



Refuting Terrorists' Fallacies

Prepared by:

**Prof. Dr. Muhammad
S. Abu-'Asi**

Professor at Faculty of Theology, and former Dean of Faculty of Post-graduate Studies

**Dr. Yaser Ahmad
Mursi**

Lecturer in Exegeses and Qur'anic Studies at Faculty of Theology, Cairo

**Dr. Hani Sayyed
Tamam**

Lecturer in Fiqh (Jurisprudence) at Faculty of Islamic and Arabic Studies for Boys, Cairo.

**Sheikh Hamdallah
Hafiz As-Safti**

Ph.D. Candidate, and Director of Scientific and Cultural Affairs at the International Organization of Azhar Graduates, Cairo.

Supervised and Reviewed by:

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mukhtar Jum'ah

Minister of Awqaf (Endowments),
Head of Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs,
And member of Islamic Research Academy
1443 A.H/2021 A.D.



Egyptian General Book Authority





Egyptian General Book Authority

Chairman

Dr. Haytham Alhaj Ali weaken



Refuting Terrorists' Fallacies

By

Prof. Dr.

Muhammad Mukhtar Jum'ah

,(Minister of Awqaf (Endowments

,Head of Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs

And member of Islamic Research Academy

First edition: Egyptian General
Book

Authority, 2021

P.O.Box 2325 Ramsis

1194 Cornish Al-Nile Ramlat

Boulaq, Cairo. Postal code: 11749

Tel: (202) 257775109 ext. 149

Fax: (202) 25764276

Published by:

Egyptian General Book Authority

Opinions in this book do not necessarily reflect the Authority's orientation, but only express the author's opinion and orientation. All rights reserved to the Egyptian Book Authority. No part of this publication may be reproduced, restored in any retrieval system, in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the Egyptian General Book Authority, or by quoting the source reference.



*In the Name of Allah, the Lord of
Mercy, the Giver of Mercy*

﴿I only want to put things right as far as I
can, I cannot succeed without Allah's help: I
trust in Him, and always turn to Him﴾ (11:88)



*In the Name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the
Most Compassionate*

Introduction

All praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of the worlds. Peace and prayers be upon the last of His prophets and messengers, our Master Muhammad ibn Abdullah, his family, companions, and all those who follow his guidance up till the Day of Judgment.

Terrorism is certainly a sweeping danger that neither threatens Egypt alone, our Arab nation alone, nor our geographical region and surroundings alone, but threatens the peace and security of mankind as a whole. There must be an institutional, national, international, and human solidarity against this sweeping danger that goes beyond limits and borders. It's like a fire that burns even its igniters, and certainly will, one day, explode



in the face of those who create, finance, harbor its elements, or provide them with financial, military, logistic, or even intellectual or ideological cover. Faith, manners, and values mean nothing to terrorists; they keep neither oath, treaties, nor loyalty. They are stripped off all religious, moral, national, and human values, and have become a defaced being that lacks any relation with religion or humanity.

In the ministry of Endowment (Al-Awqaf), we made of fighting terrorism, uncovering the misconceptions and fallacies of its holders, refuting their arguments, working on spreading the values of tolerance, deep-rooting the concepts of co-living, well-establishing the principles of equal citizenship, deepening the spirit of national loyalty and belonging, and correcting their misconceptions, a main aim and well-established clear strategy to adhere to.

Within this framework, we are pleased to present to all mankind this book that refutes some



of the fallacies and deceptions of the terrorist and radical groups, corrects misconceptions, reinforces the legitimacy of national state and inevitability of national and international lining up against radical thoughts for liquidating terrorism.

It is Allah Whom we seek to please, He is sufficient for us, It is Whom we ask for help.

***Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mukhtar Jum'a
Mabruk***

Minister of Al-Awqaf (Endowments),
Head of the Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs.
Member of Islamic Research Academy,



The First Treatise

Answering the fallacy

The concept of Jihad is restricted to fighting alone

To answer this fallacy we say:

Many people think that “Jihad” was only legislated after the Prophet r migrated to Madinah. This wrong idea emerged due to the fact that they restricted the meaning of “Jihad” to fighting alone. No doubt that fighting infidels was legislated after Muslims have settled in Madinah, but, many people miss the fact that the Qur’an which was revealed in Makkah talked also about “Jihad”. So, we find that Allah (SWT) says in chapter (16) Verse (110), which was revealed in Makkah: “But to those who left their homes after persecution, then strove and remained steadfast, your Lord,



even after that, will be most forgiving and most merciful”.

Also, in chapter 25 Verse 52, which was revealed in Makkah, we read Allah’s order to His Prophet: “So (Muhammad) do not give in to the disbelievers: strive hard against them with this Qur’an”. The word strive which is the direct equivalent to the word Jihad in these two verses reflects the original meaning of the word from which other meanings are derived, including ‘fighting’. These two verses cannot be understood as a call to fighting, as fighting was not yet legislated, it can only be understood as a call to strive to invite the disbelievers to the new religion.

So, the sense of Jihad which has been established in Makkah, that is, to call the disbelievers to embrace Islam, strive for this cause, and remain steadfast against the torture the disbelievers inflicted upon Muslims, is the original meaning of the word, from which other meanings were driven⁽¹⁾.

(1) - See: Jihad in Islam, by Dr. Al-Buty, p:19.



However, radical groups still hold the fallacy that Jihad only means fighting, ignoring the other meanings of the word, which include striving against whims, striving in the cause of Da'wah, striving for deterring any aggression against the country borders, a task which our armed forces have taken over. This is the real meaning of Jihad, not the meaning adopted by the radical groups to attain their own goals.

For more elaboration, we will make clearer – to you our honorable reader – when militant jihad, i.e. fighting, was legislated in Islam.

When the Prophet r migrated to Madinah, new circumstance emerged, which had not existed before, have. These can be summarized in two things:

First: The emergence of the first homogenous society within a fully developed state system, that is, the people, (Muslims and others), the Constitution (the Madinah document), and the ruler (the Prophet r).



Second: The emergence of the first Muslim State, i.e., the land on which the state was established, together with whatever was required for this purpose, including:

- Fortifying and guarding the borders against any potential aggression.
- Fighting whoever ambuscades the country or attacks it in any way.

Thus, militant Jihad was legislated in Madinah as a result of those new circumstances. But we should stress, in this context, the fact that the legislation of militant Jihad does not mean putting the original meaning, i.e. calling the people unto Islam with wisdom and fair exhortation, to an end, to the contrary, it is still the core of Da'wah. Shifting from this meaning to militant Jihad is only possible in case of a militant attack against the country, threatening its safety and security. It's worth noting in this respect that militant Jihad which Allah has prescribed for the reasons



mentioned above, cannot be given priority unless a threat of any kind is posed against the country. However, the public, or any of them, do not have the right to announce it; it's only the president and the institutions in charge who have the right to announce it, according to the law and the Constitution of the country, and within the limits that maintain the interests, safety, and security of the country.

A dubious argument and answering it:

No contradiction exists between what we have already stated and Allah's saying: **﴿Then, when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them (captives), and besiege them, and wait for them at every lookout post﴾** (9:5), nor the Prophet's saying: "I have been ordered to fight against people until they testify that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad r is the Messenger of Allah and until they perform the prayers and pay the zakat (alms), and if they do



so they will have gained protection from me for their lives and property, unless (they commit acts prohibited by Islam), and their reckoning will be with Allah”. (narrated by Al-Bukhari and Muslim in the Book of Iman), because Allah’s saying: ﴿ **Then, when the sacred months have passed, slay the idolaters wherever you find them” refers only to idolaters who are in a state of war against Muslims, what supports this interpretation is Allah’s saying after this verse: “And if any one of the idolaters should seek your protection, (O Muhammad), then protect him so that he may hear the word of Allah, then take him to a place safe for him﴾ (9:6). That is to say that if the motive to fighting was infidelity alone, then, it would be contradictory to Allah’s order to safeguard the idolater and protect him until he reaches a safe place.**

In the above cited Hadith, we find a difference in Arabic between the verb “to kill” and the verb “to fight”. The verb “to kill” means to transgress



against people by killing them for no reason, whereas “to fight” means to engage in a mutual activity between two or more people. It’s understood in this context as engaging in deterring an aggression according to what has established in other related texts concerning this point.

Imam Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar had drawn the attention to this meaning, so, he quoted the words that Imam Baihaqi cited from Imam Ash-Shafi’i as saying: “There is no connection whatsoever between fighting and killing. It may be allowed to fight someone, but it is not allowed to kill him”. Imam Ibn Daqiqul-’id said in his commentary on Al-’umdah: “It is not a logical consequence of allowing fighting to allow killing, as fighting is a mutual activity involving two or more people”⁽¹⁾.

So, putting the texts next to each other and contemplating them altogether within the scope of the general purposes of legislation ascertains

(1) - Fathul-Bary. Vol. 1/76.



that Jihad in Islam is a defensive Jihad that was legislated for protecting the state and its borders, and deterring any aggression against it, not to force people to embrace Islam. Allah Almighty said: **﴿There is no compulsion in religion﴾** (2:256), and said to His Prophet: **﴿Then, if they turn away, your only duty (O Muhammad) is to deliver the message clearly﴾** (16:82). Allah Almighty also says: **﴿You (Prophet) cannot guide everyone you love to the truth, it's Allah who guides whoever He will, He knows best those who will follow guidance﴾** (28: 56).



The Second Treatise

Refuting the Fallacy of describing current societies as Jahiliyyah⁽¹⁾

To answer this fallacy, we say:

The word Jahiliyyah was mentioned four times in the Qur'an:

The first: In chapter 3, where it was collocated with the word 'surmising' in Allah's saying: ﴿**And a section readily (became) anxious, surmising other than the truth about Allah, the surmises of pagan ignorance**﴾ (3:154).

The second: In chapter 5, it was collocated with the word 'ruling' or 'governing' in Allah's saying: ﴿**Is it then the judgment of (pagan) igno-**

(1) - This word means ignorance or paganism, it refers to the era prior to Islam.



rance that they inequitably seeking? And who is fairer in judgment than Allah for a people having certitude?﴾ (5:50).

The third: In chapter 33, it was collocated with the word ‘flaunting one’s finery’ in Allah’s saying: ﴿**And do not flaunt your finery as they used to do in the pagan past﴾ (33:33).** This verse described the Jahiliyyah as the past.

The fourth: In chapter 48, it was collocated with the word ‘fury of ignorance’ in Allah’s saying: ﴿**While the disbelievers had stirred up fury in their hearts – the fury of ignorance﴾ (48:26).**

Imam Al-Bukhari – may Allah’s mercy be upon him – said in his Sahih: “Acts of disobedience are acts of Jahiliyyah”⁽¹⁾.

Here, two questions emerge:

The first: Can we use the word Jahiliyyah without restricting it by a certain context?

(1) - Al-Bukhari: Book of Iman (faith).



The second: Is it proper to describe current societies by this word ‘Jahiliyyah’?

To answer the first question we say: Not at all. Because if this word is used out of context, it includes faith, manners, worship, and the whole society. Thus, if a society is described as Jahiliyy, it means that every single person in that society is jahliyy in his faith, manners, worship, dealings, rulings, and behavior, and this is an atrocious mistake, because Jahiliyyah of faith means nothing other than infidelity, and the others may be a mixture of infidelity and disobedience. It’s axiomatic that if a person believed that the rulings of Jahiliyyah are better than Allah’s rulings and legislations that were revealed to the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ, he is deemed infidel. But, if he believed that Allah’s rulings are better, but some circumstances have forced him to leave them to other rulings, he is not deemed infidel, as necessities occur to the individuals as they occur to the states, taking into consideration that necessity has its own force.



To answer the second question we say: Jahiliyyah is a period, a stretch of time, and the Qur'an described this period as such, i.e., the 150 -200 years prior to the advent of Islam.

Some radical groups consider it as a faith, or a description of faith, hence, it may be renewed. But when we contemplate the Prophet's ﷺ saying to Abi-Dharr: "You still have some manners of Jahiliyyah"⁽¹⁾, and his saying: "What a behavior of Jahiliyyah", when he was told that a man of Muhajireen slapped a man of Ansar, and his saying: "Leave it (i.e., the manners of Jahiliyyah), it's stinking", it becomes clear that the word Jahiliyyah refers to some behavior, not to the faith of those people, contrary to what those radical groups say.

