

The 'Islamic State': Not in my name.

1.0. Introduction.

Early this year, Muslims in Palestine were on the receiving end of grave atrocities committed by the Israeli Government. Reports suggest that 1890 Palestinians died, of which 414 were children. In contrast, only 66 Israelis died, of which 64 were soldiers. On the 30th July, Muslim civilians took shelter in a UN school. This was bombed by the Israelis and 19 Muslims lost their lives.

Not far away, Muslims in Iraq and Syria too were victims of severe atrocities but this time the perpetrators were not Israelis, but supposed Muslims. We have witnessed beheadings, crucifixions, stonings, rape, human slavery, massacres, burying victims alive and religious cleansing. In all, there seems to be no difference between Muslims and non-Muslims. Perhaps worse still, it is reported that approximately 500 British Muslims – men and women – made the journey to the region to participate in these brutalities.

This paper will look at the evil force behind this, the Islamic State. In particular, it will look at the root cause of this *fitna*. My aim is **not** to dwell on the brutal violence and corruption they have committed. This is evident to all and one only needs to watch the news to realise this. My aim is to analyse where and why this group has come about and importantly, how can we stop them from growing and spreading. In order to do that, we have to step back and analyse the historical context of this group.

2.0. A brief introduction to the Islamic State.

Islamic State is an ultra radical Islamist group that has seized large areas of Eastern Syria and Western Iraq. Led by Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the group aims to establish a caliphate throughout the Middle East, under one leader.

In its current form, the formation of this terrorist group can be traced back to 2002. In 2006, it changed its name to the Islamic State of Iraq (ISI). More recently, ISI rebranded itself to Islamic State in Iraq and Sham (ISIS). This itself was an indication that it saw its mission as truly global. In the last few months, it has once again changed its name to the Islamic State.

We only refer to this brutal group as the Islamic State here in this paper for identification purposes. Otherwise, they certainly do not deserve the title 'Islamic'. If anything, the name 'Satanic State' would be more appropriate. In their approach, *Aqidah* and actions, they have disowned the teachings of the Mercy of Mankind, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. They resemble the *Kharijis* not the *Ahl al-Sunna wa'l Jama'at*.

3.0. The historical context.

3.1. Introduction.

To begin then, I will take a step back and look at the historical context. In the Holy Qur'an, Allah tells us the stories of many communities that lived before us. He has done this because it helps us learn lessons from our predecessors and for us to take heed.

In order to understand the current *fitna* in the form of the Islamic State, it is imperative that one looks at the historical context of how and where it developed from. Only then can appreciate what the cause is and how to cure it. The sole purpose of this historical context is to show **that the Islamic State is the child of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab al-Najdi who lived two hundred years earlier.**

3.2. Who was Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab?

Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab (1703-1792) was the founder of a creed that we call Wahhabism today. Born in Najd, Abd al-Wahhab believed that the mainstream Muslims had strayed from the right path and introduced what he saw was a purer, form of religion.

Even in his youth, his extremism was spotted and his own father and brother warned others about him, the latter actually writing a book against his radical beliefs. He travelled widely to places like Basra, Baghdad, Damascus, Iran and India and eventually returned to his homeland of Najd.

In 1737, he began to propagate his puritan beliefs, and wrote a book called *Kitab al-Tawhid*. He blamed the bad state of the (Sunni) Ottoman Empire on the fact that they had turned away from *Tawhid* and had given too much attention to Sufism. He condemned visiting shrines, showing any respect for the dead and commemorating the *Mawlid*. He also forbade any type of intercessory, especially in the form of the *Wasila* of the Prophet (peace and blessing of Allah be upon him). In fact, he discouraged people sending *Salawat* upon the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) and told Hajjis that their Hajj was solely in Makka and there was no purpose in visiting Madina. He gave grave importance to the ritual, and deemed one who does not perform Salah a non-believer. He broke with the established past when he denounced the four *Madhhabs*, though his followers claim they follow the Hanbali school of thought.

When people accepted his version of Islam, he instructed them to read the *Kalima* again, because they were *Mushriks* up until that point. This part is crucial; it meant that if people did not accept his version, it was now permissible to kill them, violate their women and confiscate their property.

