarily, without being forced. Al-Ḥusayn remained firm upon his view, and the Shi’ites of Kūfah were writing to al-Ḥusayn when he was in Makkah. They were encouraging him to come and stating

So it has become clear that the correct affair was what they (the senior Companions) had said, and there was not to be found in the revolt any rectification or benefit for the dīn and nor for the dunyā. Rather, those oppressive wrongdoers were able to overcome the grandson of the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) until they killed him as one oppressed, a martyr. **And there was in his revolt and in his killing such corruption and mischief that would not have occurred had he sat and remained in his own town.** For whatever he intended of the attainment of good and repelling of evil, then nothing from it occurred. Rather, only evil increased by his revolt and his killing, and the goodness diminished

that that they would support him and give him the pledge of allegiance. When he confirmed that this was the case by sending a representative to Kūfah to verify matters, he then set out and travelled to them, with the anticipation that he will win their support and pledge of allegiance. However, in the end this did not occur, they did not give him that support they had initially indicated with zeal when they saw the army sent by Yazīd, indicating their treachery. The senior companions such as Ibn Abbās, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Jābir bin Abd ‘Allāh and others advised him against this. In the ensuing turmoil, when he resisted the offer of ‘Ubayd Allāh bin Ziyād (army leader of Yazīd) of taking him as captive, he died in the fighting that took place, as one oppressed. Ibn Taymiyyah clarifies a little later (4/535) the objection raised by somebody that al-Ḥusayn only abandoned fighting right at the very end of the affair because of incapability, because he had no helpers willing to aid him, by saying: “This is the very wisdom that the legislator (صلى الله عليه وسلم) aimed to accomplish by prohibiting revolt against the rulers, and he commended abandonment of fighting in times of tribulation, even if those who did it held that their objective was to command good and prohibit evil...” In short al-Ḥusayn (رضي الله عنه) made an erroneous ijtihād to go to the people of Kūfah and in the turmoil of the entire situation, it led to his killing and tribulation. He was killed whilst wanting to return to the Hijāz, and was killed in defence of his own self, not for the pursuit of leadership.

on account of that. And that was also the cause of a great deal of evil, and the killing of Ḥusayn itself was what brought about the tribulations, just as the killing of ‘Uthmān was from that which brought about tribulations.⁹

And all of this is what explains that whatever the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) has commanded of patience towards the tyranny of the rulers and abandonment of fighting against them and revolting against them, that this is of the most beneficial and rectifying of affairs, in both this life and the next, and that whoever opposes this deliberately, or due to an error, then no rectification is attained by his action, rather only corruption.

And for this reason the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) praised al-Ḥasan with his saying: “Verily, this son of mine is a leader (sayyid) and Allāh will bring about reconciliation through him between two great factions from amongst the Muslims”, but he did not praise anyone on account of fighting in the time of tribulation, and nor on account of revolting

⁹ This is the very same as what Imām Aḥmad feared when a group from the people of knowledge came to him, and asked concerning the revolt against the Khalīfah, for his preachin and imposing the doctrine of kufr, the saying that the Qur’ān, the Speech of Allāh is created. So he rejected this and said that there would be much bloodshed and that the tribulation would increase. And the likes of this fiqh (understanding) is only granted to the firmly rooted Imāms, who speak with knowledge and insight. And this insight is the very same that the firmly rooted Imāms of our times speak with in their advice to the Ummah. This also distinguishes the People of the Sunnah, the followers of the Salaf, (those who refer the affairs back to the major scholars of the time), from the Khārījites and their likes who are unable to name their scholars, because they do not have any. Their association with genuine upright scholars is only when they wish to twist or misuse or misappropriate some of their statements.

against the leaders, and nor on account of withholding from obedience, or separating from the Jamā'ah.

