

Shaykh 'Alee Ibn Yahyaa al-Hadaadee

Extremism in Takfeer



© Copyright **SalafiManhaj** 2011

URL: **www.SalafiManhaj.com**

E-mail: admin@salafimanhaj.com

Important Note:

The following document is an on-line book publishing of www.SalafiManhaj.com. This book was formatted and designed specifically for being placed on the Web and for its easy and convenient distribution. At the time of this e-book publishing, we are not aware of any other book similar to it, in terms of its translation from its original Arabic source. Since this book was prepared for free on-line distribution we grant permission for it to be printed, disbursed, photocopied, reproduced and/or distributed by electronic means for the purpose of spreading its content and not for the purpose of gaining a profit, unless a specific request is sent to the publishers and permission is granted.

SALAFIMANHAJ.COM
EEMAAN AND KUFR SERIES:
VOL. 5

الغلو في التكفير

EXTREMISM IN TAKFEER IS BEING IN THE UNITED NATIONS KUFR? (AND OTHER RELATED ISSUES)¹

By Shaykh 'Ali Ibn Yahyā al-Hadādī

*With additional points of benefit from
Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis*

Translated by 'AbdulHaq ibn Kofi ibn Kwesi al-Ashanti

¹ From Shaykh 'Ali al-Hadādī, *al-Ghulū wa Madhāhirahu fī Hayāt il-Mu'āsirah* [Extremism: Its Manifestations in Contemporary Life]. Cairo: Dār ul-Manhāj, 1426 AH/2005 CE, pp. 42-55. The book also has introductions from Shaykh Wasiullāh bin Muhammad 'Abbās and Shaykh Ahmad bin Yahyā an-Najmī.

CONTENTS

- 3 Takfeer on Account of Doing that which is Permissible
- 14 Takfeer Based on Something Possibly Being Kufr, When it is Actually Disobedience
- 15 Takfeer on Account of what Could Possibly be Kufr, Disobedience or Permissible
- 18 General Takfeer – Absolute Takfeer Due to Ruling by other than what Allāh has Revealed
- 21 Translator’s Appendix: Points of Benefit from Shaykh ‘Abdul’Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis on the United Nation

TAKFEER ON ACCOUNT OF DOING THAT WHICH IS PERMISSIBLE

From its aspects is: what is manifested by some organisations which have attracted many of the Muslim youth during this era to make *takfeer* of every Muslim country which is part of the *United Nations (UN)*.² At times they make the cause of *takfeer* to be allegiance to the *kuffār*

² **Translator's Note:** So for example, *Hizb ut-Tahreer* regurgitate that being a part of the UN is *kufir*. In an article by Naveed Butt (the 'official spokesman for HT in Pakistan) dated August 4 2006 CE he states:

“The extraordinary gathering of traitors on the 3rd of August in Kuala Lumpur has brought nothing but a new evil, a new mischief and a new surrender. This gathering marked yet another despicable proof of the treachery of the Muslim rulers. Instead of announcing that they would send armies to protect the Muslims of Lebanon, these imperialist agents, called for the strengthening of the *Taghoot* (kufr entity), the UN...”

The *juhāl* of the so-called website '*Islamic Thinkers Society*' (!?) in their simplistic article '*The Apostasy of the Rulers*' state:

“All the rulers are agreeing to sit with all the kuffar and Mushrikeen from all over the world in the U.N. this is KUFRAKBAR and makes them Kafir.”

So they have hereby issued a *fatwa* even though the so-called '*Islamic Thinkers Society*' of *takfeerees* are not those who are those fit to made such serious rulings in the *deen* based upon their own desires and therefore it is more beneficial for the likes of them to keep their mouths shut and learn the basics of the *deen*. Indeed, within their '*Press Release to the Media*' the speaker cannot even recite *Khutbah ul-Hājah* correctly and at one point even states that “we fight against Allāh”!! (refer to the link below, the speaker says this exactly eighteen minutes into the talk!) Not to mention the lack of referring to what Allāh says and what the Prophet (*sallāluhu alayhi wassallam*) says and a whole array of other errors and *jahl* within their so-called '*press release to the media*.' See: <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=-3982856370526939649&q=ITS+Press+Release+to+the+Media>

These are the so-called '*Islamic Thinkers Society*', they should seriously *think* about learning Arabic first and then *think* about how to read *Khutbah ul-Hājah* correctly before even *thinking* that they can pass judgments of *takfeer* upon the Muslim rulers without '*ilm* or precedence from the scholars! Similarly, in their '*Press Release to the Muslim Communities of North American*' after nearly forty minutes of personal gripes and making *takfeer* of the Muslim rulers (thus

and we shall discuss this in the section related to allegiance and enmity and at other times they make the cause of their *takfeer* to be ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed, and this will also be clarified when he come to discuss the issue of ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed. Most of the time, they do not apply *takfeer* based on these affiliations merely due to the causes and we will also discuss this later in this field of research.

I say: This *takfeer* is invalid and extreme because it is *takfeer* on account of doing something which is permissible. It is decisively known that the Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) made treaties with the *mushrikeen*, *yahood* and their allies, which indicates that it is permissible as long as it does not agree on doing things which are evil. Member states have freedom to

making their blood, property, honour and wealth *halāl*) they only mention one *hadeeth* from the Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*)! And these are the people who claim they want to return to the rule of the Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*)?!

On the website '*Islamic Awakening*' they have an '*FAQ on the Taliban*' (!?) wherein under point 11 they make the error of thinking that being a part of the UN necessitates some sort of 'assistance' from them, which is not even what the UN is mainly set up for in the first place! As we shall see within this treatise *inshā'Allāh*. They thus condemn being part of the UN based upon their own reasoning with no reference to the scholars and no detailed analysis. A similar pattern is given by 'Abu Dujanah' (*majhūl*) in an article entitled '*Why Have the Governments Disbelieved?*' Wherein another simplistic assessment is put forth as if the unknown 'Abu Dujānah' is qualified to now write on such serious matters and deliver judgements of *takfeer*! In a lecture entitled '*Let the Scholars Beware!*' Abdullāh Faisal al-Jamaykī al-Khārijī stated:

“Even if they implemented the Sharee’ah still they’d be kāfirs because they give their allegiance, their bay’ah, their oath of allegiance, to the UN...”