In 1744, Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab had to flee his hometown because of animosity towards him and so he took refuge in the village of Dariyah, which at the time was ruled by a local rebel called Muhammad Ibn Saud.

Both shared mistrust for the Ottomans, but more importantly they realised they could achieve power if they worked together. Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab became the religious authority whereas Muhammad ibn Saud was the political leader. They cemented this relationship through marriage and agreed that power should be inherited exclusively by their descendants. To this day, this agreement is in tact. Only Ibn Saud's descendants have ever been king and every minster of

religion in Saudi has come from the al-Sheikh family, which traces back to Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab.

Bit by bit they began to conquer the Arab Peninsula and by 1788, they controlled most of the region. They did this via brute force, violence and bloodshed. Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab convinced his people that this was justified, because it was Jihad.

They attacked Karbala in 1801/1802. They killed civilians in the markets and homes and then destroyed the dome that was over the shrine of al-Husayn (may Allah be pleased with him). Anything of precious value there was also looted. The following year, they looted Ta'if and caused immense bloodshed there too. Between 1806-1811, they took control of Makka and Madina and tried to destroy the Prophet's resting place. They did succeed in looting the mosque however, depriving it of treasures that had been there for a thousand years.

In the wider world, another important episode was unraveling itself during the time of this dual power partnership between Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and Muhammad Ibn Saud. In 1755, Britain tried to invade Kuwait, a region it wanted to cement its trade route to India. Twenty years later, they tried again but they were defeated by the Sunni Ottomans. In 1787, Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab declared himself as the leader of the world wide Ummah. He also declared war against the Mushrik Ottomans too. In order to do this, he sided with the British to try and conquer Kuwait from the Ottomans. So perversely, he sought help from the non-Muslims to fight Jihad against Muslims. Even when British interest extended to Oman, UAE and Yemen, the Wahhabis turned a blind eye. They instead continued to fight the Muslim Ottomans! One can appreciate from this that the Saudi-British relationship is a historic one. Many observers believe that the USA and the UK only side with the Saudi Government because of oil. This is not the case; the British had good diplomatic and political relations with the Saudis well before the discovery of oil.

Eventually, the Ottomans, inspired by the Sufis, reacted and succeeded in defeating the Wahhabis in the Saudi Peninsula. This was in 1818. Academically speaking, the next 80 years produced countless anti-Wahhabi literature against the Muslims. Ala Hazrat was one such product.

3.3. The revival of Wahhabism in the 20th Century.

I will not tell the full history of the movement, but it is important I share what happened in the twentieth century, which witnessed the revival of Wahhabism in the Saudi Peninsula.

After the original success in taking over the Saudi Peninsula under the partnership of Ibn Saud and Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, the Wahhabi movement was defeated by the Ottomans. It was revived in the twentieth century, as the Ottoman Empire weakened amidst the beginning of the First World War.

It was Abd al-Aziz who started this second revival. When it came to the religious base, he once again saw benefits in siding with the Wahhabi-Hanbali belief that

had been so instrumental for his forefathers too. Like Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab before him, he used marriage to strengthen his ties with Wahhabism; he did this by marrying the daughter of Shaykh Abdullah ibn Latif, the chief Wahhabi scholar of the time.

This marriage of convenience helped the Wahhabi scholars across the land to get behind Abd al-Aziz. They gave their support to King Abd al-Aziz and praised him in public. This was just the beginning however. The scholars actively promoted the idea of Jihad too. Not the real Jihad; the Jihad that meant fighting anyone who opposed the King. The King didn't just want control over the Saudi Peninsula though, he wanted it beyond that too. He needed manpower and that meant keeping the Bedouins in the surrounding regions happy.

So from 1912, different projects were initiated by the King to keep them happy such as housing, sanitation projects and jobs. Central religious leaders called *Mutawwabs* were sent there too to teach them Wahhabism to ensure he had religious control over them too.

The King needed them solely to wage his wars. For that reason he told the *Mutawwabs* to keep the following themes in high priority (i) *Takfir* (ii) Jihad (iii) *Wala* (iv) *Bara* (v) martyrdom (vi) hell fire for the one who flees from fighting Hence, the Shias became infidels. The Ottomans too, who were traditional Sunnis, were branded infidels and in fact waging Jihad against them too was obligatory.

