

The Dangers of Martyrdom or Suicide Bombings



Author:

Abdulmonem Mostafa Halimah

Abu Baseer Al-Tartousi

The Dangers of Martyrdom Bombings or Suicide Bombings and a discussion and refutation of the evidence and arguments of the opposing view

In the name of Allah, the Lord of Mercy, the Giver of Mercy

All praise is to Allah alone and may the peace and blessing be on the final Messenger

1. Introduction

I discussed the ruling of Martyrdom or Suicide bombings repeatedly in various articles and writings over five years ago; nevertheless I have continued to receive repetitive questions from brothers on this subject. They expressed difficulty in locating those discussions as they are in various documents and Q&A discussions, therefore, I have decided to discuss this topic thoroughly, reiterating what I had explained previously into one document so that it may become more easily accessible for whosoever wants to research it.

Subsequent to that I will present and discuss the arguments and evidences used to support the legitimacy of those bombings. The reason for this is that I have received several correspondences from brothers whom we have sensed a genuine concern from for knowing the truth in the matter, in which they asked me to respond to the evidence and disputes of those who hold the opposing view. Some incorporated research carried out by respected brothers and *Sheikhs*, which illustrate the arguments for the opposing view, most of which I had already reviewed. They have rightly argued that it is not enough to simply assert that the evidence they use are ambiguous and unfitting to challenge the authentic and definite evidence against martyrdom bombings or suicide bombings, as such assertions are very brief and are not evidence against those who receive it. It is important to illustrate exactly where the areas of ambiguity and weaknesses lie with some form of detail.

2. The ruling of Martyrdom Bombings or Suicide Bombings

I have previously said, and will say again that those bombings are closer to suicide than they are to martyrdom and they are *haram* and absolutely impermissible, for the following reasons and dangers that will result from them:

- 1- Most importantly is that it necessitates killing of oneself, which is in disagreement with tens of established texts in *Shariah*, both in the authenticity of their chains and relevance. Those texts indisputably forbid killing of oneself, no matter what the reason might be. These include, the saying of Allah the Most High:

﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ بِكُمْ رَجِيماً. وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ عُدْوَاناً وَظُلْماً فَسَوْفَ نُصَلِّيهِ نَاراً وَكَانَ ذَلِكَ عَلَى اللَّهِ يَسِيراً﴾

(Do not kill yourselves, 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)

[Al-Nisa, 4:29-30]

And Allah's saying that:

﴿وَأَنْفُسُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَلَا تُلْقُوا بِأَيْدِيكُمْ إِلَى التَّهْلُكَةِ وَأَحْسِنُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُحْسِنِينَ﴾

(Do not contribute to your destruction with your own hands) [Al-Baqarah, 2: 195]

The prophet peace be upon him also said:

{Whoever kills himself with a metal will be holding it in his hand and constantly stabbing his stomach with it in the Fire of Hell for an everlasting eternity. Whoever consumes poison and kills himself as a result will be consuming it in the Fire of Hell for an everlasting eternity. Whoever throws himself of a mountain cliff and kills himself as a result will be falling from height for an everlasting eternity}¹

He peace be upon him also said:

{Whoever kills themselves with anything from this world will be punished with it on the Day of Resurrection}² and **{There was a man before you who incurred a wound, he weakened and took a knife to his wrist, he continued to bleed until he died. Allah then said: "My slave has rushed to me by killing himself; I have made Paradise forbidden for him"}**³

On the other hand, certain Islamic texts are used to support the counter argument, which claims that it is permissible to kill oneself for the purpose of vexing the enemy and inflicting great harm upon them. These include texts which indicate the permissibility of advancing into the lines of the enemy and breaching their midst, as well as the story of the boy and the king and the issue of killing hostages taken by the enemy in order to prevent greater violations from being carried out by the enemy.

It is clear that reference to killing oneself cannot be inferred at all from those texts; rather what is inferred is being killed at the hands of the enemy and not oneself. The least that could be said about those texts in the way they are used as justification for the argument that licences killing of oneself to vex the enemy is that they are ambiguous and may be interpreted in many ways, other than to be implying killing oneself. Texts of this kind cannot be rightly used as evidence to the truth of an argument at hand. Additionally, they cannot be used to counter explicit and definite evidence which are authentic in their chains of narration as well as in their relevance, nor are they fit enough to challenge or oppose those evidences, some of which have been mentioned above.

- 2- Secondly, to act upon the implications of the ambiguous evidences is to necessitate the abrogation and annulation of acting upon the implications of the explicit and definite evidences, those indicating the impermissibility of killing of oneself. This approach should not be resorted to for various reasons:
 - a) Clear and unambiguous evidence should not be abrogated or rejected in preference for ambiguous evidence.
 - b) The ambiguous is explained in the light of the clear and unambiguous, and not the other way round. Similarly, the clear and unambiguous is evidence against the ambiguous.
 - c) The principles of *Shariah* necessitate that all texts from the Qur'an and the authentic *Sunnah* should be acted upon holistically. They discourage resorting to abrogating any divine text or to cancel acting upon it or to restrict its generality, except where reconciling between all texts is totally impossible.

As for the issue at hand, there is no case of impossibility in reconciling between texts. In fact there is no contradiction at all between the texts; reconciliation and acting upon all

¹ Reported in Muslim

² Reported in Muslim

³ Reported in Bukhari

of them without needing to annul any relevant text is very feasible. On the one hand, they encourage courageousness, bravery and advancing into the lines of the enemy without recklessness, even if that led to being killed by the enemy, so long as there is an outstanding advantage for Jihad, Islam and Muslims. On the other hand, they forbid killing of oneself. Hence reconciliation is possible and easy and there is no need at all to restrict, cancel or abrogate a text.

In conclusion, the position I take with regards to this issue is to bear all relevant texts in mind and to act upon them holistically. The opposing view however, necessitates the annulment of acting upon authentic and definite evidence, which forbid killing of oneself, which would be a great risk, whose negative consequences are unavoidable.

