

# Muḥammad Ḥijāb’s Horrendous Analogy in Considering Debating as the Instrument of Truth Similar to Laboratory Experiments



Mohammed Hijab @mohamme... · 13h ✓

Religious people who don't want to debate are like scientists who don't want to go to the laboratory. Perhaps the reason is psychological reassurance with a false belief may be more comforting than the painful reality of a true one. This applies to atheists too.



Imām al-Lālikāī (d. 418H) said:

“There was no crime committed against the Muslims greater than **the crime of debating the Innovators**. And they [the Innovators] did not have any subjugation and humiliation greater than that which the Salaf left them upon [in abandonment of them], left to die in their rage, in grief, till they became toothless (in old age)...” (1/19).

## INTRODUCTION

Muḥammad Hijāb continues to reveal more and more of what is in his heart, soul and mind of the khubth that he has been made to inherit through his kalām, falsafah and glorification of his 'aql.

After we discussed his errors and misguidance in the foundations of Tawḥīd, Muḥammad Hijāb used all the skills and artistry he has acquired in **drama and acting** in order to put on a great show for his audience. So far, in response to our knowledge-based replies, this online drama has included:

—Scandal mongering and trying to malign the characters of his adversaries.

—Mockery, sarcasm, name-calling.

—The use of deliberate lying and deception with the calculated aim of deceiving his followers (such as the issue of the meaning of the word منوط), because his counter-accusation and doubt was destroyed.

—Shameless and depraved use of mockery of his adversary's wife, done out of pure malice. As Muslims, we are prohibited to be unjust even against disbelievers **in actual war**. Even war does not allow you to make mockery of a disbeliever's wife, just because he is fighting against you to take your life, as this is injustice. So when this is the case, then how much more unjust is it do so when your bid'ah has been refuted by a Muslim as a means of intending goodness towards you and to relieve you from a great burden of sin?<sup>1</sup>

—Travelling to **unhappy, miserable snakes and scorpions who have been put to trial in their religion and who have grievances** in order to extract their venom so that he can broadcast

---

<sup>1</sup> And we make it clear that this injustice does not motivate us at all. These wrongs pale into insignificance compared to the wrongs that Hijāb is doing against this dīn through his innovation and misguidance.

it to his audience, all as a means of denigrating his adversaries. This, alongside mocking a person's wife when one is unable to respond academically, is not the sign of an honourable man, but a man who has no self-respect and dignity. Rather, this is the dignity of pigs, the most shameless of creatures.<sup>2</sup>

—Making bold challenges for debates to facilitate accusations of cowardice to make it appear that Hijāb is on the truth because he is allegedly invincible in debates, and this is after his misguidance and opposition to the way of the Salaf has already been made as clear as the daylight sun. He got destroyed by a Christian theologian and an atheist versed in kalām theology as we demonstrated with clear evidences in Part 8 of this series. And then this **intellectual spastic** wants to debate about the very misguidance for which evidence has been established against him through his own debates!

—And finally, he is now “referring to an expert” on these issues, after making his bold challenges for a debate. **What a strange, confused, individual.** You are challenging an adversary to a debate and then you are referring the affair to an expert?!

This is the same thing he did with that Islām-hater, **David Wood**, back in November 2018. He was messaging around asking for help from lots of people, including Shamsī. After discussing with Shamsī, I said that Hijāb is a Muslim and we should aid him against this Christian Islām-hater, and help him out in his confusion on the issue of Allāh's speech and the Qur'ān, as long as we caution him about speaking without knowledge and warn him against his superficial knowledge in these areas and that entering into these arenas is blameworthy when one is confused and unclear. So I wrote a 7 page draft document on the issue and also extracted a chapter out of my

---

<sup>2</sup> The comparison here is conceptual, in relation to dignity, not form.

book on the Ash'arīs which deals with this issue in connection to the bid'ah of Ibn Kullāb and kalām nafsī, which is used by Christians to justify their belief. I passed these materials over to Shamsī to send to Hijāb, and Shamsī also directed him to materials from Ibn Taymiyyah, but he was unable to grasp them.

So this is what Hijāb was doing then, and he is doing it now again, **running around like a headless chicken**, not knowing which direction to go in to save himself. Shall he scandalmonger? Shall he mock his adversary? Shall he now defer to an expert (in other words, throw in the towel)? Shall he abuse people's wives because he was unable to respond to them academically? What else he can do to save face and continue to play the role of a hero for his ignorant and deluded audience who, till now, have been unable to see through this performance artist, academic swindler and intellectual fraudster.

Hijāb is a **Jahm bin Ṣafwān type of character** who in is love with himself, who has self-amazment, is addicted to debate culture, and is ignorant. There is no doubt that harm is going to come from this type of individual. It is ironic that the very issue in which he was confused and feared that David Wood might use against him, the issue of Allāh's speech and will, that His speech is qadīm al-naw' and ḥādith al-āḥād, and that speech depends on Allāh's will, meaning that Allāh's act of speaking is **conditional on, determined by, results from**, His own will—as do numerous other attributes which are ṣīfāt fi'liyyah, this is the very issue he is trying to use against me as a tactical diversion away from the fact that he is upon misguidance in the foundational affairs of Tawḥīd. And in doing so, he is using the false arguments of Ibn Sīnā and the Philosophers of tarkīb and iftiqār to slander me with tajsīm, and in all of this, he is out of his depth, and has been trying to argue upon ignorance and falsehood.

So this from the most amazing of affairs and this is just a portion of what can be mentioned about his behaviour to date. **He has become a slave to his audience and his motivations, intentions are being played with it.** Deep inside, when he reads these words, he will know that they are the truth. A sign of intelligence is that when your adversary tells you the truth about yourself, no matter how bitter it is, that you accept it. Often an adversary will tell you something that your nearest friends, followers and lovers will never tell you.