And the ahādīth of the Prophet (ﷺ) that are established in the Ṣaḥīḥ, all of them indicate this... and this explains that the reconciliation between the two parties was praised and was loved by Allāh and His Messenger, and that what was done by al-Ḥasan in bringing this about was from the greatest of his excellencies and his stations, on account of which the Prophet (ﷺ) praised him. And if fighting had been obligatory or recommended, the Prophet (ﷺ) would not have praised anyone for the abandonment of that which is obligatory or recommended. **For this reason the Prophet (ﷺ) did not praise anyone on account of what happened of fighting on the Day of the Camel, and Siffin, let alone what occurred in Madinah on the Day of al-Ḥarrah, and whatever happened in Makkah in the besieging of Ibn al-Zubayr, and what happened in the fitnah of Ibn al-Ash'at and Ibn al-Muhallab and other such tribulations.**¹⁰

¹⁰ As for what is argued by the contemporary Khārijites—that this was only for those rulers in those times, and not for the rulers of our times—then this is falsehood. It is ta'wīl of the ḥadīths which resembles how the Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah make ta'wīl of the ḥadīths of the attributes. For the prohibition of revolting is based upon the prevention of greater evil and corruption in the land and the prevention of greater harm to the Muslims in general that almost invariably arises from such revolts, and the Prophet (ﷺ) advised his Companions in this respect, “until you meet me at the Ḥawḍ” as occurs in authentic ḥadīths. So these ḥadīths are for all times. As for when clear, manifest disbelief is observed from the one in authority, then this in and of itself does not warrant revolt and rebellion and fighting without exception, as the people of knowledge have explained.

Rather, it has been successively narrated (tawātara) from him that he commanded fighting against the Khawārij, the Renegades, those whom the Chief of the Believers, ‘Alī bin Abī Tālib (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ), fought against at Nahrawān, after they had revolted against him at Harūrā. For the narrations (sunan) from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) were in abundance (i.e. widespread, known) concerning fighting against them (the Khawārij), and when Alī (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) fought against them, he rejoiced with fighting against them, and he also narrated the hadīth concerning them, and the Companions also agreed upon fighting them.¹¹ And similarly the people of knowledge after them, this fighting

¹¹ Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah said: “And the way, sīrah, of the Muslims has never ceased upon this (methodology). They did not declare them (the Khawārij) to be apostates like those whom al-Ṣiddīq (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) fought against. And this despite the command of the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) to fight against them, as occurs in the authentic hadīths, and also despite what has been reported about them in the ḥadīth of Abu ‘Umāmah, collected by al-Tirmidhī and others that they are “the most evil of those who are killed under the sky and how excellent is the one killed by them”. Meaning that they are more harmful to the Muslims than others, for there are none which are more harmful to the Muslims than them, neither the Jews and nor the Christians. For they strived to kill every Muslim who did not agree with their view, declaring the blood of the Muslims, their wealth, and the slaying of their children to be lawful, while making takfir of them. And they considered this to be worship, due to their ignorance and their innovation that caused to stray...” Minhāj al-Sunnah (5/248.) Ibn Hubayrah said concerning the hadeeth of Abu Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, “In this ḥadīth is proof that fighting the Khawarij comes before fighting the pagans, mushrikīn. And the wisdom in that is that in fighting against them is a preservation of the capital of Islām, whereas in fighting the people of shirk there is the seeking of increase (in capital). So preserving the capital comes first.” Faṭḥ al-Bari (12/301). ‘Aṣim bin Shumaykh said: “So I saw him— meaning Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī (who reported the hadīth about the killing of the Khawārij)— after he had grown old and when his hands began to tremble, saying, ‘Fighting them— meaning the Khawarij— is greater to me than fighting an equal number of the Turks’.” Ibn

(against the Khawārij) was not like the fighting of the people of the Camel and Şiffīn and other than them, from those matters in which no text or Ijmā' has come, and neither any praise of the noble ones who entered into it. Rather, they were remorseful about it, and also returned (i.e. recanted) from it.