The Bedouins formed an association called the Ikhwan. They were strong and reliable. The King funded them lavishly and only wanted one thing in return; that they must be prepared to fight immediately if required.

At first, the relationship between Ikhwan and the King was a fruitful and successful one. But over time, Ikhwan grew and grew in confidence. They became arrogant. They considered themselves as the true custodians of the state and morality. As their political and military power grew, they abused such powers too.

Moreover, the Ikhwan took Wahhabism to its most literal reading. They punished those who came late for prayer, smoking, singing, beard shaving with lashing, beating and prison. Some were given the death penalty and their properties were seized as booty.

Abd al-Aziz noticed their heavy handedness and their growing arrogance. They began making decision based on Shariah rulings without consenting the King. They began questioning the political policies of the King, and opposed modernity that was now sweeping the region. They questioned modern inventions such as the telegraph, telephones, cars, cycles and even clocks. In particular, they questioned the geo-political borders. They did not believe their reign was over the Saudi state alone, and this is why they waged Jihad against Southern Iraq, Kuwait and Jordan, imposing a *Jizya* on those they conquered and looting them without permission of the King. In particular, the King frowned on them touching Kuwait, which was ruled by the British. He simply did not want the British to be upset with him. Eventually, they began to turn on the King too, and abused those who paid homage to him.

One can appreciate from this that two forms of Wahhabism emerged; the old Wahhabism loyal to the King and the new, more extreme version that was quite primitive. Both were wrong.

How did the King go about his business with dealing with the Ikhwan who were growing out of control? Through his Wahhabi scholars. Remember the Wahhabi scholars made allegiance to the King their utmost priority. So they declared that only their central scholars, who were true to the teachings of Abd al-Wahhab would be allowed to shape Shariah and offer Fatwas. No one else would be allowed to.

They sought to protect the king by saying that backbiting (against the King) is Haram. They also reminded them of their origins of being backward, ignorant Bedouins and that it was the King who gave them education and prosperity. This was the mood between 1919-1920. In fact, this went to the extent that the central Wahhabi scholars declared the Ikhwan as infidels and declared Jihad against them.

How did Ikhwan react? Did they succumb to the King and the Wahhabi scholars? No, they reminded their subjects that the King was becoming too modern and that he was communicating with the foreign infidels. The battle of Sabilla took place in 1929 where the Ikhwan were defeated by the Saudi state, helped by the British.

3.4. What this episode show?

- a. Wahhabism is really a political sect. It has merely used religion to justify its existence and control over people.
- b. Frictions and arguments between the old and new was really about power and control.
- c. Like Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab before, the Saudis never hesitated to forge alliances with the British.

4.0 Islamic terrorism since then.

Ever since then, Wahhabism has been caught in this pattern; the appearance of different versions of Wahhabism.

- a. In the mid 60s, some descendants of the original Ikhwan emerged and formed a group called **al-Jama'a al-Salafiyya al-Muhtasiba**. Ibn Baaz was the lead. They opposed modernity and wanted a return to the pure form of Wahhabism. In the early 1960s, they began to tear down any picture and photograph in public places in Madina. When they smashed a shop window that had female mannequins in Madina, some of the members were arrested. This fuelled their supporters' rage. Their acts attracted support from hardliner Wahhabis and soon had a following in Makka, Madina, Riyadh, Jedda, Taif and Dammam. All were young men and all showed their discontent to the State by refusing to take government positions for employment. All were inspired by Albani and he often delivered lectures for them. Thanks to his rejection of the *Madhhab* system, this

group set up new practices like performing Salah with shoes on. One key member of this group was Juhayman al-Otaybi.

b. One of the most serious offshoots of Wahhabism was seen by the whole world with the attack of the Grand Mosque in Makka in November 1979, led by **Juhayman al-Otaybi**.

Juhayman was venting his frustration at the Saudi state for being corrupt, wasteful and too western. He was arrested for inciting hatred against the King. Whilst in prison he met Muhammad Abdullah Qahtani, who told him that he had a dream that he was the Mahdi. Hence he saw his job was to create a state based on pure Islamic rule, in preparation for the end of the world.