In a vile lecture entitled '*The Devil's Deception of the 21st Century House Niggers*' Faysal states:

“So these tyrannical leaders which we have in our midst today who have given their allegiance to the UN or the USA or the UK or all the other Dajjāl forces on the face of the earth they are kāfirs and I will explain it later why they are kāfirs. So the soldiers of these leaders are also kāfirs...”

In the same lecture Faysal states:

“Now which ayah in the Qur’ān tells you that the moment you give your bay’ah to NATO or the UN you’re a kāfir?”

A concise refutation of the statements of Faysal will follow soon at salafimanhaj.com *inshā'Allāh*! Usāmah Bin Lādin, in his ignorance, also made *takfeer* of Saudi Arabia due to it being a member of the UN.

reject (any view, idea, resolution or article) which they do not see fit, not to mention that (view, idea or article) which is *kufr* which expels one from Islām.

From that which indicates its permissibility is the fact that its canon is mainly organisational structured around worldly benefits and not legislative, this is the case with the regulations organised around affairs of travel, trade, administration and its like. Therefore, the main intent of this organisation (i.e. the UN) is to bring about peaceful solutions between its members and serve as an organisation which fosters peaceful relations politically, economically, culturally etc.

Based upon this, its covenants come under the affairs of social interactions and the foundation of social interactions is: permissible except for that which is mentioned in the Divine Legislation as being forbidden.³ So it is from the common practices and is not from the acts of worship and common practices, as stated by Ibn Taymiyyah:

Are what the people have become used to doing in their worldly affairs which they need. The foundation here is to avoid that which is forbidden, so it is not to be forbidden unless it is something which Allāh has forbidden.⁴

Therefore, concluding treaties within these organisations are not prohibited from this angle however what is prohibited is to agree on matters which Allāh has already forbidden, based upon the saying of the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*): *“What is the condition of men who make conditions based on conditions which are not based on the Book of Allāh? Every condition which is not based on the Book of Allāh is invalid even if there are a hundred conditions. The book of Allāh is truer and the stipulation of Allāh is firmer.”⁵*

So if an Islamic state was obligated to agree with some resolutions which opposed the Divine Legislation and was not befitting for them to agree with, then to make *takfeer* cannot be justified except with specific conditions, which will be explained later *inshā'Allāh* in the issue of ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed.

³ *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, pp.28-386.

⁴ *Ibid.* vol.29, pp.16-17.

⁵ Sunan Ibn Mājah, vol.2, pp.842-843, no.2521.

Translator's Note: There is a similar *ahadeeth* in *Saheeh Bukhārī* in the 'Chapter on the *Mukhātab – Manumission of Slaves*' and 'Conditions' related from 'Amra and the *hadeeth* of 'Urwah from Ā'ishah (*radi Allāhu 'anhā*).

What is prohibited for a Muslim: is to have allegiance to the *kuuffār*, but not interaction with them via buying, selling, leasing, peace and rectification, good neighbourliness and the likes which are mentioned in the texts as being permissible. The Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) used to interact with the *kuuffār* and conclude treaties with them regarding buying, leasing, cultivation, rectification, peace and social pacts, just as the Khaza'ah tribe allied themselves to the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) and they were still upon *shirk*⁶ at that time. He (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) also made a peace treaty with the Jews when he emigrated to Madeenah and concluded an agreement with them based upon good neighbourliness and to support them against anyone who transgressed against them, and they were still upon the *kuufr* and their *shirk*.⁷ He (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) made rectification with the Quraysh in Hdaybiyah which was a rectification which in its conditions was detrimental to the Muslims and unfair to them.⁸ Yet this was all because he (*sallallāhu 'alayhi*

⁶ See the *Sīrah of Ibn Hishām* (vol.2, p.318).

⁷ Ibid. vol.1, pp.501-504.

⁸ The *Hdaybiyah Treaty* was made between the Muslims and the polytheists of Quraysh. When the *mushrikeen* of Quraysh witnessed the determination of the Muslims to risk their lives, properties, wealth and families for their faith in order to spread it peacefully, they realised that the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) and his followers (*radi Allāhu 'anhum*) could not be bullied or frightened by mere scare tactics. Therefore, a treaty of reconciliation and peace was made between the Quraysh and the Muslims. The clauses of the treaty were:

- The Muslims would return and come back in the following year (7 AH) but they would not stay in Makkah for more than three days and without arms except those concealed.
- War activities were to be suspended for ten years, during which both sides will live in security with neither side waging war against the other.
- Whoever wishes to join Muhammad (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) was free to do so and likewise whoever wished to join the *mushrikeen* of the Quraysh was also free to do so.
- If anyone from the Quraysh joins Muhammad (*sallallāh 'alayhi wassallam*) without his parent's or guardian's permission, he should be sent back to the Quraysh, but should any of Muhammad's followers return to the Quraysh, he was not to be sent back. (Safiur-Rahman al-Mubarakpuri, *The Sealed Nectar (ar-Raheequl-Makhtum)* Darusalam, 2002, p.403)

The treaty was significant in that the Quraysh began to recognise the Muslims legitimate existence and began to deal with them on equal terms. Safiur-Rahmān al-Mubārākfūrī (al-Mubarakpuri) notes in his biography of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) pp.407-408: "The Muslims did not have in mind to seize people's property or kill them through

wassallam) hoped to prevent the evils which were greater and more severe and bring about benefits which were greater than armed *jihād* against the Quraysh at that time, this is not denied except by an ignoramus or a misguided person.

