

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَحْدَهُ وَالصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَى مَنْ لَا نَبِيَّ بَعْدَهُ وَعَلَى آلِهِ وَصَحْبِهِ وَمَنْ اتَّبَعَ
هُدَاهُ
رَدُّ سَلْفِي عَلَى أَنْوَارِ الْعَوْلَاكِيِّ
الجزء الأول

A Salafee Response to Anwar al-Awlakee pt. 1

This is a translated transcription of a phone call with our shaykh Dr. Abdullaah bin Abdur-Rahmaan al-Jarboo, Professor from the College of Dawah “Usool ud-Deen” - Former head of Dept. of Aqeedah at Medinah University. This took place on Saturday, March 28, 2009(2/4/1430). This call was placed to the Shaykh in order to gain clarification about a man called Anwar al-Awlakee.

The call was placed by Br.Saeed Rhana al-Maghribee and the questions were put to the shaykh by Br. Muwahhid Aaadil al-Michiganee.

Now to the text of the call.

The Translator: Our Shaykh, we would like to present to you some of the mistakes of a man called Anwar Awlaki who is Yemeni and is currently residing in Yemen, but he used to be in the U.S. He has a lot of affect on the youth all over the west and they raise him to the level of the scholars. Awlaki has served as an Imam in Colorado, California, and most recently in the Washington, D.C. area where he headed the Dar Al-Hijrah Islamic Centre and was the Muslim Chaplain at George Washington University [2]. He studied under Sheikh Uthaymeen for a short while (few months) as well as Salman Oadah. He received a general ijaza in Quran, Sciences of Quran, Hadith, Sciences of Hadith, Tafsir , Fiqh, Usool Fiqh and Arabic from: Hassan Maqbooli al Ahdal, Hussein bin Mahfoodh, AbdulRahman Shumailah al Ahdal, Hamud Shumailah al Ahdal.. Anwar al-Awlaki currently resides in Yemen, and is associated with Iman University. (In Yemen, where Zindani is)

He published many Cds, lectures and albums, from the most famous lives of the prophets. He gives listeners doubts in their religion and does not call to Dawah Salafiyah; rather he calls to praise the people of Desire and has great mistakes in his manhaj like allowing suicide bombings. He also quotes from the people of innovation in his lectures and Cds like Sayed Qutub, Salman Oadah and Mowdoodee.

The Shaykh: This is some background information on him then?

Translator: Yes. The first of the observances against him is his saying; “Brothers and sisters whether you agree or not with martyrdom operations let’s leave our differences behind us, and let us support our Muslim brothers who are in the frontlines. Just like we disagree on many other issues, we should not let our disagreements stand in the way of

our solidarity in the face of our adversaries.” (This can be found on his website on the article called Suicide or martyrdom).

The Shaykh: In the name of Allaah the Kind Bestower of kindness. All praise is due to Allaah the Lord of all creation. In addition, may Allaah mention in the highest company and secure our prophet Muhammad, his family and his companions; to proceed.

From the standpoint of what I heard of his background, his “shaykhs”, and his ideas in general, is it clear that this individual is affiliated with the Ikhwaan al-Muslimoon (muslim brotherhood). Especially one of their branches called the “Suroorees”.

The muslim brotherhood group has a distinct orientation, and their concerns revolve around certain contemporary issues in which they oppose those firmly rooted in knowledge. They oppose the scholars in their speech and verdicts.

Therefore if this man builds his orientation upon this thinking and ideology of those groups affiliated with, and derived from the likes of the Islaamic Group of Pakistan, at whose head was al-Mawdoodee; the Muslim Brotherhood group of Egypt, and Hamaas of Palestine, (then know) that all of these groups have a specific ideology for themselves.

Thus, the awareness of this man’s background his ideological affiliation is very important in knowing his orientation, and making a ruling concerning him and his statements.

As far as the issue of suicide bombings- they call them martyrdom operations-and the scholars have labeled them as suicide, then these acts are most of what the opposers, endorsers of takfeer (i.e. those who expel muslims from the fold of al-Islaam without right) from the Muslim Brotherhood group promote on the internet, in their writings, books, CD’s, and lectures. They authorize these acts of violence for which they attempt to assemble proofs to validate them.

These proofs and evidences that they seek to substantiate their position by have already been declared by the people of knowledge as invalid for their use as evidence in the supporting of these acts.

The most important premise in their process of presenting the legitimacy of their stance is their use of al-Qiyas (i.e. analogy or comparative deduction). They conclude that these acts are the same as al-Iqtihaam (attacking the enemy ranks individually) or at-Tatarrus (making one’s self or the use of one as a human shield in a face-to-face battle with the enemy).

Because of this, and pay close attention to the following, there exists neither one explicit text, nor any historical account from the companions, Allaah be pleased with them, nor in the history of jihad that can be used to prove the validity their ideology having a basis in the religion.