They drew support from many Saudi academics and frustrated army representatives. Rich Saudi individuals began to fund them and before long, they were prepared to attack. They managed to smuggle weapons, ammunitions and gas masks into the Haram weeks before the Mosque as some army guards allowed them to.

On the 20th November 1979, they stormed the mosque and locked all the gates. They released most of the Muslims but kept many hostages too. The Saudi police thought little of the situation at first and tried to recapture the Haram. They were shot down. The battle took more than two weeks to control, by which time 255 pilgrims, troops and insurgents were killed, and 560 were injured. They were 127 military casualties.

Juhayman and 67 others were captured, tried and publicly beheaded.

Importantly, who was Juhayman's teacher? Shaykh Abd al-Aziz ibn Baaz, who went on to become the Grand Shaykh of Saudi Arabia! The secret police had arrested Qahtani months before the attack. But he was released at the request of Ibn Baaz personally.

We have seen how Wahhabis were quick to judge others as non-Muslims. This group violated the sanctity of the Haram and killed Hajis, yet Ibn Baaz was sympathetic towards them and never deemed them as non-Muslims. But when a Muslim merely visits a shrine, he becomes a Kafir.

It is no surprise that Juhayman's writings and teachings became the focal point and source of inspiration for al-Qaeda and more recently, the Islamic State.

c. After the Iraq-Kuwait war in the 1990s, a group called **Sahwa** emerged in Saudi Arabia, made up of imams and clerics who led protests against the way the King sided with the west. In July 1992, 108 senior clerics, imams, professors and so on signed a memorandum demanding that the Saudi state returns to the real Wahhabism. This formed the intellectual basis for al-Qaeda and the Islamic State. Needless to say, the original teachings of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab also formed the basis.

d. **Al-Qaeda**.

This was formed in the late 1980s by Osama ibn Laden during the backdrop of the Afghan-Soviet war. In February 1989, Osama ibn Laden returned to Saudi Arabia and not long after (August 1990), Iraq invaded Kuwait. Osama offered his services to King Fahd to protect Saudi Arabia in case of any invasion through the means of his Mujahidin. King Fahd refused and instead asked the West to protect

him. Osama was enraged. He was furious that the King had allowed non-Muslims to occupy the sacred lands. He vented his anger very publicly and as a result, he was banished and forced to live in Sudan. His Saudi citizenship was revoked and they put pressure on his family to cut off his \$7m a year they gave him.

Thereafter his primary source of funding was secret donations from wealthy individuals in Saudi Arabia.

In 1998, Osama and Ayman al-Zawahiri authored a fatwa calling on Muslims to kill Americans and their allies where they can, when they can. In 1993, they used a truck bomb to try to destroy the World Trade Center in New York. 300 died in attacks on American Embassies in East Africa in 1998. They were also blamed for 9/11 and 7/7 too.

e. **The Islamic State.**

This is basically a splinter group. Like in the past Wahhabism has been subject to division (not because of theological differences but money, wealth and power), the Islamic State is the latest.

In the early 2000s **Jama'at al-Tawhid wa al-Jihad** was formed. The leader then was the Jordanian militant Abu Musab al-Zarqawi who swore allegiance to Osama bin Laden. He was against western involvement in the Middle East. In 2003-2004, Iraq was invaded by the USA and Saddam Hussain was captured and killed.

It was at this time that the name of the group then changed to **Tanzim Qa'idat al-Jihad fi Bilaad al-Rafidayn**, or al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI). Their violent nature alienated many Iraqis. Al-Zarqawi was killed in 2006. But his mission lived on when a new group was formed called Islamic State of Iraq (ISI). In 2006, AQI merged with several other insurgent groups, and called themselves **Mujihidin Shura Council**.

The early days were difficult. The US bribed and formed coalitions with local Sunnis to try and oust them from Iraq and so they did not really get a foothold on the region.

Then came the Arab Spring uprisings in 2011-13, which led to heavy violence in Syria. ISI now led by Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, supported Syria's opposition by helping the al-Nusra Front (al-Qaeda's presence in Syria) and sending cash and fighters. Their brutal tactics were condemned by rebels. Al-Qaeda also disowned it. ISI rebranded itself to Islamic State in Iraq and Sham (ISIS). This itself was an indication that it saw its mission as truly global.