And this (aforementioned) hadīth (concerning al-Ḥasan) is from the signs of the Prophethood of our Prophet Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), when he mentioned about al-Ḥasan whatever he mentioned, and praised him for what he praised him. So whatever he mentioned and whatever he praised was in agreement with the truth that actually occurred after more than 30 years...

And this very thing is the actual wisdom that the legislator (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) was attempting to bring about and nurture in his prohibition of revolting against the rulers, and he taught abandonment of fighting in times of fitnah— even if those who fell into this considered that their intent (desire) was to enjoin the good and forbid the evil, such as those who revolted at al-Ḥarrah, and against Yazīd and al-Ḥajjāj and others. However, when evil cannot be ended except with a greater evil, then ending the (original) evil, becomes evil itself. And when some

Abi Shaybah (15/305) and Musnad Ahmad (3/33). And fighting the Khawārij, behind those in authority, is in all times, and it is necessary to repel them, by way of the pen, tongue or sword as they will never cease to emerge until in the midst of the last of them appears the Dajjaal. The Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said: "A group will appear reciting the Qur'ān, it will not pass beyond their throats, every time a group appears, it is to be cut off, until the Dajjāl appears within their midst". Reported by Ibn Mājah and it is Hasan. And see Silsilat ul-Aḥādīth al-Şaḥīḥah of al-Albānī, no. 2455.

good cannot be attained except through an evil whose corruption is greater than the benefit in that good, then to try to attain that good in this manner becomes evil in itself.

And it is actually from this angle (intending to enjoin good and forbid evil) that the Khawārij made lawful the (raising of the) sword against the people of the qiblah, until they killed ‘Alī and others from the Muslims.¹² And similarly, those who agreed with them in revolting against the rulers, with the sword, in general terms—such as the Mu‘tazilah, the Zaydiyyah, and the Fuqahā (Jurists), and others.¹³ Such as those who revolted alongside Muhammad bin ‘Abd Allāh bin ‘Abdullāh bin Ḥasan bin Ḥusayn, and his brother, Ibrāheem bin ‘Abd Allāh bin Ḥasan bin Ḥusayn and others.¹⁴

For the people possessing religiosity (i.e. righteousness) from the likes of these (who revolted), desire to achieve what they consider to be from the religion, however they err from two angles:

The first of them: That what they considered to be from the religion is not actually from the religion, such as [what is found in] the viewpoint of the Khawārij and other than them from the people of desires. For they believe in an opinion that is an error and an innovation, and then they fight the people over it. Rather, they

¹² Pay attention to this observation, for it shows the origina of misguidance and corruption and tremendous harm upon nations and societies.

¹³ Thus, you will see misguided people trying to utilise the speech of some of the Fuqahā (Jurists) in this respect to make it appear that rebelling against the oppressor is a valid juristic opinion.

¹⁴ The rebellion and fighting of all these people was based upon their belief that they were enjoining good and forbidding evil.

declare those who oppose them as disbelievers. Hence, they become errant in their opinion and also in fighting those who oppose them or making takfīr of them and cursing them.

And this is the condition of the People of Desires in general, such as the Jahmiyyah who called the people to the rejection of the realities of the Beautiful Names of Allāh, and His Lofty Attributes. They say: “Verily, He does not have speech except the speech that He created in others (besides Himself), and that He will not be seen”, and other such things. And they also put the people to trial when some of the rulers inclined towards them (the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah), and so they would punish whoever would oppose them in their opinion, either with death or with imprisonment or with banishment [from the land] and prevention of sustenance [in their livelihood]. And the Jahmiyyah did this on more than one occasion (in history), and Allāh supports His believing servants against them.