There is no precedent in history (i.e. Islamic) of anyone committing suicide in jihad! Rather, there was one who committed suicide during a battle in the era of the messenger, but the prophet condemned him for that.

On the account of there not being any clear text to support them, they resort to analogical deduction by comparing suicide bombings to al-Iqtihaam (attacking the enemy ranks individually), exposing one's self to the possibility of being killed; or they compare these bombings with the permissibility of at-Tatarrus (making one's self or the use of one as a human shield in a face-to-face battle with the enemy). The al-mutatarras bihi (soldier used as a human shield) who is killed to create an advantage for the muslim forces, is not to be compared to one who kills himself!

All of their proofs return to their comparing suicide attacks with al-Iqtihaam or at-Tatarrus. Consequently, the response to this is that they oppose the verdict passed by those firmly rooted in legislated knowledge, which is the outlawing of killing of one's self. The people of knowledge, the scholars, have explained that there are definitive texts showing that the one who kills himself with anything will be punished with the self-same object and method from his death until resurrection day.

In addition to this, whoever killed himself deliberately, then he is considered as a suicide, and is included among those threatened with the fire of hell.

The scholars have clarified that the approved warfare mentioned in Allaah's statement,

يقاتلون في سبيل الله فيقتلون و يقتلون

“...they fight in Allaah's path, wherein they kill the enemy or are killed by the enemy...”

There is not a third situation where it is mentioned that they kill themselves!

This is what is connected with the definitive texts that prove the illegality of killing one's self in any condition.

As far as the verdicts of those firmly rooted in knowledge, then those such as:

- Shaykh Abdul-Azeez bin Baaz
- The Permanent Committee for the issuance of verdicts in Saudi Arabia
- Shaykh Muhammad ibn SAalih al-Uthaymeen
- Imam al-Albaanee

And many others than these scholars, known for their knowledge, righteousness, and understanding, have agreed with the consensus, and following the example of those firmly established scholars before them, that killing of one's self is forbidden!

Now for those who oppose the scholars, then they do so from two approaches;

1. Their opposition is the result of their lack of understanding of the religion (of al-Islam).
2. They seek to prove their position with arguments leveled by the takfiri groups, or from the splinter groups of the Muslim Brotherhood, and use their methods of proof.

There are those from the people of knowledge who have issued verdicts (in favor of suicide bombings), but the reality of their proof do not extend beyond the previously mentioned arguments, or they are ambiguous evidences. However, the explicit and detailed proofs point to the illegality of such activities.

Secondly, from the angle of Qiyaas (comparative deduction), in their use of comparing suicide bombing with al-Iqtihaam and at-Tatarrus, to what they call “martyrdom operations”, this is an invalid conclusion involving two errors:

1. First of all, it is the use of deduction in the presence of explicit texts regarding the forbidden nature of killing one’s self, and in that case, there is no basis for the use of comparative deduction. This type of deduction is called “al-Qiyas Iblisee” (satanic reasoning). This satanic reasoning happens when one seeks to employ analogy in a matter where there exists a clear text, and a conclusion is drawn by this reasoning. This is similar as what occurred when Iblis (satan) was ordered by Allaah to prostrate to Aadam, and he refused to do so in the face of an explicit text, or order. He resorted to analogy by saying that fire is superior to mud, so how could he prostrate to Aadam? How could the superior one prostrate to the inferior?

Thus, they seek to prove their position while there are explicit texts to the contrary of what they promote. The evidence for the forbiddance of suicide is clear and definite. If we accept that analogy in this matter is permitted, when in fact it is not, but if we did so for the sake of argument, this analogy would be false. The false analogy is one wherein there exists disparity between the situations compared

The primary disparity is the analogy of suicide bombings to at-Tatarrus(making one’s self or the use of one as a human shield in a face-to-face battle with the enemy) and the Mutatarras bihi (soldier used as a human shield) or al-Iqtihaam (attacking the enemy ranks individually). This person does not kill himself; others only kill him. Thus, the enemy kills the one who attacks the enemy lines by himself. He does not kill himself. He does not commit suicide; rather, the one who kills him is the enemy. Furthermore, the soldier employed as a shield by the Muslim army is killed by the Muslims, because they crush him in the rush of the swollen ranks towards the enemy, with the aim of killing the unbelievers. They (the Muslims) may trample him and he dies. The Muslims do not kill him intentionally; he dies in the course of the battle. You will not find any of them killing themselves.

2. The second disparity is that the scholars have stipulated that there has to be a horde of soldiers at the battle, and that is an important condition. The condition that this person's death is the result of the throng of soldiers pushing forward in a face-to-face battle with the unbelievers has been stipulated. In this case, he is allowed to penetrate the enemy ranks individually, distracting the enemy, and inspiring bravery in the Muslim ranks. Just as the jurists require that the soldier employed as a shield is not killed except out of extreme necessity. This occurs when no other option is present. Consequently, comparing suicide attacks to al-Iqtihaam or at-Tatarrus is impermissible, and is considered a satanic analogy when made in contradiction to definitive texts.