It's not logically accepted to describe the whole society as a Jahiliyy by virtue of the behavior of only one of its members. Acceptance of Is-

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari and Muslim.



lam as a religion, either by a formal statement, or by a verbal utterance is the first basis of describing it as a Muslim society.

The most observable fact that shows that a society is a Muslim society, and deter labeling it as an atheist society is the announcement of Adhan (call to prayers). Our Prophet ﷺ says: “The best of your rulers are those whom you love , and who love you, and whom you pray for, and who pray for you, and the most evil of them are those whom you detest, and who detest you, and whom you curse, and who curse you”, the people said: “O Messenger of Allah, should we not then renounce our covenant with them?”, he said: “No, as long as they hold the prayers, no, as long as they hold the prayers”⁽¹⁾.

We assure that a man’s negligence, be him a ruler or a layman, does not apply to the whole society, as Allah said: **﴿And no soul will bear the**

(1) - Narrated by Muslim.



burden of another ﴿6:164﴾, and said: “**Each person is in pledge for his own deeds** ﴿52:21﴾.

Accordingly, it's not right to describe the whole society as atheist if a few of its members were atheists, nor to describe it as libertine, if a few of its members were libertines, nor to describe it as Jahiliyyah, if some of its members commit acts of Jahiliyyah. If we survey the history from the advent of Islam up till now, we will not find even one society free of some negligent individuals towards the upright religion.

Describing libertine people as Jahiliyyah, infidels, or fighting them will never lead to reforming a society; doing so may lead to a greater atrocity. Allah tells His Prophet ﷺ: ﴿(Prophet), call the (people) to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good teaching. Argue with them with the most courteous way, for your Lord knows best who has strayed from His way, and who is rightly guided﴾ (16:125). Scholars are unanimous that refraining from forbidding what is wrong is a must if doing it would lead to a greater harm.



The Third Treatise

Refuting the fallacy: Sins turn a Muslim infidel

To answer this fallacy we say:

Belief means to accept as true by heart, hence, true infidelity that takes a person out of religion is to deny or renegade. Scholars, may Allah's mercy shower them, laid a golden rule which Imam Abu-Ja'far At-Tahawy mentioned in "Al-'Aqidah At-Tahawiyyah": "Nothing takes a person out of faith but denying what entered him into it".

This means that a person becomes a Muslim by uttering the two testimonies: "I testify that there is no god but Allah, and that Muhammad is Allah's Messenger". So, such a person only becomes a non-Muslim if he denies these testimonies, one of the pillars of Islam, does any act of in-



fideliy such as cursing Allah or His Messenger on purpose or ridiculing them, or tears the Qur'an in public and on purpose out of despising.

Accordingly, if a Muslim committed any prohibited act, like drinking wine, committing adultery, stealing, or other prohibited acts, he cannot be deemed non-Muslim. However, texts that describe whoever commits unlawful acts as an infidel, do not necessarily mean that he became a non-Muslim; the word 'infidelity' may mean 'denying Allah's bounties', or 'disobedience'. The well-known Hadith that explains this meaning is the Prophet's ﷺ saying to Abu-Dharr: "Whoever says 'None has the right to be worshipped but Allah', and died believing in that will enter the Paradise" I said: Even if he committed adultery and theft? He said: " Even if he committed adultery and theft ", I said: Even if he committed adultery and theft? He said: " Even if he committed adultery and theft ", I said: Even if he committed adultery and theft? He said: " Even if he committed



adultery and theft even if Abi-Dharr disliked it”⁽¹⁾.

Allah Almighty says: **﴿Allah does not forgive the joining of partners with Him, anything less than that He forgives to whoever He will, but anyone who joins partners with Him has fabricated a tremendous sin﴾** (4: 48).

Al-Bukhari (May Allah’s mercy shower him) introduced a chapter in the Book of Iman (faith) in his Sahih by saying: “Book of being ungrateful to one’s husband, and disbelief is of different grades”. Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar (May Allah’s mercy shower him) commented on this by saying: “The judge Abu-Bakr ibn Al-’Arabi in his commentary said: The writer (i.e., Al-Bukhari) meant to explain that as good deeds are called faith, sins are called infidelity, but, calling them infidelity does not mean that they necessarily take a person out of religion”⁽²⁾. Then he introduced another chapter

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari and Muslim.

(2) - Fathul-Bari: 1/83.



by saying: (Book of sins of Jahiliyyah, and a sinner is not a disbeliever unless he worships others along with Allah, according to the Prophet's saying: "You still have some manners of Jahiliyyah"). Then, he mentioned a Hadith narrated by Al-Ma'rur who said: "I met Abu-Dharr at Ar-Rabadhah wearing a cloak and his slave, too, was wearing a similar one, so I asked him about the reason for it, he replied that he had a row with another man and insulted his mother, so, the Prophet ﷺ said: "O Abu-Dharr have you insulted his mother? You still have some manners of Jahiliyyah, your servants are your brothers, Allah has put them under your command, so, whoever has a brother under his command, he should feed him of what he eats, and dress him of what he wears, and should not burden him with whatever he cannot bear, in case you did, then, help him"⁽¹⁾.

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar commented: "Each sin resulting from neglecting a duty or committing a

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari and Muslim.



prohibited deed is a manner of Jahiliyyah. So, when Al-Bukhari said that sins are metaphorically called infidelity, he wanted to show that such infidelity does not take a person out of religion, contrary to Khawarij who say that they take him out of religion”⁽¹⁾.

Abu-Dharr, who was a highly true person in his faithfulness, Jihad, and companionship, whom The prophet ﷺ describes a person who still has some manners of Jahiliyyah, is not considered a renegade.

Another example is Hatib ibn Abi-Balta’ah who committed a heinous mistake as he betrayed some of the Muslims’ secrets and army movements to Quraish before the opening of Makkah. However, the Qur’an mentioned him amongst others by saying: **﴿You who believe, do not take my enemies and yours as your allies, showing them friendship when they have rejected the**

(1) - Fathul-Bari (1/85).



truth you have received, and have driven you and the Messenger out simply because you believe in Allah, your Lord, - not if you truly emigrated in order to survive for My cause and seek my good pleasure. You secretly show them friendship - I know all you conceal and all you reveal – but any of you who do this are straying from the right path ﴿﴾ (60:1).

‘Ali – may Allah be pleased with him- said: Allah’s Messenger sent me, Az-Zubair, and Al-Miqdad to follow a woman, so we set out as fast as we could on our horses, until we reached the woman. We said: “Take out the letter”, she said: “I don’t have a letter”, we said: “You have to take out the letter, or take off your cloths”, then, she took it out of her plait, and we took it to the Prophet ﷺ, when behold; it contained: From Hatib ibn Abi-Balta’ah to some associators in Makkah, telling them about some plans of the Prophet ﷺ, so, the Prophet ﷺ said: What is this Hatib? He said: ‘Don’t hasten on and take me wrong O! Allah’s



Prophet, I was a close intimate person to Quraish – Sufian said: He was one of their allies, but not the best – and the immigrants who came with you had some allies who protected their relatives there, so, I tried to have some allies there to protect my relatives. I have not done it out of apostasy, forsaking my religion, or feeling content with infidelity after embracing Islam’, the Prophet ﷺ said: “He said the truth”, Omar said: “ O! Messenger of Allah, let me behead this hypocrite”, the Prophet ﷺ said: “He had witnessed Badr, you do not realize that possibly Allah looked at the warriors of Badr and said: “Do what you will, I have forgiven you”, so, Allah Almighty revealed His saying: ﴿**You who believe, do not take my enemies and yours as your allies**﴾ (60:1).

The Ever-Glorious Qur’an has attributed Iman (faith) to the two fighting groups in Allah’s saying: ﴿**If two groups of the believers fight, you (believers) should try to reconcile them; if one of them oppressed the other, fight the oppres-**



sors until they submit to Allah’s commands, then make a just and even-handed reconciliation between the two of them, Allah loves those who are even-handed. The believers are brothers, so make peace between your two brothers and be mindful of Allah, so that you may be given mercy ﴿﴾ (49:9-10).

Imam Al-Bukhari (may Allah’s mercy be upon him) concluded from the Prophet’s ﷺ saying: “If two Muslims met with their swords (i.e., fighting each other) the killer and the killed are in Hell-Fire”⁽¹⁾, that sins do not take who commits them out of religion, because the Prophet ﷺ called them “Muslims” regardless of threatening them by hell-Fire. Hence, it’s concluded that the sins committed by Muslims do not take them out of religion whatever bad they are.

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Iman».



The Fourth Treatise

Refuting the fallacy: Describing the rulers as disbelievers, and (calling for) revolting against them

To answer this fallacy we say:

We are not aware of any evidence on which those who revolt against their rulers rely, except their claim that they are disbelievers and not conforming to the religion, and on the axiom that if a ruler became apostate and deserted Islam, the religion of the overwhelming majority of his subjects, he must be ousted by force if he didn't give up power voluntarily.

Accordingly, they think that they, by virtue of revolting against the ruler, are fulfilling an obligation that is prescribed on the whole nation. A fallacy they are repeating and inculcating into the souls of their followers.



Clearing this point requires us to define the limits and momentous actions relating to infidelity, as well as the rules laid by the scholars of Shari'a in this respect, then, specify what Muslims should do towards whoever evidently and indisputably commits an act of infidelity regardless of his position or rank⁽¹⁾.

Having known this, you must know that the question of revolting against the ruler is already discussed and settled since the first era of Islam and at the time of the Prophet ﷺ. It was settled by the trusted majority of scholars in the past and in recent times that revolting against the Muslim ruler is prohibited under any circumstances, unless he shows open disbelief, i.e., explicit and overt deed from Islamic viewpoint, such as calling people to deny and neglect prayers, nullifying and denying the rite of fasting, committing

(1)- See: Jihad in Islam, by: Al-Buty, p. 154, and Concepts that must be corrected, p. 22, published by Ministry of Al-Awqaf, Egypt.



blasphemy, or any other thing that the scholars unanimously hold that it takes whoever commits it out of religion.

However, nowadays we witness some ignorant criminal groups whose heads are jammed with terrorist thoughts, who judge the Muslim rulers and societies as infidels, consider their blood, honor, and money as lawful, and spread corruption in the whole society.

Therefore, this treatise carries answers to two questions relating to the case of revolting against the Muslim ruler:

First: What is meant by a Muslim ruler?

Second: What are the bases on which they build their pervert terrorist thoughts, what are their goals, and how should we answer them?

The answer to the first question:

The Muslim ruler is the one who has neither committed an open act of disbelief nor called on



people to do it. He has the right to be obeyed in other than unlawful deeds, to be advised by scholars and specialists, to establish legal and Constitutional procedures for monitoring him and whatever relates to him, and his tenure is determined by the Constitution of every Muslim state which is considered a contract between the ruler and his subjects.

The legitimate arguments that prove the ordinance of obeying, and not revolting against, the rulers are the Prophetic Hadiths that forbid revolting against them. Among them is the Hadith narrated by Al-Bukhari with his own chain of narrators that the Prophet ﷺ said: “A Muslim has to listen to and obey (the order of his ruler) whether he likes it or not, as long as his orders involve not an order of disobedience (to Allah), but if an act of disobedience (to Allah) is imposed, one should not listen to it or obey it”⁽¹⁾.

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in ‘Kitabul-Ahkam’.



However, it's not permissible to revolt against the ruler because he ordered a sin, but it is enough to disobey him, according to the Hadith narrated by Muslim: "And if you see your rulers do something you dislike, you should dislike his deed but do not revolt against him"⁽¹⁾. It's also narrated in Muslim's Sahih: "There will come after me rulers who do not follow my guidance, nor my Sunnah, among them will rise some men with hearts of Satins, and bodies of human beings" I said: O, Messenger of Allah, what should I do if I lived in that time? He said: "Listen and obey your ruler, even if he whipped your back, took your money, listen and obey him"⁽²⁾. This shows how dangerous it is to be hasty in revolting against the ruler without a legitimate cause, because evacuating a country from its rulers leads to an unprecedented chaos.

Yet, no one claimed that the ruler is free to do whatever he wants, but the institutions of the

(1) - Narrated by Muslim in «Kitabul-Imarah».