And the Rāfiḍah are more evil than them when they gain authority, for they are loyal to the Kuffār and aid them, and they show enmity towards all those from the Muslims who do not agree with their viewpoint. Similarly, those who have something within them of innovations, whether the innovation of the Hulūliyyah, (divine indwelling) with respect to Allāh’s essence or His attributes, or the innovation of the Negators (of the Attributes) or those who exaggerate in affirmation (of the Attributes), or the innovation of the Qadariyyah, or that of Irjā’, or other than that. You will find him believing in corrupt beliefs, and then declare as a disbeliever or curse whoever opposed him. And the Khawārij Renegades are the

Imāms of all of these in making takfīr of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah and in fighting them.¹⁵

The second angle: **The one who fights based upon his belief in a viewpoint to which he calls, [such a one] is in opposition to the Sunnah and the Jamā'ah, such as the People of the Camel, and Şiffīn, and al-Ḥarrah, and al-Jamājim and others.** However, he thinks that the desired rectification and benefit will be attained by way of this fighting, but this fighting attains no such thing. Rather, the corruption and harm becomes greater, much more than what it was initially. And then what the legislator (the Prophet) actually indicates and direct towards (of what entails true rectitude) finally becomes clear to them at the end of the affair.

Among them are those to whom the texts (regarding the prohibition of contending with and fighting against sinful, tyrant rulers) did not reach, or were not established as authentic with him. And there were some who considered them abrogated such as Ibn Ḥazm. And among them are those who make ta'wīl of them, as happened with many of the mujtahidīn (jurists who made ijtihād) with respect to many of the texts. And by these three angles, did those from the people of istidlāl (deduction of evidence from texts) abandon acting by some of the (Prophetic) texts (in this field). Either because he did not

¹⁵ The Khārijites are like this in all times and places. They declare those who call to adherence to the Prophetic Sunnah in the issue of the rulers to be apostates, disbelievers who worship the ṭawāghīt or “institutionalised bootlickers” and terms similar to this which are meant to degrade the followers of the Prophetic Sunnah and to imply takfīr of them, if not misguidance and to charge of them of accepting and validating whatever oppression may come from the rulers.

believe they were established from the Prophet (ﷺ), or because he believed that did not pertain to the affair for which evidence was being deduced, or because he believed them to be abrogated.¹⁶

And from that which is desirable to be known is that the causes of these tribulation are actually mixed, shared. For certain states and conditions come over the hearts that prevent them from knowing the truth and desiring it, and thus they resemble the state of jāhiliyyah. Since, in jāhiliyyah there was no knowledge of the truth and nor the desiring of such truth. And then Islām came with [both] beneficial knowledge and the righteous action, which [in other words] is knowledge of the truth [firstly], and desiring it [secondly]. So it is agreed that some of the rulers commit oppression by way of self-preference, and then the souls do not show patience over his oppression. And it is not possible for them to repel his oppression except by what is even greater corruption than it (ie. the ruler's oppression).

However, a person—due to love for restoring his due legal right, and to repel injustice from him—[in trying to redress this oppression], he may not look at [and consider] the general corruption that would arise from his action [in trying to remove such oppression coming from the ruler]. And for this reason the Prophet (ﷺ) said: **“Verily, you will face hardship, so have patience until you meet**

¹⁶ Within this speech of Ibn Taymyyah is a refutation of the deception of the barking hound being addressed in this article and those similar to him. Because within it is an explanation as to why those from the Salaf and others, fell into the error that they fell into.

me at the Ḥawd.¹⁷ And it is likewise established in the Ṣaḥīḥ, that he said, **“Upon a Muslim is to hear and obey, in times of difficulty and in ease, in the dislikeable things and in the likeable things, and when [the ruler manifests] selfishness (atharah) against him.”**¹⁸

For the Prophet (ﷺ) ordered the Muslims that they should be patient when they [the rulers display] selfishness against them, and that they should obey those who are in charge of their affairs, even if they (the rulers) give preference to themselves over them (the subjects), and that they should not contend for authority.