In addition to the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) concluding treaties of peace and alliance between himself and the *mushrikeen*, he (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) also instructed to fulfil pre-Islamic alliances which were founded upon justice and helping the oppressed. The order to fulfil such alliances is an evidence of the permissibility of such alliances on the condition of what has been mentioned prior. From 'Abdullāh ibn 'Amru bin al-Ās (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) that the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) said in his *khutbah*: “Fulfil the alliance (*hilf*) of the pre-Islamic period, for it does not increase it...” Meaning: Islām “...except strengthen and there is no alliance in Islām.” Related by at-Tirmidhee who said: **“it is Hasan Saheeh.”**⁹ Muslim reported in the *Saheeh* from Jubayr bin Mut'im in a *marfū'* form¹⁰: “There is no alliance in Islām yet Islām strengthens (the *hilf*) established in the pre-Islamic days (for good).”¹¹ So he forbade the alliance in Islām and instructed to fulfil the alliance of *jābiliyyah*.¹² The intent of his saying: “There is no alliance in Islām” means: the alliance which includes that which is

bloody wars, nor did they ever think of using any compulsive approaches in their efforts to propagate Islam, on the contrary their sole target was to provide an atmosphere of freedom in ideology or religion, **“Then whosoever wills, let him believe, and whosoever wills, let him disbelieve.”** {*al-Kahf* (18): 29}” The Muslims on the other hand had the opportunity to spread Islām over areas not then explored. When there was the peace agreement, war was abolished, and men met and consulted each other, none talked about Islām intelligently without entering it; within two years following the conclusion of the treaty, twice as many people entered Islām than ever before. This is supported by the fact that the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) went out to al-Hudaybiyah with only 1400 men, but when he set out to liberate Makkah, two years later, he had 10,000 men with him. [TN]

⁹ *Sunan at-Tirmidhī*, vol.3, p.241, *hadeeth* no.1585

¹⁰ A *marfū'* *hadeeth* is a *hadeeth* which has been reported by a companion and due to what is within the *hadeeth* is elevated to a saying of the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*). [TN]

¹¹ *Saheeh Muslim*, vol.4, p.1961, *hadeeth* no.2530

¹² This alliance (*Hilf ul-Fudūl*) is sometimes translated as an ‘order of chivalry’ (a rather odd translation) or as ‘a league of nobility’, ‘an alliance of excellence’, ‘an alliance of the virtuous’, ‘a committee of wisemen’, ‘an alliance for charity’, ‘a treaty for mutual assistance and goodness’, ‘a pact of the virtuous’ most of these different translations capture the essence of the *hilf ul-fudool* which was to help the poor, needy and oppressed and assure justice and human rights. [TN]

forbidden, 'Āsim al-Ahwal asked Anas bin Mālik “Has it reached you that the Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) said “*There is no alliance in Islām*?”” Anas replied: “*The Prophet (sallallāhu alayhi wassallam) made an alliance between the Quraysh and the Ansār in my house.*” Reported by al-Bukhārī.¹³ At-Tabarī said:

What Anas indicated was the verification of an alliance, which does not negate the hadeeth of Jubayr ibn Mut'im as the aforementioned fraternity was during the first hijrah and they were transmitting it and then that heritage was abrogated. Yet there remained that which the Qur'an did not invalidate such as co-operation upon truth and help and taking the oppressor by the hand¹⁴ as stated by Ibn 'Abbās¹⁵: “This alliance was formed for help, mutual advice and support and a legacy can be made for him and (the right to) inheritance was excluded.”¹⁶

This statement of Ibn 'Abbās was also reported by at-Tabarī in his *tafseer* of Allāh's statement,

﴿وَالَّذِينَ عَقَدْتَ أَيْمَانُكُمْ فَأَوْهْمَ نَصِيهِمْ﴾

“...and to those whom your oaths have bound (to you) – give them their share.”¹⁷”

{*an-Nisā* (4): 33}

He stated:

Others stated: These verses were revealed in regards to the people who make treaties by alliances, however some of them were instructed to give each other their share of support, mutual advice and the likes except for inheritance. Those who said that: Abū Kurayb narrated to us, saying: Abū Usāmah narrated to us, saying: Idrees al-Awadī narrated to us, saying: Talhah bin Musrif narrated to us, saying: from Sa'eed ibn Jubayr: from Ibn 'Abbās:

¹³ *Saheeh ul-Bukhārī*, vol.2, p.803, *hadeeth* no.2172

¹⁴ I.e. to prevent the oppressor from oppression. [TN]

¹⁵ This *hadeeth* is reported in the *Sunan Abū Dāwood (Kitāb ul-Farā'id – Shares of Inheritance)*

¹⁶ *Fath ul-Bārī*, vol.4, p.473, his saying “(the right to) inheritance is excluded” means that: inheritance is only via the three well-known means which are: marriage, lineage and allegiance only, inheritance is not obtained via religious brotherhood or fraternity.

¹⁷ By bequest, as only those relatives mentioned in verses 11 and 12 inherit fixed shares.

﴿وَالَّذِينَ عَقَدْتَ أَيْمَانُكُمْ فَأَوْهَهُمْ نَصِيهِمْ﴾

“...and to those whom your oaths have bound (to you) – give them their share.¹⁸”

{an-Nisā (4): 33}

...from help, mutual advice and support and a legacy can be made for him and inheritance is excluded.”

Then he stated:

From Mujāhid,

﴿وَالَّذِينَ عَقَدْتَ أَيْمَانُكُمْ﴾

“...and to those whom your oaths have bound (to you)...”

{an-Nisā (4): 33}

...who said: “There were alliances in jāhiliyyah and in Islām they were commanded to give them their due share of understanding, support, consultation, but not of inheritance.”¹⁹

Al-'Allāmah al-Mubārīkfūrī (al-Mubarakpuri) in his explanation of the *hadeeth*:

“Fulfil the alliance (*bilf*) of the pre-Islamic period, for it does not increase it....” Meaning: Islām “...except strengthen and there is no alliance in Islām”:

“His saying “*fulfil*...” is from fulfilling what is established in accordance with the pact “...the alliance (*bilf*) of the pre-Islamic period” meaning: the pacts which are in the alliance which do not oppose the Divine Legislation in accordance with Allāh’s saying,

﴿أَوْفُوا بِالْعُقُودِ﴾

“...fulfil all contracts (promises, covenants and oaths).”

{al-Mā'idah (5): 1}

But (such an alliance) has to be based on what Allāh said,

﴿وَتَعَاوَنُوا عَلَى الْبِرِّ وَالتَّقْوَىٰ وَلَا تَعَاوَنُوا عَلَى الْإِثْمِ وَالْعُدْوَانِ﴾

¹⁸ By bequest, as only those relatives mentioned in verses 11 and 12 inherit fixed shares.