If we accept that for the sake of argument that suicide is lawful, then it is an invalid analogy because of existing disparities that in both cases, this person is killed by other than himself.

Similarly, the jurists have explained that there exists the condition of the battle taking place amongst a crowd of combatants, and of there being a dire necessity.

It has become clear to us that the Takfeerees' dependence upon these proofs is futile. As a result of this, they contradict and oppose those scholars deeply rooted in knowledge, and muddle up the issue by resorting to analogy to prove their stance, which is not allowed, and is considered a satanic analogy.

None of their methods of proof goes beyond what we have stated, and all praise is due to Allaah.

Sa'eed Rhana: possessor of excellence, they also seek to prove their position by using the story of the Boy and the King, and the story of Baraa ibn Maalik.

Sh. Al-Jarboo: their means of using these stories as proof is well known. I myself have researched this issue, and all who seek proof by their methods, this is their condition.

In so far as using the proof of the narration about Baraa ibn Maalik is concerned, then this story is a proof for al-Iqtihaam (attacking the enemy ranks individually), because Maalik attacked the enemy lines by himself. This is their seeking proof by comparing suicide attacks with al-Iqtihaam.

Now as far as the Boy is concerned, then:

1. The boy did not kill himself: he was killed by the king.

((The call was interrupted at this point))

We say that the story of Baraa ibn Maalik falls under the category of al-Iqtihaam. The Takfeerees/Jihaadees use this as proof when actually it is a proof for al-Iqtihaam.

Furthermore, we say that Maalik did not kill himself, and he was not killed in this instance. For if he was killed, it would have been the enemy that had done so; he did not at all commit suicide! This was a situation where the ranks were extremely tight and crowded. What he did was advantageous for The Muslim army in a throng of soldiers; it does not compare to these suicide attacks.

For them, the Takfeeree/Jihaadees, there is a comparison with existing disparities, and they are not at all permitted to make analogy in this case.

They make analogies upon analogies. They compare the texts with what they call “martyrdom operations”; these bombings. They compare this with al-Iqtihaam; so we say that this analogy is exceedingly impermissible, and it is satanic when there is a found explicit text regarding this issue. We also say that this analogy is futile as it is a comparison with obvious disparities.

The reason for this is that Baraa ibn Maalik advanced on the enemy ranks by himself, during a face-to-face battle. None who do this in en-masse, and are killed, is considered to have committed suicide; they were killed by the enemy. This is contrary to what one who blows himself does.

The jurists have stipulated that there is a crush and jam of combatants for this type of strategy to be valid. The attacks that they carry out do not include this condition; rather they carry them out in a sneaky fashion.

Regarding the story of the Boy and the King, first, the Boy did not kill himself; the misguided King killed him. Secondly, the boy’s situation is from the category of extraordinary phenomena and miracles are manifest among people in accord with a wisdom that Allaah desires.

Allaah prevented the killing of the boy by the king by any method except for one. Allaah informed the boy of the method, and the boy, in turn, informed the king-thus achieving the wisdom that Allaah desired from the boy’s death.

Thus, what happened was nothing other than from the category of miracles. What proves this is that the boy was thrown from a mountain; and lived-he was thrown into the sea, and did not drown; he came out. In addition to what is mentioned in the narration is that the King said to the boy, “Your fame has reached the extent that is said that you can return sight to the blind and raise the dead, etc...” The boy was also thrown to a lion and killed it. This proves that he was given miracles.

Miracles cannot be employed in the use of analogy; there is no comparison to be made with them. They are special incidents that cannot be used as a proof in legal matters.

Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen said, “that this miracle has a benefit, and that this benefit is in accord with Allaah’s wisdom; meaning that Allaah is the one who desired that benefit and that he arranged the means by which the boy was not killed except in a certain manner.”

Therefore, the seeking of proof for these suicide bombings by employing this story is not acceptable from two matters:

- The boy did not kill himself, the boy did not kill himself; the unbelieving king killed him.
- This story is from the category of miracles and extraordinary phenomena, and comparison is not allowed to be made them. This happening was specifically for the boy. This is because Allaah informed him of the manner by which he could be killed; and the boy said to the king, “You cannot kill me except by this and that...”
- There is also a third important perspective that the people of knowledge have explained; it is that the boy was under a legislation of those nations who came before us. If we accepted this and assessed the permissibility of using this as a proof, then this is from a legislation of those who came before us; and it is not permissible to use as a proof for ourselves in a case where we find that is in contradiction to and/or abrogated by our legislation. We have in our legislation that the clear forbiddance of suicide.

From these three perspectives, it is clear that is not allowed to use the story of the Boy and the King as a proof supporting suicide attacks- and Allaah knows best.

End of **Part one**.....