Meanwhile, back in Iraq, US troops began to withdraw. Hence, ISIS violence there (against all Muslims) grew.

By 2014, ISIS were many crucial gains in western Iraq and advanced north and east. In June they conquered Mosul, Iraq's second city.

5.0. Why is the Islamic State allowed to flourish?

5.1. Money.

They are being heavily funded by the Gulf States. Qatar has allegedly been providing military and economic support to al-Qaida groups in Syria. The same applies to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

In Mosul in June (11th June), ISIS attacked the city, made 500,000 residents flee the place, freed many prisoners, performed mass beheadings and robbed Mosul's central bank. They made off with \$425 million, making them the richest terrorist group ever.

The group themselves claim to have funds close to \$2bn. This money is being used to create an army of highly paid mercenaries.

5.2. The existence of sympathisers.

Though officially they deny it, many Saudis are happy with the actions of the Islamic State because they agree with it.

-They are happy to see shrines being leveled to the ground. Theologically speaking, they agree with this.

-They are happy to see the mass persecution of Shias in Syria and Iraq. The Saudis have a long history of sheer hatred for the Shias.

-They are secretly fed up of the Saudi regime, who claim to be religious on the one hand and extremely corrupt on the other. In particular, they hate the close relation the Saudi state enjoys with the USA and the UK.

6.0. What are the common themes in all of these groups with Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab?

1. All of them use **Takfir** as their main way of justifying violence. Once a person or group is branded as polytheists, then for them this means it is permissible to kill them, loot their property and possession, violate the chastity of the women and persecute their subjects. Who started this tactic? Muhammad ibn Abdu al-Wahhab.

2. All of them perpetuate barbaric, inhumane acts of **violence**. Moreover, they do not differentiate between Muslims and non-Muslims. Juhayman killed Hajis in the Haram, in the month of Muharram. Boko Haram kidnapped 276 female pupils from a school in April 2014. They have killed approximately 2000 civilians this year alone. The Islamic State has performed public executions for the world to see.

Where do they all take their inspiration from? Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab. He killed a Muezzin who read *Salawat* upon the Prophet (peace be upon him) before the Azan. On the occasion of Fath Makka, the Prophet (peace be upon him) told the Makkans that they would be safe if they entered their homes and closed their door. In 1803, the Wahhabis looted Ta'if. The inhabitants asked for a truce (*Aman*) and entered their homes. But the Wahhabis did not give it. Instead, they killed every woman, man and child they saw, even babies in cradles. The streets were filled with blood.

3. All of them talk about the centrality of **Jihad**. In fact most of these groups have the word Jihad in their names, like Boko Haram, whose full name is Jama'at Ahl al-Sunna li al-Da'wa wa al-Jihad. Then we have the Mujahidin Shura Council, which formed after al-Qaeda in Iraq whose full name was Tanzim Qa'idat al-Jihad fi Bilaad al-Rafidayn. Whose Sunna is this? Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab. He is the one who said fighting the Muslim, Sunni Ottomans is Jihad.

4. All of them appeal to the Muslim masses by carefully highlighting known, undeniable **religious themes**. They have used this to try and religiously justify their brutal tactics.

i. Juhayman's brother law claimed he was the Mahdi. They carefully chose the day to attack the Haram in Makka, the first day of the New Year and century (1400), so to comply with the hadith literature on Imam Mahdi.

ii. Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi has talked about the Islamic Caliphate. In order to support his claim, he has tried to show he belongs to the Quraysh tribe, which is an essential prerequisite for the post.

iii. The black flag is deliberate. Again, it is appealing to known, religious themes to show their legitimacy. They quote the hadith from *Sunan Ibn Maja* where Thawban reported:

Three men will be killed at the place where your treasure is. Each of them will be a son of a Khalifa, and none of them will get hold of the treasure. Then black banners will come out of the east...If you see him, go and give him your allegiance, even if you have to crawl over ice, because he is the Caliph of Allah, the Mahdi.

iv. Where did this trend start from? Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab. He basically appealed to the most primary Islamic theme, that of *Tawhid*.