- 3- Furthermore, it is highly observable that another danger of suicide or martyrdom operations is that they often result in the killing of innocent lives that *Sahriah* has protected, without any right to do so, whether those protected lives are from the Muslims or non-Muslims. This is an evil that must not be underestimated; rather it should be much evaded and prevented because the *Iman* and religion of one are sound and good so long as they do not spill blood unlawfully. Allah the Most High said:

﴿وَمَنْ يَقْتُلْ مُؤْمِنًا مُتَعَمِّدًا فَجَزَاؤُهُ جَهَنَّمُ خَالِدًا فِيهَا وَغَضِبَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَلَعَنَهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُ عَذَابًا عَظِيمًا﴾

(If anyone kills a believer deliberately, the punishment for him is Hell, and there he will remain: God is angry with him, and rejects him, and has prepared a tremendous torment for him) [Al-Nisa, 4:93]

﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ﴾

(Do not take life, which Allah has made sacred, except by right) [Al-Isra, 17:33]

﴿وَلَوْ لَا رِجَالٌ مُؤْمِنُونَ وَنِسَاءٌ مُؤْمِنَاتٌ لَمْ تَعْلَمُوهُمْ أَنْ تَطَّوُّوهُمْ فَتُقْسَبُكُمْ مِنْهُمْ مَعْرَةٌ بَعْضُهَا لِبَعْضٍ لَئِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ مِنْكُمْ جُودٌ كَثِيرٌ لَأَكْبَرْتُمْ إِلَهُكُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلِيمٌ بِذُنُوبِكُمْ﴾

(If there had not been among them, unknown to you, believing men and women whom you would have trampled underfoot, inadvertently incurring guilt on their account– God brings whoever He will into His mercy– if the [believers] had been clearly separated, We would have inflicted a painful punishment on the disbelievers) [Al-Fath, 48:25]

Additionally, the prophet peace be upon him said: **{Avoid the destructive seven}**, among which he mentioned **{killing the soul that Allah has made sacred except by right}**.⁴ He peace be upon him also said: **{The Muslim is one whom the believers fear no harm from his tongue or hand}**⁵ and **{the believer is one whom people can trust with their money and lives}**⁶. Contrastively, the Hadeeth imply that those whom Muslims cannot trust with their money and lives and fear harm from their tongues or hands are not Muslims and are unbelievers. This is a severe admonition that one must beware of.

The prophet peace be upon him said: **{All the Muslim is forbidden upon his fellow Muslim; his blood, wealth and honour}**⁷, **{the killing of a believer is much more horrendous than**

⁴ Reported in Bukhari and Muslim

⁵ Reported in Bukhari

⁶ Sahih Al-Jami', No.6658

⁷ Reported in Muslim

the destruction of this world}⁸, {every sin, may Allah forgive, except for the one who dies a disbeliever or the one who kills a believer deliberately}⁹, {Allah refuses to accept the repentance of the one who kills a believer}¹⁰, {one will continue to find space and flexibility in the religion so long as they do not spill forbidden blood}¹¹, {whoever ... harms a believer then no Jihad will be accepted from him}¹², this is for someone who harms a believer, but what can be said of one who kills a believer and does so deliberately?

The prophet peace be upon him also said: **{whoever kills somebody of the people of whom we have covenant with, will not find the smell of paradise, even though its smell can be found from a distance of seventy years}¹³ and he said: {Allah has forbidden the smell of paradise from the one who kills a human from the people of whom we have covenant with}¹⁴.**

These evidences are explicit and definite in their meanings as well as authentic in their chains of narrations. They cannot be rejected, annulated or undermined by putting forth Hadeeth that are ambiguous or by reference to feeble excuses that cannot stand as equal to the certain meanings of those evidences.

One issue that has propped up recently and is frequently used to justify and undermine the killing of innocent lives who happen to be in an area that is being targeted by a suicide bomber, is that of *Tatarus*. *Tatarus* is the concept used to refer to the jurisprudential discussion around the legitimacy of killing hostages or human shields that are detained by the enemy in order to prevent a greater harm being caused by their kidnappers. The kind of *Tatarus* that permits killing of innocent and sacred lives has specific conditions and characteristics, if even one condition or characteristic is missing, then acting by the jurisprudence of *Tatarus* as well as using its evidence becomes annulled. Those conditions and characteristics are:

- a) The impossibility of repelling the aggression of the enemy except by putting the hostages at risk. If there is any alternative route, then killing the hostages, putting them under risk of harm or attacking the enemy through contact with them is totally forbidden.
- b) Being certain that leaving the enemy to their mischief for the sake of securing the hostages' safety and lives will bear a much greater harm and danger to the land and its people than to fight and kill the enemy through confrontation with the hostages. In contrast, if fighting and killing the enemy via contact with the hostages will result in greater harm and danger than to avoid that -for instance killing tens of sacred and innocent lives for the sake of a single *Kafir* enemy- then it will be impermissible to fight the enemy through contact with the hostages or by putting them in danger. The reason for this is because the fundamentals of *Shariah* unanimously indicate that the greater harm should be evaded by means of the smaller harm and that the least harmful of two evils should be favoured if there were no other choice but to choose between them.
- c) The resulting advantages of targeting the hostages must be certain and definite, and not based on doubt or suspicion, for those have no basis for considering them to be factual.

⁸ Reported in Sahih Al-Nisa'I, No. 3997

⁹ Al-Targeeb waltarheeb, Authentic

¹⁰ Sahih Al-Jami, No. 23

¹¹ Sahih Al-Jami, No. 7691

¹² Sahih Al-Jami, No. 6378

¹³ Sahih Al-Nis'I, No. 4763

¹⁴ Sahih Al-Nisa', No. 6458

- d) That fighting the enemy could not possibly be delayed, deferred or be allowed to benefit from extra surveillance. If it is possible to delay, defer or apply extra surveillance to the matter until the hostages or human shields escape or are escorted away from the conflict zone -especially where the human shield is mobile and is unaware that they are being used as a shield, as observed in many cases- then it is impermissible to confront or attack the enemy via the route of the hostages or human shields and putting them under risk of harm. Indeed for the *Mujahid* to observe the enemy for hours and days before attacking them independently of the hostages' route is a thousand times better than to hasten confrontation with the enemy at the expense of the innocent and sacred lives. The following of Allah's saying can surely be applied to this:

﴿ فَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ مَا اسْتَطَعْتُمْ ﴾

(Be mindful of Allah as much as you can) [Al-Tagabun, 64: 16]

- e) If the satisfaction of all the above conditions is ensured, then it will be permissible for the *Mujahid* to repel the enemy through the direction of the hostages or human shields so long as his intention is to target the enemy and not the hostages. If the hostages are affected by a form of harm or danger in the process then there is no blame on him *inshAllah* and those hostages affected by his attack will be regarded as unintentional.