(2) - Narrated by Muslim in the Kitabul-Imarah».



state must fulfill their monitoring duties according to the law and the Constitution to control the affairs of the state. However, the tools enacted nowadays are certainly different from those enacted in earlier times, and the existence of real multifarious political parties will create thousands of legal and constitutional criteria to stop tyrannical rulers, provided that the tools are correctly employed.

The logical argument that forbid revolting against the ruler is: To guard the country against chastisement, and to establish stability in the society to be able to continue its development. This argument is supported by the Prophet's saying ﷺ: "And not to fight against the ruler unless we noticed him having open disbelief for which we should have a proof with us from Allah"⁽¹⁾. Thus, the Prophet ﷺ deprived these renegade groups and the international terrorism that back them the chance to awaken chastisement among the citizens.

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Fitan».



The answer to the second question:

The answer to the second questions focuses on the basis of their arguments that says: "The rulers are apostates, and if a ruler becomes apostate and deserts Islam, he must be ousted by force if he doesn't give up power voluntarily".

They base this argument on the premise that the rulers do not judge according to what Allah has revealed to themselves or to others. Allah Almighty said: **﴿Those who do not judge according to what Allah has revealed are rejecting (Allah's teachings)﴾** (5:44). What they say is ill words and false arguments for two reasons:

First: Collective accusation of infidelity. They indiscriminately accuse people of infidelity without checking whether these accusations are in conformity with the purposes of Shari'a or not. They just lay blame on people without having proofs or clear evidence. They may accuse someone of infidelity just for doing something other than a priority, or applying a less preferable opin-



ion for achieving an interest which they neither realize, nor realize that it may make what is less preferable preponderant due to differences of time, place, or circumstances.

Second: They consider that judging not according to what Allah has revealed is infidelity. We have already explained the situations in which judging with other than what Allah has revealed is considered infidelity when we refuted the fallacy of describing all contemporary Muslim societies as infidels, we assured that if a Muslim solemnly believed that Allah's ruling is the best for him, but some circumstances and necessities forced him to take another track, he is not considered infidel. Necessities hold for individuals as they hold for countries, taking into consideration that necessity has its own force⁽¹⁾.

Should they say that judging not according to what Allah has revealed may be a sign of denying

(1) - See the second treatise in this book.



the Shari'a, we would say that this claim needs proofs and evidence, and if they do not have the necessary proofs and evidence, then the possible interpretations are open. The most commendable interpretations side with the necessities or interests sought by doing so. If more than one interpretation for a given situation is possible, it would be illogical to give one of them priority over the others, and, accordingly, it cannot stand as an evidence. In this case, the original status, i.e., being a Muslim, prevails, according to the rule that says: "Leave things as they are". If we accept that whoever judges with other than what Allah has revealed is an infidel, then, this ruling would extend to many fathers, mothers, and people of partial authorities in institutions, factories, houses, markets, and public services, and would be an unacceptable generalization that opens gates of evil that cannot be closed or tolerated.

The Hadith "The best of Jihad is a truthful word to a tyrannical ruler"⁽¹⁾ does not support

(1) - Narrated by Ibn-Majah, and An-Nasa'i.



their argument, but it refers to advising the tyrannical ruler, not to accuse him of infidelity nor inducing revolting against him; the word ‘to’ shows that the advice giver and the receiver meet in one place; it doesn’t refer to revolting against him. Likewise, the words ‘truthful word’ refer to words, not swords, guns, or explosives, and the word ‘Jihad’ refers to striving by words as shown by the context, and as we have explained earlier.

Also, the Hadith “Whoever witnesses an evil action, let him change it with his hands, if he is unable to do so, then, with his tongue, if he is unable to do so, then, with his heart, and this is the weakest of faith”⁽¹⁾. Using force for changing the evil act is restricted by some conditions, among them; the act must be unanimously considered as evil without any differences in opinions, it must be publicly shown and all the people know it, it must take place at the time of condemning it, not before nor expected to occur in the future.

(1) - Narrated by Muslim in ‘Kitabul-Iman’.



Scholars are unanimous that changing the evil act by hand is restricted to the ruler or his deputy, by tongue to the scholars and their deputies, and by heart to the public.

Accordingly, it's not permissible to the public to change it by force, otherwise, chaos will hit both the country and the people. It's axiomatic that it's not permissible to change an evil with a similar or a bigger evil.

Finally, a Muslim is not supposed to assume Allah's authority, and judge people with definitive accusations, be them rulers, or laymen. To the contrary, he must be inclined to look to Allah and the people with an open mind and clean heart.

This leads us to investigate the treatise of 'governorship', and refute the terrorists' fallacies in interpreting it in the next treatise.



The fifth Treatise

The Wrong understanding of Governorship⁽¹⁾

To correct the wrong understanding of governorship we say:

The concept of governorship is the most misunderstood and misused concept by terrorists and radical groups; they added unintended ideas to it's original definition.

Governorship means: Full commitment to what Allah has revealed. This does not exclude resorting to some human-made rules that conform to the principles of general bases and collective rules of Shari'a, according to changes of time

(1) - This treatise is taken from the book: Conceptions to be corrected, issued by the Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs pp. 34-38.



and place. Judging with those human-made rules does not contradict Allah's legislation as long as it accomplishes the general interests of the states, peoples, individuals, and societies.

Governorship is normally used in its Shari'a definition; Allah Almighty is the legislator, that is, He is the One Who commands and forbids, and makes (things) lawful and unlawful through His ordinances.

Governorship does not mean that Allah is the one who installs Khalifs or governors to rule on behalf of Him, it only means the legislative governorship. Political authority is only given by the people who choose their rulers, make a reckoning with them, and punish them. Governorship does not mean a call to establishing a theocratic state.

Thus, legislative governorship is the only governorship that must be attributed to Allah alone, not to anyone else. It's the highest degree



of governorship, and it doesn't contradict the lawfulness of a certain degree of human-made legislations, as Allah allowed people to legislate for themselves in novel cases which do not have rulings in the Qur'an or Sunnah. Such cases are known as "left-outs", and are referred to in the Hadith: "And what he (i.e. the Prophet) left out (i.e., has not mentioned or referred to) grants license"⁽¹⁾. Likewise, in the cases which are ruled by general principles and rulings, people are allowed to legislate for themselves the partial and detailed rulings, without observing anything except the collective purposes and the general rules of Shari'a, which take into consideration procuring interests, deterring evil, and observing people's needs as individuals and groups.

We would draw the attention to the fact that the contemporary detailed rulings in general do not contradict the collective purposes of Shari'a,

(1)- Narrated by Abu-Dawud, in «Kitabul-At'imah» (Book of Food).



as they also take into consideration procuring interests, deterring evil, and observing common tradition.

The issue of calling the ruler an infidel on the basis of Allah's saying: "Whoever does not judge according to what Allah has revealed, then, those are they the disbelievers" (5:44), is a false issue, because it entails that whoever does not judge according to what Allah has revealed in his house, the society in which he assumes some authority, or the institution which he manages, is an apostate who must be killed according to the doctrine of those pervert groups.

They are not likely to consider the possibility that they do not judge according to what Allah has revealed, due to negligence, carelessness, being caught by a strong desire or compelling worldly interest, or being forced to do so by the international surrounding circumstances, although they know for sure that they are not on the right track.



The perversion of their doctrine exhibits itself in ignoring the differences between behavioral sins that draw to errancy, and faith sins that lead to infidelity. One of the governing rules of Ahlus-Sunnah is that: Sinners are immoral persons not infidels.

It also is manifest in their tendency to indiscriminately issue collective judgments without considering the special individual cases, as well as their reckless opposition to the Prophet's guidance ﷺ and his warning of radicalism in the Hadith narrated by Abu-Sa'id Al-Khudriy that the Prophet ﷺ said: "You will have rulers whom you will love and reckon on, and others whom you will dislike and abandon", a man said: Shall we fight them O Messenger of Allah? No, as long as they kept up the prayers" He said⁽¹⁾. This is a clear evidence that in case a ruler neglected some guidance of the Qur'an or Sunnah, he cannot be called an infidel.

(1) - Narrated by Ahmad in his Musnad, 17/321.



We have already explained in the beginning of this treatise that commitment to Allah's legislation does not bar Muslims from laying down some laws within the framework of the general principles and rules of Shari'a, according to different times and places, and that judging according to these laws is not in conflict with Allah's legislation as long as it procures interest to the states, peoples, individuals, and societies.



The Sixth treatise

Refuting the fallacy: Inevitability of imposing Jizyah⁽¹⁾ on non-Muslims

To answer this fallacy, we say:

Jizyah is a name of a financial commitment that has been eliminated in our times; the reasons behind imposing it no longer exist, due to the fact that citizens have become equal in rights and duties, and more new financial systems have replaced it.

What has been mentioned in the Qur'an regarding Jizyah is restricted to fighters, aggressors, and deniers of citizenship. It's not applicable to peaceful participants in the efforts of building the country and defending it.

(1)- Jizyah is a kind of poll-taxes paid by on non-Muslims living in Islamic countries.



Explanation:

The Jizyah that was imposed by the Islamic state on non-Muslim inhabitants was not an Islamic novelty, but it was a well-known tax enacted in pre-Islamic laws for financing the army and defending the country and citizens. That is, it was imposed instead of taking up military tasks, not instead of adopting Islam. This is evidenced by the fact that it was only imposed on those who are capable of joining the army, and having the money for paying it. If it was really imposed instead of adopting Islam, it would have been imposed on all non-Muslims without any exception, be they children, elderly, women, disabled, or disqualified. Likewise, it was not imposed on monks, and men-of-religion. The majority of scholars said that it was imposed to relieve them from the duties of Jihad and what it takes to win victory.

It was imposed on the physically and financially competent Christians of Najran for exempting them from enlisting in the army. The Prophet ﷺ



stipulated in his contract with them that: “None of Ahluz-Zimmah⁽¹⁾ should be commissioned for setting out with Muslims to face their enemies in wars and battles, and that Muslims should defend them and be shelters for them”⁽²⁾

It was not imposed on the non-Muslim citizens who preferred to fight side by side with Muslims; they were equal with Muslims in fighting and in taking their shares of war gains as happened in Jurjan, where it was stipulated in the treaty signed by the leader Suwaid ibn Muqrin with its inhabitants; it said: “Who we ask for help among you shall have his share for his help, and shall be exempted from paying the Jizyah”⁽³⁾.

It also happened with the Christians of Homs who fought side by side with the army lead by

(1) - The free non-Muslim subjects of a Muslim state for whose security and personal and religious freedom Muslims are responsible.

(2) - Collection of the political documents of the Prophetic era, p. 25.

(3) - Tarikhut-Tabariy Vol. 4, p152, and Tarikh-Jurjan, p. 45.



Abu-'Ubaidah ibn Al-Jarrah in the battle of Yarmulke against the Byzantine Romans.

Omar ibn Al-Khattab (RA) also exempted the Christians of Bani-Taghlib. When he saw them having an aversion from paying Jizyah, he became afraid that they may renounce allegiance and join the Romans to support them against Muslims. He was fully aware that no harm will afflict the Muslims if he exempted them from the Jizyah, so, he dropped it, and took it back from them as he doubled it and called it sadaqah (donations)⁽¹⁾.

That which Allah called "humiliation" in His Book, only refers to those who are in a state of war against Muslims, not to those who embrace any other religion, so, once they end the state of war, no humiliation is attributed to them, as it is acknowledged by the scholars of Shari'a that judgment revolves with its cause positively and negatively. They also solemnly condemned whoever mistreats the People of the Book in any way, and stressed the inevitability of treating them in the best way.

(1) - Al-Amwal (wealth) by Ibn Salam, p. 45.



The Seventh Treatise

Refuting the fallacy: Violating the sanctity of blood.

To answer this fallacy, we say:

It's clear that their practices of criminal acts distort the original meanings of the Qur'anic texts that explain the rulings of fighting, and take them as pretexts to violate the sanctity of the blood of Muslims and non-Muslims alike.

It's also clear from the words and phrases they use that they awfully hate the Muslim nation, as manifested by their incessant attempts to change the facts and situations in which Jihad in the cause of Allah was mentioned, let alone their shocking and embarrassing deeds.

They burn people alive to death. And slay others in front of cameras, and show pride in this.