5. All of these groups suffered from **internal tensions** mainly because of ego and wealth. The tension between al-Qaeda and the Islamic State is purely because of land. Al-Qaeda does not want the Islamic State to take credit for what they see as their efforts and work. In Syria, al-Qaeda had its own group called al-Nusra. Al-Baghdadi wanted ISIS to merge with them there, but the al-Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri rejected this move. He wants ISIS to focus on Iraq and leave al-Nusra for Syria. In simple terms, al-Qaeda did not want al-Baghdadi to take credit for the 'hard work' they had been doing in Syria.

The same applies with Boko Haram in Nigeria. They are theologically and practically the same as the Islamic State. Have they accepted the caliphate of theirs? No, they have declared their own caliphate. It shows that this is about ego, control, fame and wealth and not about religion.

6. All of them claim they are returning to the time of the **Salaf**. But the problem is that here Salaf does not mean returning to the time of the Prophet, peace be upon him. It means going back to the teachings of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab! Rather than returning to Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, they should be returning to Sayyiduna Muhammad ibn Abd Allah, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him.

7. All of them are destroying the shrines and other important, historical places. Whose precedent is this? Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab. Look at what the Wahhabis have done to Jannat al-Baqi, to the grave of Sayyida Aamina and what they threaten to do to the Green Dome.

In simple terms, a good man equals good children. An evil man equals evil children. All these terrorists are the children of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab.

7.0. Concluding remarks.

1. Guilt is a part of *Iman*. When a person commits a sin, then showing guilt is actually an expression of faith. Why? Because the person feels that he has done something that contravenes the teachings of His Creator, the One who has the power to punish.

The problem is that the Islamic State commits the worse possible crimes and show no guilt and remorse for it. Killing is not funny. It is not entertainment. And because they show no visible sign of guilt, it means they have no visible sign of *Iman*.

Are the Islamic State Islamic? They have destroyed the shrines of prophets and saints. They have ignored the Sunna of the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) by refusing to give amnesty to those who request it. They are brutally murdering innocent civilians. And then they expect Muslims to accept their caliphate.

2. To solve the problem of the Islamic State, tackle the root not the leaves. President Obama cannot expect to send troops and resolve the situation. It will not work. If he wants this to end, he has to find ways to tackle the root cause, which is Wahhabism. They dare not take this route because they do not want to pay the market price for oil. They want the discounted price from Saudi Arabia.

3. Nothing good has ever emerged from Najd. No major scholar has ever emerged from this region. The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) never prayed for the region. Musaylma al-Kazzab emerged from Najd. And of course, Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab Najdi was from Najd too.

8.0. We have identified the problem with the Islamic State: how can we solve it?

a. We need to be **more vocal**. We need to make sure no one equates violence with Islam. Unfortunately, we have not done this properly. When 7/7 happened, the government held countless anti-extremist meetings. Where were the Sunnis? At home. The Wahhabis were packing these meetings and telling government ministers that 'no, we are against violence' when they were the key perpetrators. Additionally, they did not convince civil servants that Wahhabism was the problem. They told them British and American foreign policy was to blame, especially in Israel and Palestine. Since then, all Islamic extremism has had a convenient scapegoat in Israel. Yes, they are the problem and there is no doubt in this. But these Wahhabis were killing in the name of Allah even before Israel existed. What was the justification then?

We the Sunnis have not stood up to Wahhabism. Instead **we are fighting internally**. We *are* Islam. We are the only ones who represent the true face of it.

c. Reclaim the **Sunni banner**. Right now the terrorists are calling themselves Sunnis. Even Boko Haram call themselves Sunni (Their full title is Jama'at Ahl al-Sunna li al-Da'wa wa al-Jihad)

Don't call yourself Barelwi. If anyone asks what does Barelwi means, tell them it means anti-Wahhabi. First and foremost, claim the title of Sunnism once more. If we do not use this title, then our enemies will. The more we use Barelwism, the more people will think this is a minority sect. Barelwism is not a sect; it is the majority.

Dr. Hafiz Ather Hussain al-Azhari @hafiz_ather

BA Principles of Theology, al-Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt.

MA Arabic and Islamic Studies, Dar al-Ulum Muhammadia Ghawsia, Bhera, Pakistan.

BA Political Science, MPhil Theology & PhD Theology, University of Birmingham.