¹⁹ *Tafseer Tabarī*, vol.8, p.278

“And co-operate in righteousness and piety, but do not cooperate in sin and transgression.”

{*al-Mā'idah* (5): 2}

“For it...” meaning: Islām, “does not increase it...” meaning: the alliance of *jābiliyyah* which does not oppose Islām “...except strengthen...” meaning: firm strengthening that necessitates you to fulfil it.”²⁰

From the extant texts regarding fulfilling the pacts and agreements of *jābiliyyah* and its covenants is: the *hadeeth* of Abū Hurayrah who said “The Messenger of Allāh said “I had not seen an alliance except for the alliance of the Quraysh from the alliance of the Muteebeen and it was more beloved to me than the red camel (i.e. precious to me).”²¹ Also there is the *hadeeth* of Talhah bin ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Awf, which is *mursal*,²² that the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) said: “I had witnessed a meeting of an alliance in the house of ‘Abdullāh bin Jud’an which was more beloved to me than the red-camel and if I had been called to join it in Islām I would join.”²³ He (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) stated on the day of Hudaybiyah before he made the peace treaty with the Quraysh: “By Allāh, the Quraysh will not ask me today for any matter in regards to ties of kinsship except that I would give them it.”²⁴ In *Sabeeh Muslim* from Hudhayfah bin al-Yamān (*radi Allāhu ‘anhu*) who stated: “The only thing that prevented me from being at Badr was that I was out with my father Husayl when the *kuffār* of the Quraysh got us and said “you want Muhammad?” we said “we do not want him, we just want to get to Madeenah.” They took from us the promise of Allāh and His covenant that we would go to Madeenah and not fight with him. The Messenger of Allāh came to us and informed us saying “Go! For you have made a promise with them and we seek Allāh’s help against them”.”²⁵ These texts are

²⁰ *Tuhfat ul-Ahwādhi*, vol.5, p.209

²¹ *Sunan ul-Bayhaqī al-Kubrā*, vol.6, p.366

²² If in the chain of a particular *hadeeth*, the link between the successor (*tabi’ī*) and the Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) is missing, the *hadeeth* is *mursal* (hurried), e.g. when a *tabi’ī* says “The Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) said...” A *mursal hadeeth* is the strongest type of weak *hadeeth* and requires supporting narrations to strengthen it to the level of “*hasan due to supporting evidence*”, thereby removing doubt. [TN]

²³ *Sunan ul-Bayhaqī al-Kubrā*, vol.6, p.367

²⁴ *Musnad al-Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal*, vol.4, p.323, *hadeeth* no.1893

²⁵ *Saheeh Muslim*, vol.3, p.1414, *hadeeth* no.1787

Translator’s Note: And in another narration: “Grant them your promise to them.”

explicit regarding the obligation to fulfil alliances of *jābiliyyah* based upon justice because Islām exhorts and supports that. So what can be taken from this is the permissibility of participating in an alliance with them wherein there is a benefit for the Muslims.

The UN is an international organisation which intends, according to what is apparent from its announced articles in its charter, agreement of its members to take the oppressor by the hand, avert confrontations, spread peace throughout the world and solve disputes via peaceful means. These are principles which are totally acknowledged and supported in Islām. It is mentioned in the UN Charter, article one as follows:

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. **To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.**
2. **To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.**
3. **To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.**

In article 2 it is mentioned:

1. **All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.**
2. **All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.²⁶**

So a Muslim makes a pact with *kuuffār* based upon abandoning unwarranted enmity and upon settling disputes via peaceful means and the like (of such means) which are not forbidden let alone being *kufr* if done. It is not to be denied that there are resolutions and some articles of the UN which are included in its purposes which are not permissible within the Divine

²⁶ *Al-Qanūn ad-Dawlī*, pp.998-999

Legislation. However, we see that the Saudi state, may Allāh grant it success, which is harmed by a greater share of *takfeer*, did not fall into those resolutions and did not acknowledge them and this is a great position from the ones in charge of its affairs, we ask Allāh to increase them from His virtue, His success and His help.²⁷ This organization, with all that is within it from evil, being a part of it has led to bringing about benefits and averting harms, which is a huge thing in itself yet it is not possible to explain this fully in this abridged treatise. Therefore, with such international organizations, political, economic educational relations have been formed, besides others, and with them the lands of the Muslims have been protected from great evils.

The Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) accepted the conditions of the Quraysh in Hudaibiyah despite what was within it of unfairness and deficiency for the Muslims. However, the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) hoped to avert greater evils than those conditions and hoped for benefits which were greater than their entry into the Sacred House (i.e. Makkah) in that year and thus he (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) concluded the treaty. In relation to this *al-'Allāmah* Rasheed Ridā stated in *Tafseer ul-Manār* in discussing Allāh saying:

﴿إِلَّا أَنْ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً﴾

“...except when taking precaution against them in prudence.²⁸”

{*Āli-Imrān* (3): 28}

So if allying with them is permissible in order to avoid harm, then it is permissible wherein the benefit for the Muslims is primary. So based on this, it is permissible for the Muslim rulers to ally themselves with the non-Muslim states out of an interest to the believers by averting harm and bringing about benefit.²⁹

²⁷ See the book *Mawqif ul-Mamlakat il-'Arabiyyah as-Saudiyyah min al-Qadāyah al-Ālamiyyah fī Hay'at il-Umam al-Muhtahidah*, which mentions a load of issues which Saudiyyah rejected being signatories to, the reason of rejection being based on such issues opposing the Divine Legislation of Islām.

²⁸ When fearing harm from an enemy.

²⁹ *Tafseer al-Manār*, vol.3, p.280

During his time, Rasheed Ridā censured a people who made *takfeer* of their leader due to him meeting the British and coming to a position of mutual agreement and trust with them, he said:

Those who speak in the name of the deen without knowledge and commentate on the Qur’ān based on their desires claim that the verses of Āli-Imrān and whatever is in its meanings regarding the general and specific prohibition such as the saying of Allāh,

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا الْيَهُودَ وَالنَّصَرَىٰ أَوْلِيَاءَ﴾

“O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies.”