There is no divine message on earth that admits their deeds, and we are not aware of any prophet who did that or admitted it neither in cases of war nor in peace. Those filthy criminals wrongly attribute to the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ that he either ordered, did, hinted at, or accepted it, and that they found it in his honorable Sunnah, although he is totally clear of it.

Among their abhorrent adversities is allowing killing women, children, elderly, and disabled people, and taking innocent people as human shields, as a means of attaining their goal of tumbling the state and destroying the religion.

Parallel to executing their devastating plans, they violate the sanctity of innocent people's blood, and kill them for no liability, reason, or crime they committed. This does not belong to the Islamic law in any sense. Making a Muslim's blood lawful exhibits the reality of their doctrine, that is, they consider him a disbeliever and draw him out of Islam. It's not up to anyone to do, as



long as the Muslim holds his religion, and has not shown any sign contradictory to his faith. Another sign of their apparent denial of the Shari'a rulings is that they abolished the blood-money that is due by law to the families of those they kill by mistake, as they do not consider blood sanctified, even if it's of women, children, or elderly persons.

It's related to 'Abdullahi ibn 'Umar "that a woman was found killed in one of the Prophet's ﷺ battles, so, he forbade the killing of women and children"⁽¹⁾. Muslim jurists are unanimous that women and elderly people should not be killed in battles, unless they participated in fighting⁽²⁾.

Thus, we realize that the upright Shari'a has forbidden killing for no evident reason; such reason must be acknowledged by the ruler not by ordinary people. Violating the sanctity of blood in

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari and Muslim in «Kitabul-Jihad»

(2) - Al-Mughni by Ibn-Qudamah 9/311.



that way does nothing but opening a wide door of blood-shedding, a matter of which the Prophet ﷺ had cautioned us, as it entails a dire threat to the safety of the society, and liquidation of religion; no one can truly worship Allah or manifestly adhere to His religion in a state of horror, fear, and oppression.

Assuring the sanctity of blood, Allah Almighty says, : ﴿On that account, We decreed to the children of Israel that if anyone killed a person – unless for retribution for murder or spreading corruption in the land – it is as if he killed all mankind, while if he saves a life, it is as if he saves the life of all mankind. Our messengers came to them with clear signs, but many of them continued to commit excesses in the land﴾ (5:32), and says: ﴿Do not take life which Allah has made sacred except by right﴾ (17:33), and says: ﴿If anyone kills a believer deliberately , the punishment for him is Hell, and there he will remain, : Allah is angry with him, and



rejects him, and has prepared a tremendous torment for him ﴿4:93﴾, and says: **﴿And do not say to anyone who offers you a greeting of peace ‘You are not a believer’ out of desire for the chance gains of this life – Allah has plenty of gains for you. You yourself were in the same position [once], but Allah was gracious to you, so be careful: Allah is fully aware of what you do﴾** (4:94).

The Prophet ﷺ has considered blood shedding without right as one of the seven great destructive sins that destroy both life and society, he said: “Avoid the seven great destructive sins” The people inquired “O, Allah’s Messenger! What are they? He said: “To join others in worship along with Allah, sorcery, killing a person whose killing Allah has prohibited except by right, eating up usury, eating up an orphan’s wealth, giving back to the enemy and fleeing from the battlefield at the time of fight, and falsely accusing indiscreet



believing women of illegal sexual intercourse”⁽¹⁾, and says: “Whoever points to his brother with a piece of iron, the angels keep cursing him until he stops it, even if he did it to his brother; the son of his father and mother”⁽²⁾, and says: “A faithful believer remains at liberty regarding his religion unless he sheds a sacred blood”⁽³⁾.

Also, among their abhorrent adversities is making the blood, money, and honor of non-Muslims lawful and attribute it to the Prophet ﷺ, ignoring – on purpose – Allah’s saying: **﴿And He does not forbid you to deal kindly and justly with anyone who has not fought you for your faith and driven you out of your homes: Allah loves the just. But Allah forbids you to take as allies those who fought against you for your**

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Wasaya» (Book of Wills and Testaments).

(2) - Narrated by Muslim in «Kitabut-Tafsir» (Book of explanation).

(3) 9 Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabud-Diyat» (Book of Blood-Money).



faith, driven you out of your homes, and helped others to drive you out: any of you who takes them as allies will truly be wrongdoers ﴿60:8-9﴾. They also intentionally ignored the treaty the Prophet ﷺ made with non-Muslims who live in peace with Muslims: that his blood, money, and honor are protected as long as they have not done whatever requires penalty, have not helped other internal or external powers against Muslims, and have not endeavored to ignite the fire of dissension in peaceful countries. They also ignored that our Prophet ﷺ killed a Muslim in retaliation for a non-Muslim who was under Muslims' protection, and said: 'I am the most dignified among those who fulfilled their promises'⁽¹⁾, and said: "If a man gave a word of safety to another man then killed him, then, I am clear of the killer even if the killed is a disbeliever"⁽²⁾, and said: "Whoever inequitably treats a covenanter, despises him, bur-

(1) Narrated by Ad-Dara Qutniy in his «Sunan», and by Al-Baihaqi in «As-Sunan Al-Kubra».

(2) - Narrated by Al-Baihaqi in «As-Sunan Al-Kubra».



dens him with more than he can bear, or takes something from him without his content, I will be his opponent on the Day of Judgment”⁽¹⁾. Some scholars hold that retribution is obligatory for deliberate killing of any covenanter, regardless of the killer’s race or religion⁽²⁾. So, if a Muslim deliberately killed a peaceful non-Muslim for nothing, he should be killed in retribution, according to the general texts that assured the sanctity of blood, which, in turn, is in full conformity with the principles of equal citizenship, and the circumstances of our society and era.

(1) _ Narrated by Abu-Dawud in «Kitabul-Kharaj».

(2)- See: Al-Hidayah, 4/444.



The Eighth Treatise

Refuting the fallacy: Destroying the vehicles and equipment of the army and police is lawful

To answer this fallacy, we say:

These equipment belong to the public wealth of the country which the Shari'a has enjoined protecting them on every single citizen in the nation, and prohibited destroying them in any way whatsoever. Moreover, these equipment are the tools of defending the internal and external safety and security of the country and the people, hence, they cannot be damaged or attacked.

Allah Almighty has commanded us to prepare every possible power and to show it to the enemies in order that they may be deterred, frightened and dare not violate our countries' security.



This, in fact, entails saving lives, honor, wealth, lands from aggression and occupation. Allah Almighty said: **﴿Prepare against them whatever forces you (believers) can muster, including warhorses, to frighten off these enemies of Allah and of yours, and warn others unknown to you but known to Allah. Whatever you give in Allah's cause will be repaid to you in full, and you will not be wronged﴾** (8:60).

Two points can be concluded from this verse:

First: Preparing such forces is only meant to ward off the enemy from attacking our countries, honor, wealth, or gains, as well as deterring the enemies who are lurking to attack us.

Second: The forces prepared according to the Holy Verse are no longer strange; they are now known as armed peace or defensive deterrence.

Allah Almighty has made clear that the aim of the enemies of religion and homeland is to entice soldiers to give up their arms, He said: **﴿The**



disbelievers dearly would like you to be heedless of your weapons and baggage, in order for them to take you in a single assault﴾ (4:102).

So, it's not fitting for any believer who adheres to Allah's teachings to contradict Allah's commands and be heedless of his weapon. What logic that would say that when you have the forces you should destroy them or attack others with them- for only following the destructive people who do not want any good for our country or our people, and who do not correctly and uprightly understand their religion.

So, we realize that whoever calls for demolishing the country's army or opposing it is in apparent contradiction with Allah's saying: ﴿**Prepare against them whatever forces you (believers) can muster﴾ (8:60), and striving to achieving the enemies goal of weakening the country against them.**

Allah Almighty has stressed the importance of being precautionous; He said: ﴿**Take your precau-**



tion ﴿4:102﴾. He urged us to bear this in mind, in order that we can deter the threat of our enemies which Allah has depicted by saying: **﴿In order for them to take you in a single assault﴾** (4:102); this is the grievous end which those radical groups strive to attain through the steps explained in their Fatwas.

Accordingly, any soldier entrusted by the head of the state or by the ministry of defense to guard the frontiers should not abandon his weapons or allow anyone to reach them. Had such a thing been allowed in our Shari'a, Allah Almighty would not have ordered the fighters to take their weapons with them while praying, as He said: **﴿When you (Prophet) are with the believers, leading them in prayers, let a group of them stand up in prayers with you, taking their weapons with them, and when they have finished their prostration, let them take up their positions at the back. Then let the other group, who have not yet prayed, pray with you, also on their guard**



and armed with their weapons ﴿4:102﴾. This is what the Egyptian soldier has digested through history, and, thus, gas attained his esteemed position; he is on constant guard till the Day of Judgment.

If the trusted scholars and jurists hold that whoever dies (is killed) defending his money is considered a martyr, then, by analogy, whoever dies (is killed) defending his weapons is a martyr, and whoever died (is killed) defending his country is a martyr.

Attacking army equipment or attempting to destroy them is a sort of the corruption we have been forbidden to commit in Allah's saying: **﴿There is (a kind of) man whose views on the life of this world may please you (Prophet), he even calls on Allah to witness what he is in the heart, yet, he is the bitterest of opponents. When he leaves, he sets out to spread corruption in the land, destroying crops and livestock – Allah does not like corruption. When he is**



told, ‘Beware of Allah, his arrogance leads him to sin. Hill is enough for him: a dreadful resting place’ (2:204-206).

The proponents of this fallacy aim at dissolving the Egyptian army in particular, and the Arab armies in general for the interest of the enemy; this is a high treason against the religion, and country. The army and the police are the forts of this country, then, the call to demolish them is a call to demolish the country, a matter which cannot be admitted by religion, patriotism, or a sound mind.



The Ninth Treatise

Answering the fallacy: Encouraging their elements to carry weapons and terrify the peaceful.

To answer this fallacy, we say:

It's axiomatic in the Islamic Shari'a that terrifying peaceful people is solemnly prohibited. Imam Minawy said in his book 'Faidul-Qadir': "Terrifying a Muslim is solemnly prohibited".

The Prophet ﷺ said: "Whoever points to his brother with a piece of iron, the angels keep cursing him until he stops it, even if he did it to his brother; the son of his father and mother"⁽¹⁾. Imam An-Nawawi said: "This Hadith asserts the sanctity of Muslims, and solemnly forbids ter-

(1) - Narrated by Muslim in 'Kitabut-Tafsir'.



rifying a Muslim or exposing him to any harm, the Prophet ﷺ saying: “even if he did it to his brother; the son of his father and mother” mirrors some sort of exaggeration of forbidding doing so to anyone, be it a moral or immoral person, and be it done seriously or for fun. Terrifying a Muslim is forbidden in all circumstances⁽¹⁾. The Prophet ﷺ said: “It’s not lawful for a Muslim to terrify a Muslim”⁽²⁾, and said: “It’s not lawful for a Muslim to take his brother’s stick without his content, due to Allah’s solemn prohibition of a Muslim’s money to another Muslim”⁽³⁾.

The Prophet ﷺ has warned against terrifying any human being regardless of his faith or religion, so, he said: “Whoever inequitably treat a covenanter, despised him, burdened him with more than he can bear, or took something from him without his consent, I will be his opponent

(1) - The explanation of Sahih Muslim by An-Nawawi.

(2) - Narrated by Abu-Dawud in «Kitabul-Adab».

(3) - Narrated by Al-Bayhaqi in «As-Sunan Al-Kubra».



on the Day of Judgment”⁽¹⁾. Abdurrahman ibn Abi-Laila said: “The Prophet’s companions told us that they were travelling with the Prophet ﷺ, so, one of them fell asleep, and they took his arrow, when he woke up he was startled (for not finding it) and the people laughed at him, so, the Prophet ﷺ asked: “What are you laughing at? They said he fell asleep and we took his arrow, and he was startled, the Prophet ﷺ said: “It’s not lawful for a Muslim to terrify a Muslim”⁽²⁾.

Confronting and deterring these misled groups from terrifying safe people and destroying the country is prompted By Shari’a, even if we had to conduct an armed confrontation with them.. It’s not possible for a country to allow those groups and those behind them to spread corruption in the land. Allah Almighty has set the punishment ‘Al-Hirabah’ (revolting against the society) as retribution to those who spread cor-

(1) - Narrated by Abu-Dawud in ‘Kitabul-Kharaj.