Al-Qurtubi said in his Tafseer: 'it may be permissible to kill hostages and that be indisputable *inshAllah* if the advantage in doing so is inevitably necessary, holistically needed and whose success is incontrovertibly guaranteed. By inevitably necessary, it is meant that it is impossible to reach the disbelieving enemies without killing the hostages. By holistically needed, it is meant that killing of hostages is to be of benefit and advantage to the entire *Ummah* and all Muslims, in the sense that if it were not to be carried out it will lead to the disbelieving enemies taking over of the *Ummah* and killing the hostages at the same time. As for success being incontrovertibly guaranteed, it is meant that the advantage in killing the hostages is undoubtedly certain. Our scholars said that this advantage, bounded by those conditions and restrictions should not be a matter of controversy because it is a given fact that the hostages will be killed either way; on the hands of the enemy, whereby the enemy would have gained control over the Muslims or on the hands of the Muslims, whereby the enemy would be destroyed and the Muslims would be protected. It is not for a wise person to claim that hostages should not be killed under those restrictions, because it will necessitate the killing of the hostages by the enemy as well as the destruction of Islam and Muslims'¹⁵.

The pressing question that ought to be asked and which requires an unbiased and brave answer is; do the so called 'Martyrdom Operations' bear those restrictions in consideration, in order that it may be fair to use the issue above as a supporting argument for their case?

- 4- Among the dangers of Suicide or Martyrdom bombings are that the brother who reaches a level where he is prepared to sacrifice his soul, wealth and everything he possesses in the cause of Allah is a magnificently valuable asset and a rare and invaluable resource, whose worth cannot even be compared to a thousand soldiers of the enemies. It is far from right to sentence such a brother to death by throwing him into an explosive operation in the first step he takes to the fields of *Jihad*. This by Allah will foremost bring much happiness to the hearts of the enemies.

¹⁵ Tafsir Al-Qurtubie, 8:563

It is not permissible to underestimate and undervalue the greatest assets and cadres of the *Ummah* and shove them into limited and controversial actions whose results are unguaranteed. Allah Almighty said:

﴿لَقَدْ جَاءَكُمْ رَسُولٌ مِّنْ أَنفُسِكُمْ عَزِيزٌ عَلَيْهِ مَا عَنِتُّمْ حَرِيصٌ عَلَيْكُمْ بِالْمُؤْمِنِينَ رَؤُوفٌ رَّحِيمٌ﴾

(A Messenger has come to you from among yourselves. Your suffering distresses him: he is deeply concerned for you and full of kindness and mercy towards the believers) [Al-Tawbah, 9:128]

We should not hasten the standing of this brother before Allah, lest he is told on the Day of Judgement, ‘my slave has rushed to me by killing himself; I have made Paradise forbidden for him and for those who rush to me by killing themselves’.

The young man should be given plenty of space to practice his *Jihad* in an accurate and definite manner away from controversies and misconceptions. In a hope that Allah will grant him a long life in *Jihad* and make him a source of infuriation for the disbelievers and accomplish on his hands much displeasure to the enemy, that is worth many folds more what he will have achieved in his one and only operation, of so called ‘martyrdom’.

I have come to know that in several lands that are contemporarily sought for *Jihad* by young Muslim *Mujahideen* from various parts of the world, the young man upon arrival is asked to choose between two fixed options: to either accept to become a suicidal and explosive project - where his whole *Jihad* and life are limited to one single operation that might fail or succeed, and many are those which fail- or to return to where he had come from, after he had undertaken great sufferings and risks to come to that land.

This is wrong according to all considerations and measures, because forcing a brother and coercing him to kill himself in his own and only explosive operation, without genuine conviction in its permissibility on his part and while he entertains some forms of doubts and suspicions as to whether it is permissible or while he considers it to be closer to suicide than to martyrdom, then if he follows and obeys them in exploding himself, he is regarded as having obeyed them in a matter that is a sin against Allah, which is totally forbidden. This is because there is no obedience to any creation in a matter that is of disobedience to the Creator. If he was killed bearing those doubts, suspicions and beliefs then his ruling is that of one who commits suicide and kills himself, and all the rulings and warnings regarding the major sin of suicide apply to him.

In addition to that, it is certainly a military and strategic mistake because it requires the thrusting of a *Mujahid* in a one and final battle, which may succeed or fail. It also could dissuade a large number of the youth of this *Ummah*, who otherwise would like to join the *Jihad* in the cause of Allah.

It is also a mistake against the brother himself and disregard for his value, safety and security after he had risked and suffered greatly. This is not permissible.

The above four dangers combined are what urges me to declare martyrdom or suicide bombings as *Haram* and impermissible.

However if an ignorant or anonymous person protests by claiming that I am calling for a flowery *Jihad* and questions what the solution would be if they could not reach the enemy except through the explosive operations of martyrdom.

My response is: this is a lie. The *Mujahideen* who excel at observing the enemy and wait for them at every post do reach the enemy by blessings of Allah and inflict upon them great losses and aggravations -both in terms of quality and quantity- much more than what is achieved through suicidal explosive bombings, which are controversial and doubtful acts to Muslims and their scholars.

Moreover, in our religion and *Shariah*, ends do not justify wrong and unislamic means. Similarly, what is permissible should not be attained or evaded through sin. If reaching the enemy is truly unfeasible, then the alternative is to prepare, persevere, keep a look out, wait for them at every possible post, and maintain *taqwa* and *dua* even if that took very long, not to kill oneself or to kill those whose lives and dignity Islam has protected and justify that by declaring lack of patience and plots.

If it is said, 'do we understand from your attestation that suicide bombings are forbidden and are closer to suicide and self-annihilation than they are to martyrdom; that those who detonate themselves in such operations have committed suicide and that they are from the people of Hell and will face what awaits the one who commits suicide, according to the texts that warn against the punishments of those who kill themselves?

In response, there are two popular opinions in this regards; a group of scholars regard them as having certainly committed suicide, as self-killers and as among the people for whom the punishment for suicide awaits and has been promised. On the other hand, another group of scholars regard them as martyrs, most certainly and that they are among the people for whom the rewards of paradise and pleasures have been promised.

To me, both opinions are weak and lack evidence. Despite the fact that I regard those operations as forbidden and *Haram* and as closer to suicide and self-annihilation, I believe that if the one who carried it out did so subsequent to having adopted the interpretation and evidences of the scholars who allow it, and believed that it is permissible and respected the conditions and restrictions the scholars have set, I hope that they are martyrs and among the people for whom paradise and its pleasures have been promised and that Allah will forgive them *inshAllah*.

However, if they knew it is *Haram* and were convinced that the evidence to it being impermissible are the strongest or if they were in doubt and suspicion as to its permissibility, but nevertheless went ahead and carried it out -for one reason or another- then they have committed suicide and killed themselves by themselves and they are among the people for whom Hell has been promised and all the Islamic texts that are related to the punishment for suicide apply to them. Allah knows best.