{*al-Mā'idab (5): 51*}

...indicates that it is not permissible for Muslims to be make pacts (or alliances) or to agree with other than them, even if the alliance was for their own benefit! (The people who hold that position) have bypassed the fact the Prophet (sallallāhu alayhi wassallam) was allied to the Khaza’ah tribe while they were still upon their shirk. Some those enthusiastic for the deen based on ignorance even claim that it is not permissible to have any interaction or association whatsoever with non-Muslims or agreements with them on any issue. It has already become known to us as we write on this matter that one of the newspapers that we saw via telegram mentioned that some fanatical Afghānees angry with their leader who interacted with the English (i.e. British) in India, came to a position of mutual agreement and trust with them and wore Western attire. The Afghānees all came to a collective agreement and ruled their leader to be a kāfir who must be removed from power. An army was sent to split up their ranks and the likes of such ignorant fanatics and enthusiasts are the worst of creation to Islām and the Muslims, rather they are the most distant from the reality of Islām than the rest of the worlds!³⁰

With this report from the Shaykh (*rahimahullāb*) it becomes apparent that the entry of a Muslim country into the UN, or any other organisation like it, is no problem due to what it is based upon in terms of major benefits, on the condition that it does not concur on that which contains disobedience to Allāh and His Messenger (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*).

Before we conclude this area of research: I bring attention to the fact that none of the Imāms of the contemporary *Salafees* have made *takfeer* of a Muslim country due to it being

³⁰ *Tafseer al-Manār*, vol.3, pp.277-278

part of these organizations according to what my research has indicated. So if it (i.e. being a member of the UN) was from the actions which necessitate *kufir* they would have made this clear without delay, even once. So their silence on the matter indicates that they do not view any harm in it and this is what is thought by them. From here it is also known that those who make *takfeer* due to this reason are from the extremists and transgressors of the era, and with Allāh is success.

TAKFEER BASED ON SOMETHING POSSIBLY BEING KUFR, WHEN IT IS ACTUALLY DISOBEDIENCE

From the manifestations of repulsive extremism is: specific *takfeer* due to something which could possibly have many aspects of interpretation: such as making *takfeer* of a Muslim whose Islām is verified with the certainty of all people and then he wears a medal at a ceremony of honour, so even though it is a medal it could possibly be seen as being a cross and it could possible be something else.³¹ So such a person should not be rashly made *takfeer* of and this condition is one of pouring scorn on the sanctity of the Muslims and having contempt of the Divine Legislation of the Lord of the worlds, as it is an issue wherein one could possibly be ignorant of the ruling of wearing a cross and could possibly be due to a lack of knowledge that the medal is a cross in origin and any one of these possibilities prevent *takfeer* being made. Why not? When it has been said that the person in question was informed about the situation and he immediately removed it and sought forgiveness from Allāh, yet still those who are crazy with *takfeer* spread that the person is a *kāfir* even up to this day, and Allāh's refuge is sought. Concluding with a point of benefit: the *Permanent Committee for Islamic Verdicts (Lajnah ad-Dā'imah)* was asked:

We differ in regards to a Muslim who wears a cross, the symbol of the Christians, some of us judge with the kufr of the individual and some of us say “We do not judge him with kufr until we debate him and make clear to him the prohibition of that as it is a

³¹ As the image of a cross is the placing of a (horizontal) line and its likes over a slightly longer (vertical) line so that the small (horizontal) line is high up about a third of the way down of the long (vertical) line from the top formed by crossing the right angles. *Fatwa Lajnah ad-Dā'imah*, vol.2, p.121.

symbol of the Christians and if he continues upon displaying it then we judge him with kufr.”

Answer:

Detailed explanation within this matter and its likes is necessary. If it is made clear to him the ruling of wearing the cross and that it is the symbol of the Christians and that wearing it indicates that one is pleased to be associated with them and pleased with what they are upon, and then continues upon that (i.e. wearing it) then he is judged with kufr based on Allāh’s saying,

﴿وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّهُمْ مِنْكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ﴾

“And whoever is an ally to them among you – then indeed, he is one of them. Indeed, Allāh does not guide the wrongdoing people.”

{*al-Mā'idah* (5): 51}

...when wrongdoing is applied here the intent is major shirk.³²

TAKFEER ON ACCOUNT OF WHAT COULD POSSIBLY BE KUFU, DISOBEDIENCE OR PERMISSIBLE

From the manifestations of this extremism is: what has occurred of *takfeer* due to what they claim is helping the *kuffār* against the Muslims in the American war against Afghanistan and al-'Irāq. It is obligatory to know that there is no doubt that assisting the *kuffār* in such instances is a despicable crime and a great evil, however *takfeer* cannot be made of a specific individual until it is explained:

So if one helps them, at the same time possessing hatred of Islām, love of *kufr* and a desire to manifest *kufr* and exalt it, then there is no doubt of the *kufr* at such a time. Yet if the one doing it (i.e. aiding the *kuffār*) does it out of a worldly concern while absolutely believing in the prohibition of his action, then such an individual is upon great danger, however he is not

³² *Fatāwā Lajnah ad-Dā'imah li'l-Iftā'*, vol.2, p.119, *fatwa* no.2245

made *takfeer* of due to his action. If his action was out of being compelled and a necessity then Allāh has said,

﴿إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ﴾

“...except one who was forced while his heart is assured with eemān.”

{*an-Nabl* (16): 106}

So if Allāh has excused the believer who expresses *kufr* while his heart is still assured with *eemān* in a state of compulsion, then what about other than that which deserves more of an excuse?