(2) - Narrated by Ahmad in his Musnad, 38/163.



ruption in the land, He said: ﴿Those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger and strive to spread corruption in the land should be punished by death, crucifixion, the amputation of an alternate hand and foot, or banishment from the land: a disgrace for them is this world, and then a terrible punishment in the Hereafter, unless they repent before you overpower them – in that case, bear in mind that Allah is forgiving and merciful﴾ (5:33).



The Tenth Treatise

Answering the fallacy: Using chaos and peaceful demonstrations as a cover for destroying the country, as well as attacking private and public properties

To answer this fallacy we say:

Constitutions and laws have set the mechanisms for people to express their views, such as peaceful demonstrations and other means of expressing one's opinions. But those misled and misleading groups take these means for spreading chaos and attacking public and private properties, with the aim of weakening the state or bringing it down.

Browsers of Islamic history would find that some groups have lost the right way. The beginning was with those who revolted against 'Uth-



man ibn 'Affan (may Allah be pleased with him). Taking religion as pretext, they protested against him, then raised their weapons in his face together with the faces of the Prophet's ﷺ honorable companions (may Allah be pleased with them). It resulted in killing the upright Caliph, 'Uthman ibn 'Affan, then the door of dissension was widely opened, and the group of Khwarij (insurgents), who revolted against 'Ali ibn Abi-Talib (may Allah be pleased with him) came to existence. They also killed 'Ali, and torrential waves of dissension started to hit the whole nation, and got it involved in unprecedented historical wars and discord, which have never been known before.

Likewise nowadays, spreading chaos, ridiculing sacred rites, and making killing lawful to seize power or to serve enemies' goals, is the ultimate aim of these terrorist groups.

Therefore, scholars hold that selling weapons at times of dissension is prohibited, as it entices people to use it and commit atrocities and



aggression. ‘Umran ibn Al-Husain said that “The Prophet ﷺ prohibited selling weapons at times of dissention”⁽¹⁾.

So, we wonder how may anyone urge others to use violence and terrorism as a means of reformation? Allah forbid – It is a monstrous slander?

What adds to our knowledge of the errancy of these groups is their blatant negligence of the Prophet’s admonition: “Do not regress to infidelity by striking the neck of one another after me”⁽²⁾.

Accordingly, whoever calls the people to revolt, kill, and destroy is an opponent of the guidance of our Prophet ﷺ; those groups are certainly on this heinous track.

The stand taken by ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Umar during Ibn Az-Zubair’s affliction attests to the prohibition of helping others to kill Muslims; “Two men came to him and said: “The people are lost,

(1) - Badai’ As-Sana’i, 5/233.

(2) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in ‘Kitabul-Maghazi’.



and you are ‘Umar’s son, and the companion of the Prophet’s ﷺ, so, what forbids you from coming out (i.e., to fight)? He said: “Whatforbids me is that Allah Has prohibited the shedding of my brother’s blood” They said: “Didn’t Allah say: “Fight them until there is no more persecution, and all worship is devoted to Allah alone? He said: “We fought until there was no more persecution, and all worship was devoted to Allah alone, now, you want me to fight until there is more persecution, and all worship is devoted to other than Allah”⁽¹⁾. In another narration related to Sa’id ibn Jubair that he said: “‘Abdullah ibn ‘Umar came out to us and we hoped that he would narrate to us a good Hadith, but before we asked him, a man got up and said to him, “O, Abu ‘Abdurrahman: Narrate to us about the battles during the time of the afflictions, as Allah says: “Fight them until there is no more persecution”. Ibn ‘Umar said: “Do you know what is meant by afflictions? Let

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in ‘Kitab tafseerul-Qur’an’.



your mother bereave you! Muhammad ﷺ used to fight against the pagans, and the affliction was to embrace pagan's religion, Muhammad's ﷺ fighting was not like your fighting which is carried on for the sake of ruling"⁽¹⁾.

Thus, we see how Ibn 'Umar classifies those who strive to levy followers and urge them to fight and spread dissention as strivers for seizing power and authority. He (may Allah be pleased with him) had depicted the reality of those groups who take religion as a cover for attaining their malicious purposes, even if they shed blood for no reason, out of folly, and out of having the audacity to disobey Allah and his Messenger.

It should be born in mind that Allah Almighty has sanctified to all people, regardless of their race or nationalities, their wealth, honor, and properties. Whoever says that it is lawful to expose public or private properties to any danger

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Fitan».



or attack, has invented lies about Allah and His Messenger, because this contradicts Allah's saying: ﴿Do not transgress, surely, Allah does not love transgressors﴾ (2:190), and contradicts what the Prophet ﷺ did when he left Makkah, as he returned the money and consignments that the infidels of Quraish entrusted him to keep them, despite the fact that they disbelieved him. Before he ﷺ left Makkah, he gave the money and consignments to his cousin 'Ali to give them back to their owners; he didn't keep them for himself, but he obeyed Allah's commandment: ﴿Do not eat up your property wrong fully, nor use them to bribe judges, intending sinfully and knowingly to eat up parts of other people's property﴾ (2:188). Hasn't he said in his farewell speech: "Surely, your blood, wealth, and honor are prohibited for you as the prohibition of this day, this country, and this month. You will certainly meet your Lord, and He will ask you about your deeds, so, do not regress to infidelity by striking



the neck of one another after me, have I conveyed the message, O! Allah, be my witness”⁽¹⁾.

So, we say: Whoever strives to spread chaos, and to attack public and private property, similar to those radical groups, is wrongfully eating up other people’s property and damaging them, opposing our Prophet’s ﷺ guidance, and is included in Allah’s threat: **﴿You who believe, do not wrongfully consume each other’s wealth but trade with mutual consent, do not kill each other, for Allah is Merciful to you. If any of you does these things, out of hostility and injustice, We shall make him suffer Fire: That is easy for Allah﴾** (4:29-30).

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in ‘Kitabul-Maghazi’.



The Eleventh Treatise

Answering the fallacy: The call to cut off roads and create traffic congestion

To answer this fallacy, we say:

The commandments of the honorable Sunnah regarding disliking sitting on the roads, let alone cutting them off, have been totally ignored by those groups. It is narrated by Abu-Sa'id Al-Khudriy that the Prophet ﷺ said: "Beware! Avoid sitting on the roads" The people said: "There is no way out of it as these are the sitting places where we have talks" The Prophet ﷺ said: "If you must sit there, then observe the rights of the roads" They said : What are the rights of the roads? He said: "Lowering your gazes (on seeing what is illegal to look at), refraining from harming people, returning greetings, advocating good, and forbidding evil"⁽¹⁾.

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Mazalim».



The Prophet ﷺ has laid down rules for using the roads in case one had to sit there, and made these rules rights of the road not of any person. So, on what grounds do those groups make lawful the cutting off roads, attacking them, and, in turn, attacking the people who use them? The Islamic Shari'a forbade traffic congestion, for the harm it entails to the public interest, let alone opposing the Prophet's ﷺ commandments: "Refraining from harming people, and forbidding evil", i.e. the roads' rights.

The merit and good reward of whomever removes harm away from the roads is ascertained by the honorable Sunnah. Abu-Hurairah narrated that the Prophet ﷺ said: "While a man was going on a way, he saw a thorny branch and removed it from the way, and Allah Almighty became pleased with his action and forgave him for that"⁽¹⁾. He also says: "Faith (belief) consists of more than sixty branches (parts), the best of them is to say: There

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Azan».



is no god but Allah, the lowest is to remove harmful things from the way, and self-respect (modesty) is a part of faith”⁽¹⁾, and said: “Each person’s every joint must perform a charity every day the sun comes up: to act justly between two people is a charity; to help a man with his mount, lifting him onto it or hoisting up his belongings onto it is a charity; a good word is a charity; every step you take to the prayers is a charity, and removing a harmful thing from the road is a charity”⁽²⁾.

Encouraging cutting off roads and causing traffic congestion leads to paralyzing the whole country, and exposes innocent lives to danger; a matter which blatantly contradicts the rules of Shari’a.

It also poses threat to the state’s public property and utilities, and inflicts harm on the state, society, and the interests of the people. It clearly

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Iman».

(2) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Jihad».



means that these steps mirror a meticulous plan for spreading chaos in the country, and agitating the anger of the people, in order that they may revolt against their rulers, thus, creating the disorder which our enemies are striving to achieve for attaining their goals of disuniting and dissolving the country, turning it into weak entities that may not do any good to a friend nor any harm to an enemy.



The Twelfth Treatise

Answering the fallacy: Calling people to hunger-strike aiming to spread chaos and crumbling the country

To answer this fallacy, we say:

Holders of this fallacy base it on Mary's saying: **﴿I have vowed to the Lord of Mercy to abstain from conversation, and I will not talk to anyone today﴾** (19:26). They depicted her abstention from talking as a strike, and forgot that this was a miracle for her against her people. Moreover, what is the connection between her abstention from talking, which is a miracle, that would not inflict any harm on her, and the hunger-strike which may end in perishing?

One of the principles of Islamic Shari'a, and all other faith's principles, is to protect human



beings' lives, Allah says: **﴿Do not contribute to your destruction with your own hands﴾** (2:195). And says: **“Do not kill each other, for Allah is Merciful to you. If any of you does these things, out of hostility and injustice, We shall make him suffer Fire: That is easy for Allah﴾** (4:29-30).

Keeping one's soul requires observing many factors, the most important of them is food and drink, hence, if a person deliberately refrained from eating and drinking, and this ended up in death, the scholars of Shari's hold him as suicide.

Besides, it's a forbidden self-torturing. We also are forbidden from burdening ourselves with whatever we cannot bear; we have to observe our bodies' rights on us, as the strong Muslim is better and more loved by Allah than the weak one.

It gets worse if the hunger-strike is politically-oriented, and has nothing to do with mistreatment in prisons or elsewhere, as it involves ly-



ing, fabricating accusations, fraud, and falsely accusing people of what they are clear of. These groups aim to provoke the international organizations against their country to exert pressure on it, or, maybe, to give them some pretext to impose economic or military sanctions against it, freeze its monetary deposits for weakening it, and spread chaos in it to attain their ultimate goal of seizing it. This end would only serve the purposes of our enemies, and is in blatant opposition to the purposes of Shari'a that urges us to keep the strength, unity, and stability of the country, and deter any aggression against it.

The scholars unanimously hold that it is incumbent to protect the country against aggressors, and stipulate that achieving that goal is a collective duty, if some people did it, the others are exempted from blame, but if none did it, the whole nation is held responsible for it. But in case the country was assaulted by the enemies, every individual is held responsible for defending it, regardless of the form of assault.



The Thirteenth Treatise

Answering the fallacy: The call to levying Zakah (alms) to support their criminal acts which they falsely call: Jihad

To answer this fallacy, we say:

The recipients (or beneficiaries) of Zakat have been specified by Allah Almighty in the Ever-Glorious Qur'an, He said: **﴿Alms are meant only for the poor, the needy, those who administer them, those whose hearts need winning over, to free slaves, and help those in debt, for Allah's cause, and for travelers in need. This is ordained by Allah; Allah is all-knowing and wise﴾** (9:60).

The distortion they applied to this verse originated from their misunderstanding of Allah's saying: "for Allah's cause"; they thought that the de-

struction, devastation, killing, and driving people away from their homes, is Jihad for Allah's cause. We have already made clear the meaning, kinds, and conditions of Jihad.

We here assure that acts committed by these groups are not Jihad for Allah's cause, but an aggressive war against Islam and Muslims, and the whole country.

Zakat has its legal recipients, fulfilling the needs of the poor and the needy; doing whatever is necessary for the safety of the society comes first. Distorting the texts and extracting unintended meanings from them is a great catastrophe. And the money which is collected as Zakat for the orphans, widows, the poor, the needy, building mosques, schools, and hospitals, then directed to financing terrorist elements, is nothing but unlawful money, betraying the trust, and wasting the rights of those who are in need for it.

