

Khārijite Abū Muḥammad al-Maḡdisī: Raising and Flying Flags of Muslim Nation States is Apostacy

The Khārijite renegade and ideological terrorist, **Abū Mūhammad ‘ Iṣām al-Barqāwī al-Maḡdisī**¹ - demonstrating the

¹ Abū Muḥammad al-Maḡdisī 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-Durar 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 which clarify and give detail to their generalised or contextually limited statements and rulings. The evaluation of his character is that he is amazed

extent to which he wallows in the doctrine of the Khārijites claims that raising the flags of Muslim nation states is from the mukaffirāt (what expels from Islām). He states: “For that reason, we believe that displaying these symbols and those flags, with knowledge of what they signify and indicate, doing so out of choice without real compulsion, or permitted interpretation (of law) is not mere disobedience. Rather it is disbelief (kufr) and departure (murūq) [from Islām]. The one doing so is to be counted amongst the ranks of the disbelievers and polytheists and is to be treated in the world with a treatment similar to when the allies of al-Raḥmān face the allies of Shayṭān. This is because it is a clear sign of loyalty, support and compliance to the sinful ṭāghūt and his government and an open display of entrance into the religion of the government.”²

The meaning of this Ḥarūrī Khārijite fatwā is that any person who raises the flag of his country, be that Kuwait, Pakistan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia – and these are the countries he actually intends – is a disbelieving apostate whose blood is lawful because he is essentially announcing his entrance into the ‘religion of the government’ – which is shirk and kufr. In this he is mimicking his Khārijite ancestors of old who, after describing an abode (dār) as an abode of disbelief on account of the alleged disbelief of its ruler, extend the judgement to all of its inhabitants with the

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 Takfīrīhī Li Dawlat al-Tawḥīd (1428H) pp. 17-26.

² Kashf al-Niqāb ‘an Sharī‘at al-Ghāb. p. 109

argument that they are content to live in this abode, accept the status quo and have allied with the disbelievers and polytheists.

The reality of the saying comes down to a more fundamental Khārijite principle which is that every Muslim who does not agree with their doctrine and join them is automatically a supporter and aider of the ṭawāghīt (false deities) and therefore an apostate like them. And thus, the only true abode of Islām is the one they reside in and all other abodes are abodes of disbelief whose inhabitants can be robbed and killed wherever the situation demands that. The Ahkhnasiyyah, Azāriqah and Bayhasiyyah, all sects of the Khārijites of old, considered their abode to be the abode of Islām and all other abodes to be either abodes of disbelief or deception (taqiyyah),³ with the meaning that one may employ deception in those lands in their interactions with its 'apostate' inhabitants. It is related through numerous sources from al-Maqdisī, through former associates, that whilst in Kuwait, al-Maqdisī used to steal from European and Japanese expat workers, as well as from the police.⁴

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

³ Refer to the relevant sections of al-Milal wal-Nihal of al-Shahrestānī, Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn of al-Ash'arī, al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq of al-Baghdādī, Talbīs Iblīs of Ibn al-Jawzī and al-Faṣl fil-Milal wal-Niḥal of Ibn Ḥazm.

⁴ Refer to Tabdīd Kawāshif al-'Anīd Fī Takfīrihi Li Dawlat al-Tawḥīd (1428H) pp. 17-25 and al-Qiṣṣah al-Kāmilah Li Khawārij Aṣrinā (1436H) pp. 218-254.