This is the case if the consequences of their actions bore effects only on themselves. But if the consequences of their actions led to the killing of sacred and innocent lives without any due right, then the discussions regarding people's rights, atonements will have to be laid out. Those discussions are lengthy and can be found in the books of jurisprudence for those who wish to refer to them.

This is the verdict that I gave and will give. And our last prayer is that all praises are to Allah, Master of the worlds.

We now turn to a discussion of the evidence and arguments used by supporters of the opposing view. We will be taking each evidence and argument one at a time, seeking the support of Allah and placing our trust in Him.

3. Discussion of the evidence and arguments used by supporters of the opposing view

I have studied the evidence used by supporters of the opposing view and found that they are not more than the ones listed below:

3.1 Using the verse: *(do not take the life Allah has made sacred, except by right)*

They have claimed that one of the strongest evidence for the permissibility of Martyrdom bombings and self-annihilation for the purpose of infuriating the enemy is the saying of Allah the Most High:

﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ ذَلِكُمْ وَصَّاكُمْ بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ﴾

(Do not take the life Allah has made sacred, except by right) [Al-Anaam, 6:151]

They also quoted that Sheikh Abdul Qadir bin Abdul Aziz used to regard Martyrdom operations as impermissible because he could not find one, single definite evidence that removes it from being an act of suicide. He then reflected on it for a long time until he found the evidence for its permissibility in the above verse. At **(expect by right)**, he thought, *Jihad* against the enemy and infuriating them with losses is the rightest of rights.

In Response:

It is apparent from what has been quoted about the Sheikh is that he is in agreement with us that all the other evidence and arguments used by supporters of the opposite view - which we will come to discuss *inshAllah*- do not indicate the permissibility of those operations and do not remove it from being an act of suicide, and hence from being liable to the ruling of suicide, expect for this evidence: **(Do not take the life Allah has made sacred, except by right)**. The Sheikh is unique in having understood this verse as relevant evidence to this discussion. But is this verse really evidence for the permissibility of those operations?

The answer is no. It does not indicate the permissibility of the so-called Martyrdom operations. The reason being is that the above verse -according to the consensus of the *Mufasireen* i.e. Qur'an commentators and scholars- refers to the execution of the death *Hadd* or enacting the death sentence on whoever is Islamically guilty and deserves it, by a Muslim governor. It also refers to the permissibility of killing and fighting whoever deserves to be killed Islamically, such as enemies at war or traitors.

Furthermore, the one who is to enact the death sentence is the Muslim governor or his representatives, and the one on whom the death sentence is passed, is another individual who is guilty of a crime which is punishable by death according to the *Shariah*.

It could also be argued that killing the murderer is right, and executing the death punishment on that murderer is the rightest of rights, but nevertheless, according to the consensus of all the

scholars- it is impermissible for the murderer to kill themselves and to execute the death punishment upon themselves.

It can also be argued that such odd interpretation cannot be traced to any member of the *Salaf* or to any trustworthy contemporary scholar.

Additionally, it is not with those kinds of odd and exclusive interpretations that definite and unambiguous evidence are to be rejected, lives and souls to be destroyed and huge risks to be taken!

It is also apparent that the verse and its meanings are in one valley, and the issue that the verse is being used to support is in another valley and that they are both totally unrelated. Moreover, that the evidence used to support the opposite view and is regarded as one of the strongest evidence for their case - if not the strongest- does not even qualify as an ambiguous evidence for their case, let alone as a definite evidence for the permissibility of the so-called Martyrdom operations.

Is it logical that with such evidence -which cannot even qualify to be an ambiguous one- that authentic and definite evidence which forbid self-annihilation and regard it as a major sin are being rejected and restricted?

3.2 Using the following Verse to advocate the permissibility of so-called martyrdom operations; Allah the most High said:

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَأْكُلُوا أَمْوَالَكُم بَيْنَكُم بِالْبَاطِلِ إِلَّا أَنْ تَكُونَ تِجَارَةً عَنْ تَرَاضٍ مِنْكُمْ وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ بِكُمْ رَحِيمًا وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ غَدُونًا وظُلْمًا فَسَوْفَ نُصَلِّيهِ نَارًا وَكَانَ ذَلِكَ عَلَى اللَّهِ يَسِيرًا﴾

(You who believe, do not wrongfully consume each other's wealth but trade by 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)

[Al-Nisa, 4:29-30]

They read the verse ﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ﴾ literally as **(Do not kill yourselves)**, hence they argue that that the verse is only condemning those who kill themselves **(out of hostility and injustice)**, as for those who kill themselves for a reason that is not hostility and injustice then the promise of punishment does not apply to them and that they are in fact worthy of reward.

This is one of the weakest evidence on the issue and I did not expect that any reasonable opponent would use it as evidence for the permissibility of the so-called martyrdom or suicide operations as it does not contain any direct or indirect indication to such. In fact, the verse can be used to illustrate the impermissibility of those actions, for the following reasons:

- a) The above understanding and use of the verse was not understood by any scholar or commendable Qur'an commentator.

- b) Rather the explanations of scholars and commendable Qur'an commentators prove the total opposite of what the opponents arrived at.

For example, Ibn Jareer Al-Tabari explained in his *Tafseer*: 'The One whose praise is exalted literally says: ﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ﴾ meaning do not kill one another, as you are all on a single pathway, whose call is one and whose religion is one. The One whose praise is exalted made the people of Islam from one another. He made the killer among them the killed one too, since his killing of one of his people is regarded as killing of himself. The killer and the killed are essentially one entity against others who oppose their religious pathway. Qur'an interpreters have said the same as we did.'

He then quoted the explanations of Al-Siddi and Al-Atta' bin Abi Rabah.

He further said, 'as for the interpretation of the Most High's saying: **(If any of you does these things, out of hostility and injustice, We shall make him suffer Fire: that is easy for Allah)** interpreters have differed in explaining **(If any of you does these things, out of hostility and injustice)**, some said whoever kills themselves meaning their believing brother out of hostility and injustice, then **(We shall make him suffer Fire: that is easy for Allah)**. Others said it is aimed at whoever does any of the forbidden things mentioned from the beginning of the chapter, such as marrying forbidden next of kin, transgressing Allah's limits, consuming orphans' wealth unfairly and killing a life unjustly. Others said, that it is referring to consuming the wealth of a fellow Muslim brother or sister without their acceptance or kills them then **(We shall make him suffer Fire)**.

As for the meaning of **(out of hostility)** it means transgressing what Allah allowed to what he forbade and out of **(and injustice)** meaning doing and carrying out what Allah did not give permission to. As for **(We shall make him suffer Fire)** meaning a fire where they will be scorched and burnt.'