The Ever-Glorious Qur'an had promised a painful torture to those who do not urge others



to feed the needy in Allah's saying: ﴿(Prophet) have you considered the person who denies the Judgment? It is he who pushes aside the orphan, and does not urge others to feed the needy, So, woe to those who pray but are heedless of their prayers; those who are all show and forbid common kindness﴾ (108:1-7), and in His saying addressing the dwellers of Hellfire: ﴿What drove you to the Scorching Fire? And they will answer 'We did not pray; we did not feed the poor; we indulged with others (in mocking the believers); we denied the Day of Judgment; until the Certain End came upon us﴾ (74:42-47), so, how about that who assaults their rights and unjustly directs them to others? He is certainly among those who unjustly eat orphan's money up; Allah says: ﴿Those who consume the property of the orphans unjustly are actually swallowing fire into their own bellies, they will burn in the blazing flame﴾ (4:10). This includes the direct eating up of the rights of the needy people, or directing their rights to finance radical



organizations, or any other institution for which the money has not been assigned. The scholars hold that the purpose of the donator should be respected, and that the conditions of the donator are equally similar to the conditions of Shari'a, as long as they do not render a lawful thing unlawful or vice versa.

The worst among these groups are those who interpret Allah's saying : "those who administer them" according to their whims, and illegally consume some money for themselves, although all scholars are unanimous that those who administer the Zakat must be appointed by the head of the state for this purpose, and have been assigned a specific sum of money for doing this job; not those who unjustly take money for themselves without any legal justification.



The Fourteenth Treatise

Answering the fallacy: Calling the people to 'Civil Disobedience' with the aim of overthrowing the state

To answer this fallacy, we say:

The holders of this fallacy have fabricated some hadiths and related them to the Prophet ﷺ, hoping that they would make their filthy dreams come true; hadiths such as “By the end of the time, there will be unjust rulers, immoral ministers, dishonest judges, and false scholars, whoever among you realizes that time, he should not be one of their leviens, aid, nor a policeman”. According to the authenticators of Hadith, this is a fabricated untrue hadith⁽¹⁾.

(1)- See: The edition of Sahih ibn Hibban by Sheikh Shu'ayb Al-Arna'ut, 10/447.



So, their counting on this Hadith without mentioning the scholars' opinions on it ascertains their bad intention, and their strive to bring confusion in people's faith, attribute some fabrications to the Prophet ﷺ, and accuse him ﷺ of using violence and civil disobedience; a matter that leads to total paralysis of the state, without considering the needs of the weak, patients, and children, let alone inflicting harm on other creatures like animals which Allah has held man responsible for their safety. All of this aims to paralyze the move of life, inflict losses in money and lives, break up the efforts of the army and police, deform the image of the state in other countries, and disdain it in a way that makes others hopeful of seizing it, thus, creating a chance for those who want to break through it, and those who want to fabricate lies and attribute them to the Prophet ﷺ, who said: "Whoever deliberately attributes a lie to me, let him occupy his seat in Hellfire"⁽¹⁾.

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Jana'iz».



The Prophet ﷺ has never ordered civil disobedience nor strike, and let whoever attributes that to him wait for Allah's are considered every sinning liar; how can anyone imagine that the Prophet ﷺ has ordered to paralyze the move of life, while he said: "Let people gain their livings from one another, if any of you sought an advice from his brother, let him get it"⁽¹⁾. Our upright Shari'a is based on urging people to work and to master their work, and augmented the reward for every worker who strives for providing for himself and his family, which means providing for his country as well. The nations that do not own their food and their weapons lacks everything ad does not deserve a place in this world.

They hold the fallacy that they should not cooperate with the rulers on the basis that they are unjust, and whatever possible should be done to ruin their authority, and quotes, as a support for their claim, the Prophet's saying: "This branch of

(1) - Narrated by At-Tabarani in «Al-Mu'jam Al-Kabir», 22/354.



Quraish will ruin my nation”, the companions of the Prophet asked: What do you order us to do then? He said: “I would suggest that the people keep away from them”⁽¹⁾. ‘Abdullah ibn Ahmad ibn Hanbal answered this fallacy, and attributed the answer to his father as he said: “My father said in his illness after which he died: “Forget about this Hadith as it contradicts the Prophet’s ﷺ Hadith: “Listen and obey and be patient”⁽²⁾. Al-Hafiz said in his book Al-Fath that the Prophet ﷺ meant by ‘nation’ the people who lived in his time and the nearest to them, not the whole nation to the Day of Judgment⁽³⁾.

Ahmad Shakir commented on this Hadith: “It may be a precaution on the part of Imam Ahmad, lest the readers should understand that the Prophet’s ﷺ saying: “keep away from them” means to go out to fight them, since fighting

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Manaqib».

(2) - Musnad Ahmad 13/381.

(3) - Fathul-Bari 13/10.



them would lead to a great corruption and disunite the nation, as well as revolting against the ruler. The real meaning of this statement is to be cautious for your religion and to keep away from corruption and dissention⁽¹⁾. Imam Ahmad, due to his sagacity, summarized the whole issue in that the deeds of those groups end in: perishing the people, on the basis that: they seek power and fight for it, a matter which leads to spoiling people's life, and spreads killings. This is quite clear in their words, which entice reviving dissention, killing, burning, destruction, making lawful whatever Allah has made unlawful, under the pretext of observing people's interests, but we ask: Where are the interests in working to demolish the state, and paralyze people's life?

These groups have deliberately hidden these facts and avoided mentioning them, and ignored considering the consequences which the Shari'a fights and tries to keep the people away from

(1) - Editing of Musnad Ahmad 13/382.



their woes. The lies they fabricated and falsely and unjustly related to the Prophet ﷺ that he ordered civil disobedience or any act of violence are implausible and far away from him ﷺ, and contradictory to the authentic Hadith that he said: “Soon others will be preferred to you, and there will be things which you do not like.” The companions of the Prophet ﷺ asked, “O Allah’s Messenger! What do you order us to do (in this case)?” He said: “(I order you) to accomplish your duties, and to ask your rights from Allah.”⁽¹⁾

This Hadith devastates the principle of ‘civil disobedience’ in every sense. To the contrary, the Prophet ﷺ taught us that even in hard time where injustice prevails, every follower must give everyone his rights following the Prophets ﷺ saying: “to accomplish your duties, and to ask your rights from Allah.” He ﷺ has established the principle of giving the rights to their owners under any circumstances, so, where from have those

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in ‘Kitabul-Mana’iqib’.



groups got those lies that the Shari'a has allowed such very perilous thing, i.e. 'civil disobedience'? We resort to Allah Almighty to save us from those unjust people who call for destroying the country, perishing the people, and making the lands available to corrupt killers, who distort the meanings of Allah's words.

Surely, Allah's promise of victory to the truth, and of uncovering the immoral and defeating them will materialize; ﴿**The evildoers will find out what they will return to**﴾ (26:227). What evil is more than fabricating lies and relating them to Allah and His Messenger ﷺ.?



The Fifteenth Treatise

Answering the fallacy: Using social media and media for destabilizing security and defaming the image and leaders of the state

To answer this fallacy, we say:

The destructive squadrons who support those terrorist groupson the social media and other forms of media strive to highlight the weak points and concentrate on the security barracks to make them easy targets for those terrorist groups, self-killers, and suicide-bombers, unaware of the danger that a word may incur at the time of dissention; this word may lead to killing many innocent martyrs. The media of those terrorist groups strive to ignite the fire of dissention through the lies they propagat in different ways, ignoring Al-

lah's saying: ﷺ (Prophet), do you not see how Allah makes comparisons? A good word is like a good tree whose root is firm and whose branches are high in the sky, yielding constant fruit by its Lord's leave – Allah makes such comparison for people so that they may reflect – but an evil word is like a rotten tree, uprooted from the surface of the earth, with no power to endure” (14:24-26). What is more rotten than a word that calls for destruction, demolition, charging of infidelity, explosion, killing, and corruption?

Our Master the Messenger of Allah ﷺ says: “Surely, a man may utter a word that pleases Allah not paying attention to it, and Allah lifts him up many ranks for it. And a man may utter a word that incurs Allah's wrath, and he would be flung to a distant place in Hill-fire for it”⁽¹⁾, in another narration: “A man would say a word seeing no harm in it, and it would flung him in Hill-Fire seventy years”⁽²⁾.

(1) - Narrated by Ibn Majah in «Kitabud-Diyat.

(2) - Narrated by At-Tirmidhi in «Kitabuz-Zuhd.



The attempts of those groups to deceive their victims and delude them that - by attacking the state and its institutions by words or by acts – they are enjoining good, forbidding evil, and striving for reformation, are far from true; these attempts are nothing but a blatant fallacy. The supporters of those groups who are always seen on T.V. and other media are exactly like those groups in sinning and errancy; they are striving day and night through their fabricated lies which they broadcast to the people to demolish the state by the hands of its citizens. They do that by loading the citizens through concentrating and augmenting the negative aspects, as well as minimizing the positive aspects, despising them, spreading lies and rumors, practicing moral killing through defaming the figures of the state, distorting the meaning of their words, relating lies to them, and diminishing their achievements, in order that people distrust and contempt them. They always reduce the value of big projects to diffuse despair and carelessness among the people and push



them to rebellion and disobedience. They have never considered reviving the role of individuals' responsibilities and duties towards their society, nor stressed the necessity of being compatible with state's institutions for developing the country, nor worked on directing their energy to reviving the loyalty, love, and caring for their country. Some owners of private channels tend to allow certain people to appear on their screens, knowing the attitudes and thought of those people who only tend to lessen the power of the state, but they present them as men of letters, thinkers, scholars, or saviors.

Allah's saying: **﴿When you welcomed it up with your tongues, and uttered with your mouths that whereof you had no knowledge, you counted it a trifle. In the sight of Allah it is very great﴾** (24:15), applies to all what they say to instigate people to destroy and demolish.

Through their suspicious media campaigns, these groups aim to split the society into two fac-



tions; a criminal killer faction that strives to track the security policemen for weakening them, and opening the door to the enemies to interfere in the state's affairs, and to pursue the genuine scholars so that they may not reveal the fallacies of these groups. The other faction should remain weak, scrawny, humiliated, and powerless, for the sake of exhausting the ruling system, toppling it, and instating whoever they think will be their tool for achieving their goals and plans. So, whoever helps those groups and likes to see obscenity widespread among the Muslim nation should wait for Allah's torment in this life and in the Hereafter.

We all must fight rumors by checking and verification. Allah Almighty says: **﴿Believers, if a troublemaker brings you news, check it first, lest you should wrong others unwittingly, and later regret what you have done﴾** (49:6). He promised those who work on spreading chaos in the society: **﴿A painful torment waits in this world and**



the next for those who like indecency to spread among the believers: Allah knows and you do not know” (24:19), and forbade us follow a passing word without verifying or checking it, as He said: ﴿When you heard the lie, why did you not say ‘We should not repeat this - Allah forbid! – It is a monstrous slander?’” (24:16). Likewise, our Prophet ﷺ said: “ It is enough a lie for a person to say all that he hears.”⁽¹⁾

(1) - Narrated by Muslim in the introduction of his Sahih.



The Sixteenth Treatise

Answering the fallacy: Their appeal to external powers and international organizations for assistance against their country

To answer this fallacy we say:

These groups are like those who built a mosque in an attempt to inflict harm, and spread disbelief and disunity among the believers. Allah has mentioned this incident in the Qur'an saying: **﴿Then, there are those who built a mosque - in an attempt to cause harm, disbelief, and disunity among the believers – as an outpost for those who fought Allah and His Messenger before: they swear 'Our intention was nothing but good' but Allah bears witness that they are liars. (Prophet) never pray in that mosque, you**



should rather pray in a mosque, founded from the first day on consciousness of Allah. In this mosque there are men who desire to grow in purity: Allah loves those who seek to purify themselves” (9:107-1-08).