An evidence of this explanation is: the story of Hātib Ibn Abī Balta’ah (*radi Allāhu ’anhu*) from ’Ali Ibn Abī Tālib (*radi Allāhu ’anhu*) who said: “The Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*) sent myself, Zubayr and al-Miqdād ibn Aswad saying: “Proceed until you reach *Rawdatu Khākb*³³ therein you will find a woman with a letter so take the letter from her.” So we set out and our horses ran at full pace until we got to ar-Rawdah wherein we found the lady and said to her “Take out the letter.” She replied, “I have no letter with me.” We said, “Either you give us the letter or we will take your clothes off.” So she took it out of her braids and we took the letter to the messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*), and within the letter was a message from Hātib ibn Abī Balta’ah to some people from the *Mushrikeen* in Makkah informing them of some of the intentions of the Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*). The Messenger of Allāh said to Hātib “O Hātib what’s this?” Hātib replied “Do not be hasty against me. I was an ally of Quraysh, but I was not one of the important ones; those who immigrated with you have relatives there to protect their families and friends, but since I do not have such links, I wanted to do them a favor so that they would protect my family. I did not do it out of *kufr* or due to apostasy from the *deen* or out of being pleased with *kufr* after Islām.” The Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*) said “Indeed, you have spoken the truth.” ’Umar said: “O Messenger of Allāh, allow me to strike the neck (i.e. execute) this munāfiq!” The Messenger of Allāh (*sallallāhu ’alayhi wassallam*) said: “Verily he (i.e. Hātib) was at Badr and what do you know, Allāh

³³ Situated between Makkah and al-Madeenah

might have looked at them (warriors of Badr) and said (to them), “Do what you like, for I have forgiven you.” Agreed upon.³⁴

Within this *hadeeth* it is apparent that the Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam*) did not make *takfeer* of him at the first opportunity due to assisting the *kuffār* against the Muslims. This indicates that his action was not *kufr* in similar situations, rather it will be *kufr* if the motive was being pleased with *kufr*. If it could not possibly be anything except *kufr*, the Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam*) would have sought an explanation from Hātib (*radi Allāhu ‘anhu*), and Hātib responded saying that he did what he did due to a worldly interest while his heart was assured with *emān* and the Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam*) accepted Hātib’s excuse and repentance. He also informed that the people of Badr are forgiven and this is another proof that his action was a sin and not apostasy, because if it was apostasy his presence at Badr would not have been expiation for him. What also certifies this understanding is the statement of Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (*rahimahullāh*):

Love of them (i.e. the *kuffār*) due to kinship or a need can influence a man and this would be a sin which weakens his *emān* yet he is not a disbeliever due to it, just as what happened to Hātib ibn Abī Balta’ah when he wrote to the Mushrikeen informing them of some of the plans of the Prophet (*sallallāhu alayhi wassallam*), Allāh revealed about him,

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا عَدُوِّي وَعَدُوَّكُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ تُلْقُونَ إِلَيْهِمْ

بِالْمَوَدَّةِ

³⁴ *Saheeh Bukhārī*, vol.3, p.1095, *hadeeth* no. 2845 and *Saheeh Muslim*, vol.4, p.1931, *hadeeth* no. 2494. What is also unfortunate is that harmful speech has emerged regarding the rights of this companion from some who attach themselves to *da’wah* and Islamic knowledge. From them are those who say that “**Hātib fell into the greatest treachery**” and from them are those who say that he disbelieved due to his action, and all of this is major evil. The Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam*) did not refer to Hātib’s action as being “**kufr**” or “**the greatest treachery**” rather he referred to it as a sin which Allāh will expiate due to Hātib’s righteous actions such as his being present at the battle of Badr. Then the Prophet (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam*) absolved Hātib and accepted his repentance and instructed that he not be mentioned except with good, so where are the keepers of his promise (*sallallāhu ‘alayhi wassallam*).

“O you who have believed! Do not take my enemies and your enemies as protecting friends, showing affection to them...”

{*al-Mumtabinah (60): 1*}³⁵

GENERAL TAKFEER – “ABSOLUTE TAKFEER DUE TO RULING BY OTHER THAN WHAT ALLĀH HAS REVEALED”

What has become widespread today is what has come to be known as “*Tawbeed ul-Hākimiyyah*” which means according to those who adhere to it: the *kufr* of all those who do not rule by the Divine Legislation of Islām in matters of the limitations and personal affairs. They also connect to this *takfeer*, without explanation, of the countries which rule by man-made laws, some of them go to further extremes and make *takfeer* of the people of those countries due to their following the leader, to the extent that some of them say:

Humanity has apostated to the worship of slaves and to the joining of religions. Humanity has retreated from La ilaha il-Allāh and if a group of mankind are shaded from it they return to La ilaha il-Allāh without comprehending its significance and meaning and thus apostazises from it, and without rejecting the Divine Legislation of Hākimiyyah which the servants call to for themselves, which is a synonym for Ulūhiyyah, whether legislation is called to as individuals, as organisations or as a people. As individuals, like organizations and like a people, are not a deity and they do not have the rightful permission to Hākimiyyah (sovereign rulership) due to humanity having return to Jāhiliyyah (the pre-Islamic period of ignorance) and having thus apostasized from La ilaha il-Allāh yet these slaves have been given the characteristics of Uloohiyyah and they did not single out Allāh alone and make allegiance sincerely for Him. All of humanity, including those who repeat from the minarets from east to west, the words ‘La ilaha il-Allāh’...³⁶

³⁵ *Maǧmū’ al-Fatāwā*, vol.7, p.522

³⁶ *Fī Dhilāl il-Qur’ān*, vol.2, p.1057

These frank words clearly show that the writer sees no problem in making *takfeer* of Islamic peoples today, even those who call the *adhān* calling out the word of *tawbeed* to those who repeat them!³⁷ All due to the governments not ruling by the Divine Legislation and because the people are pleased with this rule as the writer suggests. There is no doubt that this is extremism which even the *khawārij* did not say! And the *khawārij* were the ones who introduced the innovation of *takfeer* on account of committing major sins.

Ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed is from the most hideous and despicable crimes, Allāh has said:

﴿وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

“Whoever does not rule by what Allāh has revealed, then they are the disbelievers.”

{*al-Mā'idah* (5): 44}

These verses could possibly apparently mean that the ruler by other than what Allāh has revealed is a disbeliever who has committed major *kufr*, however Ibn 'Abbās (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) the ink of the *ummah* and the commentator of the Qur'ān explained the verse as being *kufr* less than *kufr*, meaning: if he legalized it he has thus disbelieved. If he did not legalize it then he has not disbelieved, he (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) stated after reciting the words of Allāh,

﴿وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

“Whoever does not rule by what Allāh has revealed, then they are the disbelievers.”