Despite his extensive knowledge and awareness of the interpretation of other Qur'an commentators, he did not mention anyone's interpretation that is similar to the one suggested by supporters of so-called martyrdom operations.

Most of the commentators explained the verse similarly to Ibn Jareer Al-Tabari's explanation. Ibn Kathir said: ﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ﴾ **(Do not kill yourselves)** by committing what Allah has forbidden and dealing with sins and consuming one another's wealth unjustly, as Allah has always been **(merciful to you)** in what He has commanded and forbade you.

As for **(If any of you does these things, out of hostility and injustice)** it means that whoever unjustly deals with what Allah has forbidden, knowing the impermissibility of their action but proud of their action, regardless, then **(We shall make him suffer Fire)**, this is indeed a severe threat and a certain warning. Let every wise and intelligent person who has heard this take heed of it.'

Al-Qurtubi said in his *Tafseer*: 'As for the Most High's saying ﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ﴾ **(Do not kill yourselves)** the people of *Tafseer* unanimously agreed that it means the impermissibility of people killing each other.' Hence none of them understood what the opponents understood. He further added: 'its literal meaning involves killing of oneself by being ready to kill for the sake of this world and its money, hence in doing so one arrogantly leads themselves to destruction. It is also possible that the verse means **(Do not kill**

yourselves) out of frustration and anger, this is all impermissible. Amru bin As used this verse when he refused to take a bath in cold water when he was in a state of impurity in the battle of *Dhat Al-Salasil* out of fear that it may not do him well. In response, the prophet peace be upon him consented to his objection and laughed and did not say anything.

As for **(If any of you does these things, out of hostility and injustice)** hostility is transgressing limits and injustice is placing something in its wrong place, as mentioned earlier, additionally, punishment is constricted by mention of 'hostility and injustice' to exclude those who slip or err mistakenly and unintentionally.'

Al-Shawkani said in his *Tafseer*: 'His saying ﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ﴾ meaning O Muslims do not kill one another, except by a certain reason from Shariah, or do not kill yourselves by committing sins, or it could be that the impermissibility of self-annihilation. It is possible to apply the verse to all three meanings.

As for **(If any of you does these things, out of hostility and injustice)**, hostility is exceeding limit and injustice is placing something in its wrong place. These two attributes exclude killing for the purpose of a penalty, killing the apostate, other Shariah legal penalties and killing by accident.'

Abulrahman Al-Sa'die may Allah have mercy on him said: '﴿وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ﴾ means do not kill one another, and do not kill yourselves, this includes leading oneself to destruction and doing dangerous things that lead to damage and ruin. **(If any of you does these things)** meaning consuming unlawful wealth and killing life **(out of hostility and injustice)** not out of ignorance or forgetfulness **(We shall make him suffer Fire)**.'

- c) Furthermore, the fact that Allah said **(out of hostility and injustice)** this excludes those who fall into any of those sins out of ignorance, forgetfulness or due to carrying out of a penalty of Shariah; such as killing the murderer, killing the disbelieving apostate as quoted above by Qur'an commentators. They are excluded from the threat of **(We shall make him suffer Fire)**.'

Similarly, the Mujahed who storms and braves into the lines of the enemy and looks danger in the eye for an almost certain advantage and hence gets killed as a result by the enemy, may be said to have killed themselves metaphorically because they stormed into various causes of death. Nevertheless, they are excluded from the verse because of other evidence that permit storming and braving into the lines of the enemy for a great advantage. However, this is not comparable to suicide bombings, as in the former, the individual is killed on the hand of the enemy, whereas in the latter the individual self-annihilates themselves.

- d) Self-annihilation for any purpose is killing of oneself **(out of hostility and injustice)** and hence the threat in the verse **(We shall make him suffer Fire)** as well as in other authentic evidence applies to them. The verse is clear evidence to the view that we take on this issue, i.e. that the so-called martyrdom operations are impermissible and there is no backup for the opponents in this verse.

To say that it is permissible for one to kill themselves for *Jihad* purposes because they have not done so **(out of hostility and injustice)** is like saying that one may deal in

interest, to steal and to cheat for *Jihad* purposes because they have not done so **(out of hostility and injustice)**.

If one disputes this by saying those things are inherently forbidden and no noble cause can justify them, we say the same thing for self-annihilation, it cannot be justified by a noble cause, as a legitimate and noble end does not justify wrong means.

- e) One of the dangers of suicide bombings that are so-called martyrdom operations is that they often result in the killing of so many innocent lives that are protected by the Shariah, as is witnessed and is the reality of those actions. Hence, not only does one kill themselves, but they also kill lots of innocent lives that are regarded as sacred by the Shariah. Therefore, the warning in the Most High's words, **(If any of you does these things out of hostility and injustice We shall make him suffer Fire)**.
- f) It is not on the basis of such ambiguous evidence that many lives are killed, major jurisprudential issues are formed and many unambiguous and definite evidence on the impermissibility of self-annihilation are rejected.

3.3 The Boy and the King

Supporters of the opposite view also refer to the story of the young believing boy with the tyrannical king. They argue that the boy directed the king to the only possible way in which he could kill him, which is comparable to killing oneself, hence, it is evidence to the permissibility of the so-called Martyrdom operations.

In Response:

This is one of their strongest evidence, but nevertheless, it is ambiguous in its indication of the permissibility of the so-called Martyrdom operations. Here are the reasons why:

- a) The story of the boy with the king is an exclusive and exceptional one. It has not been replicated in history. Additionally, the boy's actions were as a result of some sort of inspiration or revelation that instructed him to do such and such. I do not think that anyone – without claim to revelation- can say to a tyrannical and oppressive king, 'you have no authority over me, you cannot kill me no matter what you do and even if you bring all your soldiers against me, except through one specific way'. Surely, suicide bombings are not like this!
- b) Additionally, one of the purposes for which the boy revealed the method of killing himself to the king is to prove to the king, his consultants, ministers and people; that the king is not the Almighty Master, as he claims, and that he is completely weak and powerless, that he does not possess the ability to kill whoever he wants, despite the strength and might he has been given. Furthermore, he wanted to prove to him that souls are in the hands of their Creator and Owner, the One who gives life and death. If the king wanted to kill him, then the only way to do so is by asking the permission of the Creator, the Owner of his and others' souls. This would be sought by gathering all people in one place and saying: 'In the name of Allah, the Master of this boy' otherwise he will never be able to kill him and will have no power over him no matter how much he tries.