Imam ibn Katheer said: The reason of sending down these verses is: Before the Prophet ﷺ came to Madinah, there was a man from Al-Khazraj called ‘Abu-’Amir Ar-Rahib’, he was highly respected by his people. When the Prophet ﷺ came to Madinah, and the Muslims gathered around him and gained power, and won victory on the Day of Badr, he proclaimed his enmity to the Muslims, and resorted to the infidels of Makkah to instigate them to fight the Muslims, so, they gathered the Arab tribes who agreed with them, and came in the year of ‘Uhud’, and won victory over the Muslims. On that day, he dug some trenches between the rows of the Muslims, and the Prophet ﷺ fell in one of them and was injured in his face and head. He took the lead in the dual, and tried to



convince his people to join him against the Muslims, when they became aware of his real intentions, they insulted and rebuked him. Before he fled to Makkah, the Prophet ﷺ called him to embrace Islam and recited the Qur'an to him, but he refused, so, the Prophet ﷺ invoked Allah against him, and he was taken by this invocation. So, when he saw the Prophet's affairs are prevailing, he went to Hercules, the Roman king, and sought his help against the Prophet ﷺ. The king promised him, gave him hope of victory, and gave him a place to stay in. The man wrote to the hypocrites and suspicious people of his tribe promising them that he would come with a big army to fight Muhammad ﷺ and his followers and defeat them. He asked them to prepare a stronghold for him and the troops that would accompany him, so, they started building a mosque next to Qibaa' mosque, and finished building it before the Prophet ﷺ sets out to Tabuk. They came to the Prophet ﷺ and asked him to pray in it, in order that they may claim the Prophet ﷺ approval of



it. They claimed that they built it for the weak and the sick people who couldn't go to far mosques in the rainy nights. Allah protected Prophet Muhammad ﷺ from doing that, and inspired him to say to them: "we are setting out for a journey, when we come back, Allah willing, we will come to you and pray with you in it". On his way back from Tabuk to Madinah, Gabriel came down to him and told him the story of the mosque, and what those people intended to do, so, he sent someone to demolish the mosque before he reached Madinah. Allah Almighty depicts this scene in the Qur'an by saying: **﴿Then, there are those who built a mosque - in an attempt to cause harm, disbelief, and disunity among the believers – as an outpost for those who fought Allah and His Messenger before: they swear 'Our intention was nothing but good' but Allah bears witness that they are liars. (Prophet) never pray in that mosque, you should rather pray in a mosque founded from the first day on consciousness of Allah. In this mosque, there are men who de-**



sire to grow in purity: Allah loves those who seek to purify themselves. Which is better, the person who founds his building on consciousness of Allah and desires for His good pleasure, or the person who founds his building on the brink of crumbling precipice that will tumble down in the Fire of Hell, taking him with it? Allah does not guide the evildoers: the building they have founded will always be a source of doubt within their hearts, until their hearts are cut to pieces. Allah is all knowing and wise” (9:107-110).

This story serves as a good answer to those groups who call on the people who live outside the country to move with all that they have, and do all that they can to bring down the state, or seek help from some external powers and international organizations against their country and fellowmen. This is exactly what the above-mentioned hypocrite did with the aim of erasing the Muslim state and occupying their lands. The



least we can say about those groups is that they are traitorous and betrayers of their religion and country; this , for them, is a matter of a habit, as we know that no religion, honorable patriotism, nor upright morals would admit what they do. They were brought up to hate their country, and to believe that means justify the ends. This fallacy emanates from their disbelief in country or nation, therefore, we have to stress the legitimacy of the national state in the next treatise.



The Seventeenth Treatise

Casting doubt on the legitimacy of the national state⁽¹⁾

Radical groups always work on casting doubt on the legitimacy of the national state, and deriding its associations and national loyalty.

To answer those groups we assert that the legitimacy of the national state is indisputable, as it's indispensable in our contemporary world. The scholars asserted that defending the country is a religious and legal requirement in the first place, because religion has to have a hosting country to protect it, otherwise, they would not have held that in case the enemies have stormed a Muslim country, every single person in that country, be

(1)- This treatise has been written by Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mukhtar Jum'a, minister of endowments.



it male or female, young or old, strong or weak, armed or unarmed, becomes obliged to defend the country, even if they all perished in this defensive war. Instead, the inhabitants would have been allowed to leave the country to save their lives and religion if defending the country had not been one of the most important purposes of Shari'a,.

The concept of 'national state' means: to respect the citizenship contract between the individual and the state, full commitment to providing equal duties and rights for all members of the state without any sort of discrimination on the basis of religion, color, race, blood, or language. But those renegade groups do not believe in country nor in national state, maybe because their ideological loyalty is over than any other loyalty, that is, their organizational space is more spacious than national state's space.

Those groups try to market themselves as the religion-protectors, and that they try to enact Al-



lah's rulings and Shari'a, but we wonder: what is the relationship between what they do of killing, explosion, destruction, blood shedding, enslaving women, theft, and terrorizing innocent people on the one hand, and Allah's rulings and Shari'a on the other?

Certainly, what those groups do is blatant crimes against Islam. Islam has never been defamed throughout history by the Tatters in the past or ISIS, Qaidah, Nusrah, Buku-Haram, and their associates in present times as it was defamed by the insane behavior of those criminals.

We can confidently stress some points; the most important of which are:

First: Islam has not laid down a specific inevitable system for ruling, but laid down general principles, bases, and criteria for ruling, so, whenever and wherever they materialize, the ruling is considered sound and acknowledged by Islam. The prime of them are justice, equity, and bring-



ing about the people's interest; no matter whatever name has been given to that sort of ruling.

Second: Allah's Shari'a and genuine Islam exist wherever the people's interest exists. To the contrary, wherever destruction, demolition, and ruin exist, devil's work and misled groups exist.

Third: Working on strengthening the national state is a religious and national prerequisite. Whoever works on weakening the structure of the state, causes it to lag behind, destroys its infrastructure, or terrorizes the innocent people, is a criminal in the eyes of his religion and nation.

Fourth: We are in dire need for minute critical rereading of our intellectual heritage, that distinguishes the permanent from the changeable, and the individual judgments exerted by scholars that suited their time and environment and that which suite our time and environment. This must be done by specialized accurate scholars for the sake of resolving contemporary problems; espe-



cially, those relating to the rulings of citizenship, as well as inculcating the notion of mutual human living in the souls of the citizens with the aim of making clear that the security and safety of the state and people is an inseparable wholesome, and is not liable to become divided or separated into classes. Imam ibn Hazm (may Allah's mercy shower him) said that if a group of non-Muslims were living with us, and became a target for other groups, it becomes incumbent on us to go out to protect them by our weapons and die for that. Then, how come that we may violate their blood, wealth, or honor?



The Eighteenth Treatise

The scholars' blood is lawful, and their image must be denigrated in their societies and in the eyes of those who follow them worldwide

To answer this fallacy, we say:

Among the signs that exhibit the errancy of those groups is that they strive to gain any advantage against the scholars , especially scholars of Shari'a, because they are the ones who represent a dire threat to them; they demolish all the fallacies they inculcate into the souls of the people, wherein they propagate misinterpreted Shari'a texts, and quote evidence from earlier scholars in a distorted manner. So, any scholar who seeks to uncover the fallacies of these groups, they chase him; if they couldn't kill him, they turn to propa-



gating false stories and lies about him to distort his image. For this cause, they use modern technology to hack their private information and distort them in order that people may keep away from them. They claim that they are the true scholars, and call on the people to desert the real specialist scholars and listen only to them and take their Fatwas as the impeccable religious opinion. For this purpose, they stress the principle of 'blind obedience', so, if a member of the group thought of discussing his group leader he is considered as an apostate that must be punished or repent. So, those who seek peace of mind never try to express themselves or discuss their seniors, and take their words for granted. Many of them might like to discuss you in the Qur'anic or Prophetic texts, but never do that with their seniors.

However, we stress that the sanctity of scholars' blood and keeping them intact stems from the magnificence of their role in society, as they are considered as a guard of the religion and coun-



try; they enlighten the laymen and provide them with sound religious knowledge about Shari'a rulings and the means of applying them. They try to save the people from those radical groups and their pervert thoughts that call for charging people with infidelity, destruction, explosion, and spreading misconceptions. The scholars are the defenders of the stable percepts of the nation and of its pillars, i.e., the Ever-Glorious Qur'an and the authentic Sunnah. It is not fitting for a pious sincere scholar to attribute to Shari'a what does not belong to it, and this is a distinct feature that distinguishes genuine scholars from pervert ones.

It gets clearer when we read the Prophet's saying: "Whoever takes a road for seeking knowledge, Allah will pave for him a road to the Paradise; the angels put down their wings in satisfaction with the knowledge seeker, all those in earth, Heavens, and seas invoke Allah to forgive the scholars. The merit of the scholar over the



worshipper is like the merit of the full moon over all other stars. Scholars are the inheritors of the prophets, and the prophets have not left a Dinar nor Dirham (i.e., money), but they left knowledge, whoever takes it, takes a treasure”⁽¹⁾.

Scholars who inherited prophets’ knowledge, regardless of their religions or legislations, would only direct people and guide them to Allah’s commandments of doing good and beneficence, and forbid them to commit evil deeds or corruption.

The Prophet ﷺ urged us to respect, honor, and be polite with the scholars, as he said: “Whoever does not respect our elderlies, show mercy to our youngsters, nor value our scholars, does not belong to my nation.”⁽²⁾, and said in Abu-Huraira’s narration: “Show humbleness to your educators”⁽³⁾, yet, the Prophet ﷺ has elevated the

(1) - Narrated by Abu-Dawud, and At-Timidhiy.

(2) - Musnad Imam Ahmad, 37/416.

(3) - Narrated by At-Tabarani in *Al-Mu-jam Al-Awsat*, 6/200.



rank of the scholars so high that he made them the inheritors of the prophets, and the holders of the banner after them, as he said: The merit of the scholar over the worshipper is like the merit of the full moon over all other stars. Scholars are the inheritors of the Prophets, and the Prophets have not left a Dinar nor Dirham (i.e., money), but they left knowledge, whoever takes it, takes a treasure”⁽¹⁾, and there are many other Hadiths on this topic.

But those who call people to disseminate infidelity, explosion, suicide-bombing, and destroying populous areas, are only spreading destruction and corruption in the earth, even if they have some knowledge, because his knowledge didn't lead him to piety nor revering Allah, to the contrary, they used their knowledge in unlawful matters, and follow their desires to gain the worldly pleasures; Allah Almighty says: ﴿(Prophet). Tell them the story of the man to whom We gave

(1) Narrated by Abu-Dawud.



Our messages: he sloughed them off, so, Satan took him as his follower and he went astray –if it had been Our will, we could have used these signs to raise him high, but instead he clung to the earth and followed his own desires” (7: 175-176).

Allah Almighty cautions us from abandoning his obedience, or turning our backs and block our ears to the truth, as others do, so, He says: **﴿Believers, obey Allah and His Messenger: do not turn away when you are listening to him. Do not be like those who say ‘We heard’, though in fact they were not listening. The worst creatures in Allah’s sight are those who are (willfully) deaf and dumb, who do not reason. If Allah had known there was any good in them, He would have made them hear, but even if He had, they would still have turned away and taken no notice” (8:20-23).**

Depicting the scholars in a dreadful image by those misled and misleading groups, has a bad



effect on the image of Islam itself; knowledge has an appreciated impact on human beings, in all fields and worldwide. People often do not like to belong to a religion wherein scholars are not revered or highly respected, accordingly, spoiling the image of the scholars aims only to distorting the image of religion in the eyes of laymen to turn them away from it. Once the people turn away from the sincere scholars, they only find those fake scholars who mislead them to catastrophe.

Our Prophet ﷺ cautioned us from following those fake scholars as he said: “Allah does not take away the knowledge by taking it away from ((the hearts of) the people, but takes it away by the death of the scholars, till when none of them remains, people will take as their leaders ignorant persons who when consulted will give their verdict without knowledge . So, they will go astray and will lead the people astray”⁽¹⁾.

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabul-Ilam».



In the next treatise, we will differentiate between the free scholars and the ideology-tied scholar.



The Nineteenth Treatise

Working on convincing the scholars and intellects of their ideologies⁽¹⁾

Radical groups are always working on convincing the scholars, students, young people, and intellectuals of their ideology. To answer them and give an idea about the danger of this process we assert that: we certainly live in a highly interwoven and complicated world to the point that it became so difficult to distinguish between things, except for those whom Allah has granted knowledge, sagacity, prudence, and sincerity.

Certainly, the free scholar who is bound to nothing but his religion, consciousness and patriotism is the best model for whom we search;

(1)- This treatise has been written by Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mukhtar Jum'a, minister of endowments.



it is the scholar who serves his religion, state, and issues with no complications. On the other hand, the scholar who is ideology-oriented, molded, or directed to serve a special group, cannot be but a slave of that group, who replaces his religion with a tiny worldly thing.