And many of those who revolted against those in authority, or the vast majority of them, then they revolted so that they may contend with them (for authority), alongside the rulers pursuing his own self-interests over them (i.e. a monopoly through the state), so they did not show patience upon this situation of the [ruler’s] monopoly. Then (at the same time) the ruler could have other sins, and then that person (who revolts), his hatred of the ruler’s monopoly leads him to magnify those sins, and the one who fights (against him) remains thinking that he is only fighting him so that there is no more fitnah and so that the religion, all of it is for Allāh, **and yet the greatest of that which actually motivated him (mobilised him) was seeking his portion, either of leadership, or of wealth.** Just as Allāh, the Exalted said: **“If they are given part thereof (of alms), they are**

¹⁷ Related by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

¹⁸ Related by al-Bukhārī, and the meaning of “atharah” is that the ruler does not fulfil the rights of the subjects and enriches himself at their expense and thinks only of himself.

pleased, but if they are not given thereof, behold! They are enraged!” (9:58).¹⁹

And in the Ṣaḥīḥ from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) that he said: **“There are three whom Allāh will not speak to, nor look at on the Day of Judgement, and nor will he purify them, and they will have a tormenting punishment... and a man who gives the pledge of allegiance to a leader (imām) and he does not do so except for the sake of the world, if he is given from it, he is pleased, and if he is prevented from it, he is enraged...”**

So when the two come together from this angle, first the doubt (shubhah) and then desire (shahwah), and from this angle, the desire (coming first) and then the doubt, then tribulation (fitnah) will arise.²⁰

And the legislator ordered every person with what is beneficial for him and the Muslims. Thus:

¹⁹ And this verse is a reference to Dhul-Khuwayṣarah and his followers, who are the seed and foundation of the Khārijites who appeared after the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).

²⁰ Ibn Taymiyyah here is describing the process by which a person is led to rebellion, thinking that he is pursuing truth and justice. So the circumstances are such that either he first has a shubhah (doubt, misconception) in the issue of revolting, wrongly believing he is justified in doing so from a knowledge point of view, and this is for the three reasons Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned earlier. Either not considering the texts to be authentic, or that those texts do not relate to the issue at hand or that those texts are abrogated. And then this is followed by something of desire (shahwah), in that there is some hidden personal motivation as well connected to the world, and so when this desire mixes with the doubt, then this leads him to the action of rebelling and all the while, he thinks he is being sincere and striving to establish justice, when this is not the actual reality. Likewise, it can happen the other way around, the desire comes first, and then he finds justification for rebelling through the shubuhāt, once again wrongly thinking he is fighting in order remove tribulation and establish the dīn, when it is not the case in actual reality.

—He ordered the rulers with justice and sincerity of purpose towards their subjects...

—And he ordered the subjects with obedience (to the ruler) and showing sincerity of purpose...

—And he ordered with patience upon their misappropriation (monopoly), and prohibited fighting against them, and contending with them (for authority), despite their oppression.

Because the corruption, mischief that arises from fighting during fitnah, is greater than the corruption in the oppression of those in authority. Thus, the lighter of two evils is not to be removed by the greater of the two.

And whoever reflects upon the Qur’ān and the Sunnah that is established from Allāh’s Messenger (ﷺ) and considers it will find it to be in agreement with what he finds in his own soul.

Abu ‘Iyād

@abuiyādsp ♦ salaf.com ♦ kharijites.com

9 Ramaḍān 1440 / 14 May 2019

v. 1.04

Closing Note:

The speech of Shaykh al-Islām is crystal clear and it exposes the antics of misguided individuals like the barking hound in question, who mocks and reviles Salafis for venerating and adhering to the Prophetic Sunnah. There is not a doubt or misconception that can be brought except that Ibn Taymiyyah has explained and repelled it in his speech above. As for describing him as a “barking hound” then this is from the angle of muqābalah (compensation, return) for his mockery of the People of the Sunnah, his arrogant derision of them and disdain of them and

using ugly words and phrases to describe them. This behaviour is proof that he is a person of desires filled with malice.