Such is a remarkably great and important objective, since people at that time believed that the King is their Almighty Master and that he has power over the souls of people and the ability to bring life and death upon whom he wants. Suicide bombings have no such remarkably great objectives.

- c) In addition, the way in which the boy was killed had led to the guidance of an entire nation and caused the liberation of people from the darkness of *Shirk* and worship of the tyrant into the light of living by the Oneness of Allah and worship of the Creator, may He be Exalted. The boy had been made aware of this by means of *wahi* or divine inspiration and was aware of the guaranteed great results, hence he was determined to go by the only possible way through which the king could kill him and through which all those great results, -which are incomparable to any other benefits or advantages- may be achieved. It has been authentically reported that when the boy died people said: **'We have believed in the Master of the boy, we have believed in the Master of the boy. The king was then told, 'aren't you seeing what you feared most? By Allah you have been struck with what you feared most'**. No doubt suicide bombings are nowhere near this.
- d) Furthermore, despite the Muslim Ummah being a nation of struggle and martyrdom and has fought in thousands of battles over its long and productive history, nevertheless the jurists of Islam have never concluded from the story of the boy and the king what some contemporary people have understood as evidence for the permissibility of self-annihilation for the purpose of inflicting harm on the enemy. Safety is guaranteed in following the righteous predecessors and their understanding, and not innovation, especially if such innovation is related to people's lives and honours.
- e) Having said all the above, the boy did not even kill himself in the first place, rather he was killed at the hands of the tyrannical king, whereas in suicide bombings one directly kills himself.
- f) Additionally, it cannot be said that a person who commits murder and then hands himself to an Islamic court to be sentenced to death, has killed himself by himself or that he is comparable to the one who kills himself and therefore he may kill himself by himself without even resorting to the court. The same applies in the story of the boy and the king. The fact that the boy led the king to the only way of killing him –for the above mentioned advantages- does not mean that he killed himself by himself and that his ruling is like that of the one who kills himself, as some people have understood.

From the above points, it has become apparent that the story of the boy and the king as well as its meanings and denotations are in one valley and suicide bombings are in another. The most that can be said in regards to the story is that it is undoubtedly ambiguous in its indication of the permissibility of suicide bombings. In effect, as has been mentioned earlier, ambiguous evidence cannot possibly rival, undermine, restrict or cancel the ruling that forbids suicide and forbids self-annihilation.

3.4 Comparing the killing of *Turs* i.e. hostages and human shields to self-annihilation

Supporters of the opposing view compared self-annihilation for *Jihad* advantage and its benefits to the permissibility of killing Muslim hostages or shields for *Jihad* purposes and its advantage. They argue that scholars have allowed killing of innocent Muslim hostages or shields whose life is sacred for the purpose of repelling the aggression of the enemy, and hence it is permissible for one to kill himself by himself, as is done in Martyrdom bombings, because they are both for the purpose of *Jihad* and because they are equal in lives and sacredness.

In Response:

This is a false comparison, because the compared objects are incompatible, hence it may not be used as evidence to the permissibility of suicide bombings, for the following reasons:

- a) Firstly, killing of Muslim hostages and human shields is subject to conditions and constrictions that are not non-existent in suicide bombings. Al-Qurtubie said: 'it may be permissible to kill hostages and that be indisputable *inshAllah* if the advantage in doing so is inevitably necessary, holistically needed and whose success is incontrovertibly guaranteed. By inevitably necessary, it is meant that is impossible to reach the disbelieving enemies without killing the hostages. By holistically needed, it is meant that killing of hostages is to be of benefit and advantage to the entire *Ummah* and all Muslims, in the sense that if it were not to be carried out it will lead to the disbelieving enemies taking over of the *Ummah* and killing the hostages at the same time. By success being incontrovertibly guaranteed, it is meant that the advantage in killing the hostages is undoubtedly certain'¹⁶. In addition to all this it has to be guaranteed that there is no other way to repel the enemy except through contact with the hostages. Only under such conditions and restrictions may that be permissible. Contrastively, suicide or martyrdom bombings - as can be observed- do not abide by any of those conditions or restrictions and hence it cannot be compared to the issue of killing hostages.
- b) Furthermore, hostages are killed by others not by themselves. The possibility of them being killed by others does not reckon the permissibility of them killing themselves for to prevent themselves from being used to manipulate and put pressure on the Muslims. Contrastingly, in suicide bombings, one kills themselves by themselves.
- c) Our *Ummah* which is accustomed to *Jihad* and fighting is in much need of benefiting from every juristic ruling related to *Jihad*, but nevertheless, our righteous predecessors have not arrived at such an understanding or irrational comparison of the killing of hostages to suicide bombings. This does not imply their deficiency and inability to comprehend and generate new and relevant interpretations, not at all, rather it implies the deviance and weakness of the contemporary few who adopted such understandings.
- d) As for them saying that the hostages who are killed by others and the one who kills themselves for the advantage and benefit of *Jihad* are both 'equal in lives and

¹⁶ Tafsir Al-Qurtubie, 8:563

sacredness' is in fact untrue. If they are equal in the sense that both lives are sacred, then they aren't equal in other measures and degrees. A Mujahid who fights in the fields of Jihad is not equal to the ones who stay behind, whether able or unable to take up arms and whether hostage or not. Allah the Most High said:

﴿لَا يَسْتَوِي الْقَاعِدُونَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ غَيْرُ أُولِي الضَّرَرِ وَالْمُجَاهِدُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ الْمُجَاهِدِينَ بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ عَلَى الْقَاعِدِينَ دَرَجَةً وَكُلًّا وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْحُسْنَى وَفَضَّلَ اللَّهُ الْمُجَاهِدِينَ عَلَى الْقَاعِدِينَ أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا﴾

(Those believers who stay at home, apart from those with an incapacity, are not equal to those who commit themselves and their possessions to striving in God's way. God has raised such people to a rank above those who stay at home— although He has promised all believers a good reward, those who strive are favoured with a tremendous reward above those who stay at home) [Al-Nisa, 4:95]

This verse speaks of those who stay behind for excusable reasons. As for those who stay behind for inexcusable reasons, then a Mujahid is worth a thousand of them. Allah also said:

﴿وَمَا لَكُمْ أَلَّا تُنْفِقُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَلِلَّهِ مِيرَاثُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ لَا يَسْتَوِي مِنْكُمْ مَنْ أَنْفَقَ مِنْ قَبْلِ الْفَتْحِ وَقَاتَلَ أُولَئِكَ أَعْظَمُ دَرَجَةً مَنِ الَّذِينَ أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ بَعْدُ وَقَاتَلُوا وَكُلًّا وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْحُسْنَى وَاللَّهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ خَبِيرٌ﴾

(Those who gave and fought before the triumph are not like others: they are greater in rank than those who gave and fought afterwards. But God has promised a good reward to all of them: God is fully aware of all that you do) [Al-Hadeed, 57:10]

The contrast and favouritism is made between those who gave in charity and fought before the liberation of Makkah and after its liberation. Surely the contrast is much greater between those who have never given in charity nor fought for the sake of Allah and accepted to be among those who stay behind.