Most scholars who devoted themselves for serving the interests of some groups or their ideologies, and blindly followed them, have lost their credibility, neutrality, themselves, and maybe their religion altogether.

Any scholars or intellect whose religion or consciousness can be bought is a traitorous to his religion and country. Additionally, the state should embrace its scholars, caution them of the challenges they face, and the challenges that they may not realize, in order that they may be aware of the unseen challenges of the current situation, and adjust their Fatwas according to the needs of society in a moderate way.



We certainly are sure, from thirty five years of experience in the field of calling to Allah, that the scholar, preacher, or imam who is not ideologically-oriented, i.e., who does not follow a certain group or organization, can readily return to the truth and compromise with you, is ready to listen to the other opinion, and to refrain from arguing but in the best manner, does not call to Allah but with wisdom and good teaching, and whenever he becomes sure of the truth he sticks to, thanking that who guided him back to it in a lenient manner.

But, if he was intimately attached to a group or organization, you may find him incapable of engaging in a meaningful dialogue, or unwilling but to engage in a barren argument in his own way that may only lead to the end he wants, moreover, he may force you to indiscreetly accept his ideas, even if they contradicted all the basics of reasoning and logic.

If the preference to these groups represents a dire threat to the national texture and to other as-



pects of life, it's more dangerous and more catastrophic when it relates to religion, thought, education, and entity. Therefore, I will keep asserting on depriving anyone who belongs to these radical groups from reaching the positions of making decisions, be it religious, intellectual, cultural, or educational. They should be kept away from being able to mold the minds, especially the minds of young people.



The Twentieth Treatise

The necessity of protecting the society against radicalism and terrorism⁽¹⁾

No doubt that the misled radical groups have tried to hijack the religious discourse and use it ideologically to attain their goals and the goals of those who finance them for the sake of bringing down the regional states and dividing them. Anyone hears that a religion or a group makes lawful to itself to slaughter the people, put them on blaze, and torture them, would reject that religion and that group together with the fabrications and lies they attribute to Allah, His messengers, and all the books He revealed. As to the state, these renegade groups do not believe in homeland nor a national state; they were made to demolish the

(1)- This treatise has been written by Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mukhtar Jum'a, minister of endowments.



homeland. It is not far from our minds the words that reveal the reality of the terrorist group called 'Muslim Brotherhood' on the tongue of its ex-leader Muhammad Mahdy 'Akif about Egypt and other countries; they only see them as a handful of dust. Land in their views is not worth of anything, whereas Islam made it incumbent to defend it with whatever we have of money or souls.

The question is: Which do we need more; to decompose the radical thought or the radical groups? The unanimous answer is that we need to decompose both of them, but decomposing the thought comes first. If you decompose a terrorist or radical group, more vicious groups may crop up, but when we succeed in decomposing the radical thought, and exposing its perversion, falsehood, corruption, and fallacies, we would uproot the whole problem.

For attaining this goal, we have to uncover and expose those radical groups, and to explain how traitorous to their religion and nation they are,



and to make very clear the testimonies of those who could flee the hell of those terrorist astray groups, and to show the falsehood they promise the young people which has no connection with the reality. Whoever joins them, ends in exploding himself, and if he only thought of fleeing them, they may slaughter, burn, or torture him to death.

Their fallacies that make lawful people's blood, money, and honor, and charge people with infidelity must be refuted. They propagate the fallacy of charging people with infidelity to justify for themselves killing them and taking their women as captives; a matter of which Allah has cautioned us as He said: **﴿So, you who believe, be careful when you go to fight in Allah's way, and do not say to someone who offers you a greeting of peace, 'You are not a believer' out of desire for the chance of this life – Allah Has plenty of gains for you. You yourself were in the same position (once), but Allah was gra-**



cious to you, so, be careful: Allah is fully aware of what you do” (4:94). We assure that charging someone with infidelity can only be proved by a judicial final decree due to the serious consequences that derive from such charge. Likewise, their fake call to jihad, despite the fact that what they do is mere assault and aggression which has no connection to Jihad at all.

Hence, we should explain that Jihad in the cause of Allah is much wider than fighting; there is Jihad of the self by committing it to obedience and good manners such as truthfulness, honesty, fulfilling one’s promise, and forbidding it from sinning.

On the other hand, Jihad in the sense of fighting was only allowed to defend the homeland; it’s not up to a group of people, party, or tribe to declare war, but it’s only up to the ruler according to the stipulations of the Constitution in each country which defines the conditions of declaring war or peace. The Constitution may give this right to



the president of the state, its security council, or the president after parliamentary approval. What we stress here is that it's not up to the individuals or groups, otherwise, it would be chaos and ignorance. The poet says:

The people cannot do, if they live in chaos
without a leader

The leaders cannot do, if the ignorant people
prevailed

We really are in terrible need for enlightened thought, sound understanding of the religion, correcting the wrong conceptions, restoring the religious discourse from those who tried to hijack it, and depriving the radicals from practicing the call to Allah and issuing Fatwas. Until we confront the ignorance with knowledge, the dark with light, the wrong with the right, destruction with construction, we should work on establishing the national loyalty and co-living on pure humane bases, and strive for the safety and security of all



human kind. We should realize that we are in one ship, any flaw in the ship may expose all of us to death. Our Prophet ﷺ says: “The example of the one who abides by Allah’s orders in comparison to those who violates them is like the examples of those persons who drew lots for their seats in a boat. Some of them got seats in the upper part, and the others in the lower. When the latter needed water, they had to go up to bring water (and that troubled the others), so, they said: ‘Let’s make a hole in our share of the ship (and get water), and save those who are above us from troubling them. So, if the people in the upper part left the others do what they have suggested, all the people on the boat would be destroyed, but if they prevented them, both parties would besafe.’”(1)

So, we all, each of us in his domain and field, must work on protecting our society and our youngsters against that terrorist thought, and

(1) - Narrated by Al-Bukhari in «Kitabush-Sharikah».



strive to bar the terrorist elements from the administrative, leading, or decision-making barracks of the state, especially, the religious, cultural, and educational institutions, whose mission is to build the minds of young people, in order that we may eradicate and dry up the sources of this thought and uproot it **﴿That is not difficult for Allah﴾** (35:17)



The Twenty First Treatise

How would you protect your children from terrorism?⁽¹⁾

This question certainly can be understood in two ways: One: How would you protect your children from the harm of terrorism? Second: How would you protect your children from becoming terrorists?

The two questions are closely related in terms of logic, that is, one of them is wider than the other. The first is wider or more comprehensive in the sense that it includes the subject and object together, i.e., the terrorist and the victim, whereas the other includes the subject only, i.e., the terrorist, regardless of the fact that terrorism

(1)- This treatise has been written by Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mukhtar Jum'a, minister of endowments.



is disastrous to both the subject and object, but it is more vicious on the object part.

In fact, the threat of the subject on himself, his community, country, and nation is more than destructive.

It's easy to answer the first question, however, it requires solidarity, cooperation, and coordination in combating terrorists and terrorism in a decisive open way, without hesitation, or calculations other than observing the interests of religion and state; such combat must be comprehensive on intellectual, cultural, academic, educational, family and security levels, as well as cutting off all the roads that lead to terrorism, such as fanaticism, radicalism, and overstepping the bounds of religion.

To answer the second question of protecting your children and family from becoming terrorists, you should monitor the behavior of whom you care for according to the following chart:



To investigate the status of his colleagues, friends, followers, those who come to visit him, whom he visits; if he shows inclination to any political, Islamic group, inclination to perversion or criminal acts, if you find him inclined to secret meetings, or his behavior became ambiguous, you have to closely follow him to know the reality of his affairs, to save him from that storming threat in due time.

In case you found him having abnormally lot of money, or a change in the manner of his expenditure, you have to find out the source of this money.

If your son started unexpectedly to stay out of home, especially if spends nights out, or goes out in unanticipated times, you have to know where and with whom he spends that time, and what he does when he is away in such suspicious times.

If you noticed sudden and unexpected change in his behavior, negatively or positively, you must find out the reason of this change.



If you noticed that he started lying, you must realize that he has been infected by those groups who believe that lying is lawful and that ends justify the means.

You must get closer to your children, discuss with them all their affairs, provided that you lead a quiet meaningful discussion with them in order that you may find out what they think about, and give them the full chance to express themselves freely, without putting any restraints on them, and treat them as friends in order that you may get all that which you want to know, out of loving them, for the sake of their safety, and for fulfilling your duty towards them.

It's imperative on you to explain to them the reality of those terrorist groups and organizations which do not believe in homeland nor in the national state, and that they only serve the interests of the enemies of religion and state; they are agents for those who finance them, our enemies use them to weaken our nation, disunite it, and



defame the civilized, pure, and tolerant face of our religion.

I have repeatedly mentioned that the terrorist group of ‘Muslim Brotherhood’ is the God-father of all other terrorist groups and organizations, and their principal financier. Most of the terrorist groups are either its offspring, or linked to it in a way or another; a matter that is assured by many reports, articles, and international newspapers.

What we should stress here is that these groups took lying and tricking as a profession, and made the blood and money lawful, they twist the texts, and distort the meanings of the word. They approach you in a very lenient way, and do all the tricks that make you get deceived in them, they give you poison coated with the sweetest words ﴿**They are the enemy, beware of them**” (63:4). Allah has referred to them in His saying: ﴿**There is (a kind of) man whose views on the life of this world may please you, he even calls on Allah to witness what is in his heart, yet he**



is the bitterest of opponents. When he leaves, he sets out to spread corruption in the land, destroying crops and livestock – Allah does not like corruption” (2:204-205).

There is another thing; we must be aware of the map of terrorism, its environments, causes, and the means of dealing with it. What we are sure of is that some environments are invaded by terrorism more than others, and some groups, organizations, associations may be more fertile for producing terrorism than others.



Contents

Introduction	5
The First Treatise	9
Answering the fallacy: The concept of Jihad is restricted to fighting alone	
The Second Treatise	17
Refuting the Fallacy of describing cur- rent societies as Jahiliyyah	
The Third Treatise	23
Refuting the fallacy: Sins turn a Muslim infidel	
The Fourth Treatise	31
Refuting the fallacy: Describing the rulers as disbelievers, and (calling for) revolting against them	



The fifth Treatise	43
The Wrong understanding of Governorship	
The Sixth treatise	49
Refuting the fallacy: Inevitability of imposing Jizyah on non-Muslims	
The Seventh Treatise	53
Refuting the fallacy: Violating the sanctity of blood	
The Eighth Treatise	61
Refuting the fallacy: Destroying the vehicles and equipments of the army and police is lawful	
The Ninth Treatise	67
Answering the fallacy: Encouraging their elements to carry weapons and terrify the peaceful	



The Tenth Treatise	71
Answering the fallacy: Using chaos and peaceful demonstrations as a cover for destroying the country, as well as attacking private and public properties	
The Eleventh Treatise	79
Answering the fallacy: The call to cut off roads and create traffic congestion	
The Twelfth Treatise	83
Answering the fallacy: Calling people to hunger-strike aiming to spread chaos and crumbling the country	
The Thirteenth Treatise	87
Answering the fallacy: The call to levying Zakat (alms) to support their criminal acts which they falsely call: Jihad	
The Fourteenth Treatise	91
Answering the fallacy: Calling the people to 'Civil Disobedience' with the aim of overthrowing the state	



The Fifteenth Treatise	99
Answering the fallacy: Using social media and media for destabilizing security and defaming the image and leaders of the state	
The Sixteenth Treatise	105
Answering the fallacy: Their appeal to external powers and international organizations for assistance against their country	
The Seventeenth Treatise	111
Casting doubt on the legitimacy of the national state	
The Eighteenth Treatise	117
The scholars' blood is lawful, and their image must be denigrated in their societies and in the eyes of those who follow them worldwide	



The Nineteenth Treatise	125
Working on convincing the scholars and intellects of their ideologies	
The Twentieth Treatise	129
The necessity of protecting the society against radicalism and terrorism	
The Twenty First Treatise	137
How would you protect your children from terrorism?1	



Egyptian General Book Authority



Supervisor of Cultural Projects

Marwan Hamad

Follow-up

Firyal Fuad

cover design

Mohammed Baghdadi

Artistic production

Mervat Anter Elnahass

رقم الإيداع بدار الكتب / ٢٠٢١ /
ISBN