{*al-Mā'idah* (5): 44}

³⁷ **Translator's note:** This entire sentence from Sayyid Qutb, which Shaykh 'Ali al-Hadādi did not complete is as follows:

All of humanity, including those who repeat from the minarets from east to west, the words 'La ilaha il-Allāh' without any significance or reality, are the most sinful of people and will be the most severely punished on the Day of Judgement, because they have apostasized by turning to the worship of the servants (of Allāh) after the guidance had been made clear to them and after they were upon the deen of Allāh...

“Whoever rejects what Allāh has revealed has disbelieved and whoever acknowledges it yet does not rule by it is a transgressing sinner.”³⁸

Ibn 'Abbās (*radi Allāhu 'anhu*) also said:

It is not the kufr that they go towards; it is not the kufr which expels one from the religion,

﴿وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ﴾

“Whoever does not rule by what Allāh has revealed, then they are the disbelievers.”

{*al-Mā'idah* (5): 44}

Means: kufr less than kufr.”

Verified by al-Hākim who said: “This hadeeth is of a Saheeh chain of transmission” and did not reject it, adh-Dhahabī agreed with him saying “Saheeh.”³⁹

At-Tirmidhī stated:

It has been related from Ibn 'Abbās, Tāwūs, 'Atā and more than one from the people of knowledge who have said: “kufr less than kufr and fisq less than fisq”.⁴⁰

Imām Ibn Qayyim (*rahimahullāh*) supports this *tafseer*, he said:

...and what is correct is: that ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed is between two types of kufr, minor and major depending upon the condition of the ruler. For if the ruler believes in the obligation of ruling what Allāh has revealed, yet does not apply out of being disobedient whilst knowing that he can be legible for punishment, then in this event this is minor kufr. Yet if one believes that to rule by what Allāh has revealed is not obligatory and that he has a choice in the affair while knowing that it is the rule of Allāh, then this is major kufr. If one is ignorant of it and errs then such an individual is mistaken and the ruling of those who err is to be applied to him.⁴¹

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Bin Bāz (*rahimahullāh*) stated in explaining this issue:

Whoever rules by other than what Allāh has revealed is not free from four matters:

1. The one who says “I rule by this (i.e. man-made laws) because they are better than the Divine Legislation of Islām (i.e. Sharee'ah)” then such a person is a disbeliever, who has committed major kufr.

³⁸ *Tafseer at-Tabarī*, vol.10, p.357

³⁹ *Al-Mustadrak 'alā's-Saheehayn*, vol.2, p.313

⁴⁰ At-Tirmidhī, *Sunan at-Tirmidhī*, vol.5, p.21

⁴¹ *Madārij us-Sālikeen*, vol.1, p.365

2. The one who says “I rule by these man-made laws as they are like the Divine Legislation of Islām, and ruling by it is permitted, just as ruling by the Divine legislation of Islām is also permitted” such a person is a disbeliever who has committed major kufr.
3. The one who says “I rule by these laws, but the Divine Legislation of Islām is better, but ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed is permitted.” Such a person is a disbeliever who has committed major kufr.
4. The one who says “I rule by these man-made laws” yet believes that it is not permissible to rule by other than what Allāh has revealed and says “Ruling by the Divine Legislation of Islām is better and it is not permissible to rule by other than it” yet is weak or does this out of what his rulers have originated before him, such a person is a disbeliever who has committed minor kufr which does not expel him from the religion and the action is considered to be from the major sins.⁴²

Secondly: If the *kufr* of a leader is verified based on the judgement of the people of knowledge who are firmly grounded in knowledge, then it does not necessitate the *takfeer* of his subjects or of his aides. In the same way it does not necessitate that due to them being the leader’s subjects that they are pleased with what he is doing and are in agreement with his crime (of not ruling by what Allāh has revealed). Even if they are silent (with regards to the crime of not ruling by what Allāh has revealed) it could possibly be silence in order to preserve their lives and honour, or possibly out of their ignorance of the ruling or there could be other possibilities. Whoever’s Islām is verified with certainty then his Islām is not negated except with similar certainty.

⁴² *Qadeeyat ut-Takfeer Bayna Ahl us-Sunnah wa Furuq ad-Dalāl* [The Issue of Takfeer Between the People of Sunnah and the Misguided Groups], pp.72-73.

POINTS OF BENEFIT FROM SHAYKH 'ABDUL'AZEEZ BIN RAYYIS AR-RAYYIS REGARDING THE UNITED NATIONS⁴³

Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis (*bafidhabullāb*) has dealt with this in *al-Burhan al-Muneer fee Dhad Shubuhāt Ahl it-Takfeer wa't-Tafjeer* in a chapter dealing with the issue of *takfeer* due to being in the *UN*. Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Rayyis notes that:

(The UN) is an organisation comprising of rules, resolutions, agreements and charters which most of the world's states are affiliated to, including the state of Saudi, may Allāh protect it. It (i.e. the UN) developed after the Second World War and the main aim of its development was to bring together nations and views and to narrow the variances which can emerge between nation-states which if left to continue would lead to dangerous consequences for peace and security between two states alongside achieving peace. It also was also set-up to prevent the use of power as a solution to global problems.

Then Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Rayyis (*bafidhabullāb*) mentioned King Faysal highlighting this about the *UN*⁴⁴ and then the Shaykh stated:

And as the majority of the member states are kuffār there are aspects which do not agree with the Divine Legislation and for that reason Saudi rejected some of the system and did not agree with all that is in it. Here unto you are some of the agreements and treaties that the Saudi state, may Allāh protect it, did not accept:

1. **The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not agree with the agreement judging all forms of discrimination against women. Talāl Muhammad Nūh 'Atā stated: "The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia preserved this agreement put did not adhere itself to what opposed the Divine Legislation of Islām.**
2. **The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not agree with article 16 which says that a man and a woman, when they reach the age of marriage, they have the right to marry without any religious conditions. Saudi Arabia stated in a memo sent to the United Nations "The marriage of a Muslim male to a polytheist woman or to a woman who**

⁴³ Abridged from Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Rayyis ar-Rayyis, *al-Burhān al-Muneer fī Dhad Shubuhāt Ahl it-Takfeer wa't-Tafjeer*, pp.30-34 (www.islamancient.com)