3.5 Using of evidence regarding the permissibility of braving and storming into the lines of the enemy

In presenting their arguments, supporters of suicide bombings repeatedly bring up evidence on the permissibility of braving and storming into the lines of the enemy if there is an apparent gain for *Jihad* and compare that with self-annihilation in suicide bombings. Though evidence indicating the permissibility of braving into the lines of the enemy if there is an apparent gain for *Jihad* and acting upon them is true, however that is one thing and self-annihilation as in suicide bombings is another matter, the two cannot be compared to each other for several reasons as illustrated below:

- a) Firstly, that the one who braves and storms into the lines of the enemy is killed by the enemy, whereas the one who carries out a suicide attack kills himself, so the two are incomparable.

- b) Secondly, the killing of the one who braves and storms into the lines of the enemy is uncertain as many of them succeed in dispersing the enemies and achieve their target without being killed. Indeed, Islamic history of *Jihad* has many stories that prove this. On the other hand, the one who detonates and explodes themselves in suicide bombings is certainly guaranteed to self-annihilate themselves, so the two are incomparable.
- c) Thirdly, the comparison between the two is an innovatory one and our righteous predecessors did not indulge in it. One mustn't argue that this is because they didn't have explosives, as the tools of suicide are varied and numerous and are available in every era. Therefore, if it were permissible for one to kill themselves for the purpose of *Jihad*, we would have surely found a supportive saying, as they didn't leave a single matter relating to *Jihad* without discussing it and clarifying it thoroughly.

From the above, we realise that the evidence for the permissibility of braving and storming into the lines of the enemy cannot be used to prove the permissibility of self-annihilation for the purpose of *Jihad* and that it is ambiguous in its relevance to the issue at hand, to say the least, and Allah the Most High knows best.

3.6 Argument: 'the one who carries out a suicide or martyrdom attack does not do so out of despair from this life and out of desire to end any suffering that has struck them, rather they do it to cause harm to the enemy seeking martyrdom in the cause of Allah. Hence the Quranic verses and the Hadith that forbid self-annihilation apply to the former not the latter type of self-annihilation'.

In Response:

Any action of worship from which one intends to please Allah the Most High, must abide by two necessary conditions, even one of them alone does not suffice. The first is that the action must be sincere for Allah the Most High alone and secondly that it must follow the Sunnah and the rulings of Shariah as opposed to being innovatory. Whoever worships Allah with other than what He permitted and ordered, then their worship is rejected, even if it was sincere. Allah the Most High said:

﴿فَمَنْ كَانَ يَرْجُو لِقَاءَ رَبِّهِ فَلْيَعْمَلْ عَمَلًا صَالِحًا﴾

(Anyone who fears to meet his Lord should do good deeds) [Al-Kahf, 18:110], meaning that the deed should be in accordance with the Sunnah and rulings of Shariah.

﴿وَلَا يُشْرِكْ بِعِبَادَةِ رَبِّهِ أَحَدًا﴾

(and give no one a share in the worship due to his Lord) [Al-Kahf, 18:110], meaning that the good deed should be sincerely for Allah.

Allah the Most High also said:

﴿الَّذِي خَلَقَ الْمَوْتَ وَالْحَيَاةَ لِيَبْلُوَكُمْ أَيُّكُمْ أَحْسَنُ عَمَلًا وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الْعَفُورُ﴾

(Exalted is He who holds all control in His hands; who has power over all things; who created death and life to test you [people] and reveal which of you does best) [Al-Mulk, 67:2]

Scholars commented saying that 'does best' means most accurate and most sincere deeds.

Jihadi action is no exception and must abide by those two conditions and it isn't enough for the action to be sincere for Allah the Most High, as it must also be in accordance with the Sunnah and rulings of Shariah. If either of those two conditions is neglected then the action will be rejected from its doer and they will be at loss.

Abu Muhammad bin Waddah Al-Qurtubi reported that Abu Ubaidah bin Huthaifah said: 'a man came to Huthaifah bin Al-Yaman while Abu Musa Al-Asha'ri was present and said, 'If a man struck with his sword out of anger for Allah until he got killed, will he be in Paradise or Hell?', Abu Musa replied, 'in Paradise'. Huthaifah said, 'clarify from the man and explain to him properly', Abu Musa said, 'Allah be exalted, what did you say again?', the man replied, 'I said if a man struck with his sword out of anger for Allah until he got killed, will he be in Paradise or Hell?', Abu Musa replied, 'in Paradise', Huthaifah said, 'clarify from the man and explain to him properly', he repeated that three times, upon the third time, he said, 'by Allah you are not clarifying from him', he then called the man and said, 'hold on, if that man struck with his sword until it broke and did so rightly until he was killed then he is in Paradise, but if he didn't do so rightly and Allah didn't guide him to the truth then he is Hell', and then he said, 'by Allah a huge number of people will enter fire because of the issue you asked about'.¹⁷

Hasan Al-Basri commented that people have resorted to their swords in defence of innovatory matters.

3.7 Argument: 'The opinion you advocate is not for the advantage of Jihad and Mujahedeen but rather benefits their enemies'.

In Response:

What is important initially is the ruling of Shariah on the matter; whatever the ruling of Shariah is will be where advantage lies, and wherever Shariah is not abided by is where disadvantage and corruption will lie, whether we realise this or not, for **(Allah knows and you do not)** [Al-Baqara, 2:132].

Additionally, the opinion that I take in this issue is where greater benefit lie for *Jihad* and Mujahedeen; and for the status and reputation of *Jihad* as a great fundamental of Islamic principles, which I firmly believe in and are certain of. This is one of the reasons that made me discuss this matter a long time ago.

Let it be known, that we do not agree to nor accept for the youth of Tawheed –withstanding their scarceness- to be taken into the holocaust of suicide bombings. This will certainly please the enemy and it offers them the most precious act of service, without return, whether knowingly or unknowingly. Let not opponents present the issue as if there is no

¹⁷ Al-Bida' Walnahi 'Anha, Muhammad bin Waddah Al-Qurtubi.

other means for *Jihad* and reviving this duty except via this controversial and divisive matter that has divided Muslims.

