

[Imam Ibn Taymiyya](#) (1263 - 1328) - Hanbali jurist, famous theologian, scholar, Professor John Esposito calls him “a pious Sufi” (*Unholy War*). Here again, open ended orders still good for all times against all non-Muslims and it is not a historical account, but a religious ruling by a famous authoritative Hanbali jurist:

“Since lawful warfare is essentially jihad and since its aim is that the religion is God's entirely and God's word is uppermost, therefore according to all Muslims, those who stand in the way of this aim must be fought...”

“As for the People of the Book and the Zoroastrians, they are to be fought until they become Muslims or pay the tribute (jizya) out of hand and have been humbled. With regard to the others, the jurists differ as to the lawfulness of taking tribute from them. Most of them regard it as unlawful of taking tribute from them.” (Excerpted from Rudolph Peters, *Jihad in Classical and Modern Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener, 1996), pp. 44-54.) (Bostom)

"There is a Hadith related by a group of people which states that the Prophet said after the battle of Tabuk: 'We have returned from Jihad Asghar [lesser] to Jihad Akbar' [greater]. This hadith has no source, nobody whomsoever in the field of Islamic Knowledge has narrated it. Jihad against the disbelievers is the most noble of actions, and moreover it is the most important action for the sake of mankind." (*Al Furqan baina Auliyair Rahman wa Auliyaisy Shaitaan*, matter 44-45) From Rudolph Peters, *Jihad in Classical and Modern Islam* (Andrew Bostom [Legacy of Jihad](#))

[David Yerushalmi](#) explains how Taymiyya’s defensive jihad is cited as rationale for offensive jihad for today’s world: [Selected Classical Sources](#)

"While Ibn Taymiyya focused almost exclusively on the obligation of defensive jihad in light of the Mongol invasion of the Muslim empire, and indeed held that offensive jihad was voluntary and had no place in Shariah without the sufficient resources and order of a military campaign because arbitrary and unlawful offensive jihad would “constitute the greatest compulsion in religion” and presumably violate the Quranic prohibition against compulsion (Q. II, 257) (see Ibn Taymiyya, “Qa’ida fi Qital al-Kuffar,” in *Majmu’at Rasa’al*, ed. M. Hamid al-Fiqqi (Cairo, 1949) (Arabic), pp. 126-153), his injunction for defensive jihad as a personal obligation to fight the “false” Muslim leaders and all others who might utilize non-Shariah law to govern Dar al-Islam or otherwise allow non-acceptable worship in the realm has been the favorite source of the contemporary mujahideen for jihad against all Western interests anywhere in the Muslim world— including that part of the world once considered in the domain of Dar al-Islam such as Spain and other parts of Europe, northern and parts of sub-Saharan Africa, and large regions of Asia. (see Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyah, *Al-'Ubuliyah. Being a True Slave of Allah* (London: Ta-Ha Publishers, 1999), pp. 112-113; Ibn Taymiyya, *Ibn Taymiyya on Public and Private Law in Islam: Or Public Policy in Islamic Jurisprudence*, trans. Omar A. Farrukh (Beirut, Lebanon: Khayats, 1966), pp. 138-145; for the use of Ibn Taymiyya by modern jihad advocates, see Mary Habeck, *Knowing the Enemy* (New Haven: Yale U. Press, 2006), fn. 10 at p.182)."