⁴⁴ *Majallat Faysal*, no.106, Rabī' al-Ākhir 1406 AH

does not believe in the existence of Allāh is a matter that Islām has prohibited. Also, the marriage of a Muslim male to a woman of the book, being a Christian woman or a Jewish woman is a matter that Islām has allowed. As for the marriage of a non-Muslim male to a Muslim female then this is impermissible.⁴⁵

3. The state of tawheed did not agree with article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which gives anyone the right to change their religion. ⁴⁶
4. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia did not implement two state covenants, the first being particular to economic, social and cultural rights and the second being related to political and civic rights due to what is within these covenants of contents which do not conform with the Divine Legislation of Islām.⁴⁷

So if this was the situation of the Saudi state with the UN, in that it does not accept those aspects of the system which contradict the Divine Legislation of Islām, by the admission of the leaders of this state (i.e. Saudi), may Allāh grant them success with His guidance of what is in it, and their application of the Divine Legislation practically and preserving the Divine Legislation in face of the system and contradictory resolutions. So if this is the condition of the Saudi state in its dealings with the UN, why then, O people of justice, is it abused and made takfeer of? Is it not from its right that it is thanked rather than made takfeer of due to its avoidance of resolutions which oppose the Divine Legislation of Islām? Is it not from its right that it is supported and trusted due to its unique pride, amongst all of the Islamic countries, in the Divine Legislation of Islām and preserving it against whatever contradicts it.

B. THE BENEFIT DEPENDS ON THE ENTRY OF THE SAUDI STATE TO THIS ORGANISATION

⁴⁵ *Mudhakirat ul-Hukūmah Saudiyyah ilā Munnadhmat il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah Hawla Tatbeeq Huqūq ul-Insān fī'l-Mamlakah 'Amalan bi'sh-Sharee'ah Islāmiyyah* [Memo of the Saudi Government to the United Nations Organisation About the Application of Human Rights in the Kingdom According to the Divine Legislation of Islām], *Majallah 'Arabiyyah*, no.1, p.182. Also see *Kitāb Mawqif Mamlakat il-'Arabiyyat is-Saudiyyah min al-Qadāyah al-'Ālamiyyah fī Hay'at il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah* [The Position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in Regards to World Affairs in the United Nations Organisation], p.98.

⁴⁶ Ibid

⁴⁷ *Kitāb Mawqif Mamlakat il-'Arabiyyat is-Saudiyyah min al-Qadāyah al-'Ālamiyyah fī Hay'at il-Ummamil-Muhtahidah* [The Position of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in Regards to World Affairs in the United Nations Organisation], p.98.

To protect itself from its kuffār enemies, or even rather, some Islamic countries which oppose the creed of the Salaf lay in wait for the state of tawheed to meet with disaster for many well known reasons. From the clearest proofs of this is the first Gulf war wherein one state attacked another. What is repeated in the Divine Legislation is circumstances of weakness are different from a state of strength. The treaty of Hodaybiyah is the best witness and proof for this. The historian, Shaykh Ibrāheem Bin 'Ubayd Āl 'AbdulMuhsin in his historical book Tadhkiratu Awlee wa'n-Nahy wa'l-'Irfān bi-Ayām Allāh al-Wāhid ad-Dayān:

“Sixthly: Ibn Saud made agreements just as his fathers did in order to keep away the enemies from the regions of Kuwait, Bahrayn, the Shaykhs of Qatar,⁴⁸ the coastal areas of 'Uman (Oman) which were under the rule of the British and had treaty relations with the aforementioned government. Also, the agreements were to neither interfere in the affairs of these countries nor to settle in those areas, the treaty was signed on (circa) 18 Safar 1334 AH corresponding to 16 December 1915 CE. There is no doubt that this type of agreement is allowed...and the well-versed historian Fu'ad Hamza⁴⁹ stated about it that the treaty was permitted. The adept intelligent memoriser who was gifted with fame for free thinking, composure of intellect and independent opinion stated: “The short-sightedness of the advisor of Ibn Sa'ud of what was taking place in the world was clear and was merely taking advantage of the opportunities. However, it was said about the opportunity that the circumstances of the time necessitated a treaty to be signed...”⁵⁰

C. TO ASSUME, FOR ARGUMENT'S SAKE, THAT JOINING THE UN WAS RULING BY OTHER THAN WHAT ALLĀH HAS REVEALED

The Saudi state still would not be made takfeer of by being in it, because, as has been explained, ruling by what Allāh has revealed is due to weakness and the reign of the enemy, so it does not expel from the religion, this is what our Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez Bin Bāz and Shaykh al-Albānī (rahimahumallāh) judged as has preceded.

⁴⁸ The Ottoman Turks were driven out of these three regions in 1913 CE after Ibn Sa'ud finally defeated them at al-Ahsa. [TN]

⁴⁹ He is the author of *Qalb Jazeerat ul-'Arab* (Riyadh: Maktabat an-Nasr al-Hadeethah, 1968 CE). [TN]

⁵⁰ Vol.2, p.198

ATTENTION: If joining the UN was ruling by other than what Allāh has revealed you would have seen our scholars such as Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrāheem, Shaykh Sa'd bin 'Ateeq, Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez bin Bāz and Shaykh Muhammad ibn Sālih al-'Uthaymeen (rahimahumullāh) reject it and clarify its prohibition. Rather, it is transmitted from some of them its permissibility (being part of the UN), Shaykh 'Uthaymeen was asked:

“Some people say that joining the UN is ruling by other than Allāh, is this correct?”

He answered:

“This is not correct, as each one in his country rules by what is required of him. So the people of Islām rule by the Book (Qur'an) and Sunnah and others rule by their laws. The UN does not force anyone to rule by other than what they rule by within their countries. Being in the UN is nothing other than from the aspect of treaties which take place between the Muslims and the kuffār.”⁵¹

So rather, such scholars (which have just been mentioned above) constantly repeat that the Saudi state rules by what Allāh has revealed.

⁵¹ *Majallat ud-Da'wah*, no.1608, dated: 10 Jumadā al-Ulā 1418 AH/September 11 1997 CE.