How can anyone possibly presume that in sacrificing a youth from the youth of *Tawheed* and *Jihad*, knowing that his death is certain and knowing that their number does not exceed hundreds or few thousands in order to kill one individual or two or to injure a number of enemy forces whose numbers exceed hundreds of millions, that in this there is an advantage and gain for *Jihad* and *Mujahedeen*, militarily and strategically wise?

Have the youth of *Tawheed* and *Jihad*, the chosen ones of the Ummah become that cheap?

And then we ask and reiterate that the opponents to this view have legalised suicide bombings under specific conditions; that they should be exceptional operations, i.e. only resorted to in matters of absolute urgency that are imposed by necessary one-off circumstances; that the likelihood of its success is almost certain and achievable, not based on assumption. Furthermore, that the success of it should be so huge that the return of it benefits all Muslims, also that a great damage and harm is caused to the enemy and the impossibility of causing this harm except through this means. Additionally, that it does not result in the death of innocent lives who have been protected by Shariah and who don't fall under the category of hostages or *Turs*. And finally that the motivation behind that act should be that Allah's word be the highest and struggle with sincerity for that and not any other motivation.

These are the conditions of the contemporary scholars who legalise these operations. They only consent to those operations if those conditions are abided by. However, the important question is: 'do those who carry out the suicide bombings that we see, witness and hear today fulfil and respect those conditions and restrictions and how many out of all suicide bombings respect those conditions and restrictions?'

The awkward answer is that more than ninety percent of suicide attacks do not fulfil all those conditions nor abide by those restrictions. Hence, it is impermissible to attribute the permissibility of those attacks to contemporary scholars who allow those operations with the above mentioned conditions and restrictions. This is also a reason for those scholars to revise their verdicts having seen that their verdicts have been misunderstood, faultily practiced or misapplied and used by groups or individuals who don't know anything about the restrictions and conditions they put and do not care much about them, as is evident these days.

4. Important Remarks

Finally, I would like to point out a few important issues:

- 1- The so called issue of Martyrdom bombings in the way it is practiced today is regarded as a contemporary and new topic. Hence, it is subject to *ijtihad* i.e. open to sound interpretation as well as to difference among scholars. Moreover, it is of the practical matters, on which no enmity, allegiance or disloyalty should be placed, nor accusations of deviance or treachery.

- 2- My opinion in the matter is an old one and is known to the close and distanced and was published on my website more than five years ago in the book of 'Fatawa', in contrast to what certain biased and scornful media outlets have publicised; that those declarations are new alternations, shifts and hesitations. Some have also gone too far in their negative thinking and claimed that we have written the following section of this book -which was published earlier- out of fear and *taqiya* from being affected by the new British laws and legislations. They have indeed lied and wronged me. All praise to Allah, it is not for one like me to write out of fear or *taqiya* from any creation, regardless of who that creation is. In fact the first paragraph of this text above -also published earlier- is a clear refutation of their lies. They have deliberately overlooked it and made themselves blind in order for it to be easy for them to fabricate lies, allegations and create *fitnah*.

- 3- Knowledge is unbiased and is impartial and truth is dearer to us than anything else. To give it justice and favour it upon what we like and desire is a religious obligation and is a goal and an objective to the truthful believers. This teaching is regarded as a basic and commonsensical part of our *Haneef* and upright religion. We must not overlook it while we are in the heat of arguments and give blind allegiance to one person.

- 4- It is a blessing from Allah, that when I write, speak or do anything I do not consider what others want to hear, nor do I consider angry audience, the media or the oppressive tyrants or how to turn people's attention to me by saying what they desire and like at the expense of the truth. This does not come to mind and is not in my character or nature. What I really consider severely and bear in mind is 'what does my Master want from me? The most Perfect and High?', 'what brings me close to Him?' 'What pleases Him with me?' even if that were to displease the whole earth and all its inhabitants from people and Jinn.

My job and mission are to call people to Allah the Most High, to correct people if they were to become corrupt and swerved from the truth, not to complement them follow them on their falsehood and deviance or to join them in puncturing the ship if they decide to puncture it. This is a requirement of the *amanah* and trust that have been placed on our shoulders and which we will be asked about on the Day of Judgement. We ask Allah the Most High to grant us support, steadfastness and a beautiful end to our lives and to not leave us to our weak selves, even for a blink of an eye

- 5- Truth and justice are mercy for all the worlds, they are benefited from by people and Jinn, believers and disbelievers, as well as animals, insects, plants... all of those benefit from ruling by truth and justice. Hence, when disbelievers happen to benefit from a truth or justice in one way or another, that should not make us deny the truth, disbelieve in it, hide it or conceal it. Not at all. This is not from our manners; rather it is from the manners of the people of the book; the Jews and Christians, who concealed what was in their books and what Allah has sent down on their prophets of truth. The beauty of our upright religion is that it preaches justice and kindness to its followers and enemies alike, it gives what is due to its disbelieving enemies as it would to its believing followers. It even avenges disbelievers from believers, if justice required it. Allah the Most High said:

﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُونُوا قَوَّامِينَ لِلَّهِ شُهَدَاءَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَا يَجْرِمَنَّكُمْ شَنَا نُ قَوْمٍ عَلَىٰ أَلَّا تَعْدِلُوا اعْدِلُوا هُوَ أَقْرَبُ لِلتَّقْوَىٰ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ خَبِيرٌ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ﴾

(You who believe, be steadfast in your devotion to Allah and bear witness impartially: do not let hatred of others lead you away from justice, but adhere to justice, for that is closer to awareness of Allah. Be mindful of Allah: Allah is well aware of all that you do) [Al-Ma'idah, 5:8]

- 6- The people who follow their desires and innovations might pick on our words and any ambiguous statements -as they have done to many others before us- whereby they take meanings out of context for an evil intention. This however does not justify silence on our part or stopping short of speaking the truth, in fear that the people who follow their desires will take our sayings out of their real contexts, otherwise all the people of knowledge will have chosen to be silent, and knowledge or truth will not have reached us from them. The solution in this case is for people to make an effort to take information, verdicts or news from their original sources and from its people, not from the sources of the people of deviance who follow their desires. But if one insists to do otherwise then they have preferred to believe in lies and to follow the liars, and they will eventually only have themselves to blame.

Having clarified those points, our final prayers are all praise be to Allah, the Master of the worlds.¹⁸

**Abdulmonem Mustafa Halimah
'Abu Baseer Al-Tartousi'**

20.7.1426
24.08.2005

www.abubaseer.bizland.com
<http://www.altartosi.net/ar>

¹⁸ Translated by Walaa Halimah