## THE SUBJECT MATTER

Coming to the subject matter, then just reflect on Hijāb's statement:

**“Religious people who don't want to debate are like scientists who don't want to go to the laboratory. Perhaps the reason is psychological with a false belief may be more comforting than the painful reality of a true one. This applies to atheists too.”**

### Comments:

This statement of Hijāb is extremely bizarre and there are lots of things it contains, from them.

1. One of the effects of falsafah is that when you delve into it, you will, by default, start to acquire the poisoned, compromised way of thinking that comes with it. This is what happened to al-Ghazālī (d. 505H) and al-Rāzī (d. 606H). And unbeknown to you that poison will start to filter through into your thoughts, emotions and then to speech and outward behaviour.

2. He says: **“Religious people who don't want to debate...”** Notice how he never said “Muslims” but generalised it to include all

religious people, Jews, Christians and others. When we put this alongside Hijāb’s other remarks, such as this one:

 Twitter • 28m ^

**Mohammed Hijab**



Moreover I have never claimed to be a theologian per se. My masters degree in Islamic sciences and studies with my mashaykh (which I've done with more than one sheikh for over 6 years) is just to facilitate my politically philosophical arguments ;)

It appears that Hijāb is not that much interested in religion as much as “facilitating” his “**politically philosophical arguments**”, whatever that is supposed to mean. This means that everything is centered around debating and winning debates, and he will take from any direction, so long as it aids him in his goal.

This is what happened to the likes of **al-Jahm** and **al-Ja’d**. They absorbed the philosophy of the nations to devise and refine arguments, and this eventually led to a reframing of the Tawḥīd of the Messengers from one that is **founded upon Ulūhiyyah**, to one that is **restricted to Allāh’s existence or Lordship**. This then paved the way for the appearance of shirk in the ummah, centuries later, when the Ash‘arites, having acquired the uṣūl of the Jahmiyyah, began to incorrectly say that an ilāh is “**one that is able to create**”—and thus Tawḥīd became centered around affirming a creator for the universe and not around the truth that **none has the right to be worshipped except Allāh alone**. This is why Hijāb belittles the works of Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb on Tawḥīd. It is because he believes he and people like him are sophisticated philosophers who are much more intelligent. And this is the general perception of the people of kalām and falsafah—[whose speech does not venture any further than al-Rubūbiyyah (or Hijāb’s “necessary existence”) in their

affirmation of the first pillar of *īmān*—towards the people of the *Tawḥīd* of the Messengers. Ahl al-Sunnah see reason as a tool, an endowment by which to **understand revelation** and to use in the affairs of the world to know the beneficial and harmful, to realise benefits and ward off harms. As for the people of *kalām* and *falsafah*, they operate on their principle that reason is given precedence over revelation and is the primary source in arriving at truths and realities, and they entered this into the realm of theology and in speaking about Allāh, His existence, names and attributes.

3. This statement about “**religious people who don’t want to debate**”, then this means that truth and falsehood are determined by debate and by whoever wins the debate, not that there is a criterion of truth to which every person’s beliefs, sayings and actions are returned back to such that it is **Allāh who is al-Ḥakam** and that it is His revelation that is **al-Furqān** and that it is His Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) to which all disputes are referred back to and that it is upon the *fahm* of the *Salaf* that correct and true meanings are affirmed. And this is tremendous misguidance. This reveals the ‘**aqlānī poison**’ that Muḥammad Ḥijāb is carrying in his debate culture. This type of debating is what led to the misguidance of all the people of revealed books as is mentioned in the *Qur’ān* in that they differed after the *bayyināt* came to them. So Ḥijāb want’s to put this issue of how to arrive at the *Tawḥīd* of the Messengers to debate, despite the fact that evidence is already established that he is a misguided innovator in this field, upon the way of Ibn Sīnā, the Mu‘tazilah and al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān in his innovated, philosophical language of bodies (*ajsām*), *a’rāḍ* (accidents), *ḥawādith* (events, occurrences) and so on, **and the use of dubious, ambiguous loaded terminology** which led him to statements of disbelief and to be

confounded by Christian theologians and atheists versed in kalām theology, as we demonstrated in Part 8, lucidly.

4. In his analogy, **“Religious people who don’t want to debate are like scientists who don’t want to go to the laboratory”**, Hijāb reveals his confusion and misguidance even further.

First of all, in the worldly affairs, our understanding of the world, its workings, mechanisms, and causes and effects can be facilitated through observation, inference, deduction and the likes. So scientists go the laboratory to do experiments because that is a route to arrive at an understanding of cause-effect mechanisms to construct and validate theories and give working knowledge of creation.

So in his analogy, **religious people** are put in the same place as **scientists** and **laboratory experiments** are put in the same place as **“debate”**. In other words, no place for revelation (waḥy) here at all. In other words, just as for scientists, the scientific method is the route for gaining what they consider to be sure, certain, credible knowledge about the world, then for religious people it is “debate”—and not revelation. When the Salaf condemned disputation and its people, they were speaking about people like Hijāb. Essentially, Hijāb is just another Jahm bin Ṣafwān in approach (not in the ruling upon him, but in the approach), and likewise Bishr al-Marīsī and people like them who made the ḍīn of Allāh subject to debate and to rationalities.

The correct analogy would be to say—even though we do not agree that this type of speech should be said, but we are just showing Hijāb that even in his misguidance, he is misguided—:

**“Religious people who don’t return back to sound revelation (naql ṣaḥīḥ) with correct interpretation are like scientists who don’t want to do experiments in the laboratory.”**



And this is because the revelation not only establishes the **masāʾil** (the affairs which we must believe in) but also established the **dalāʾil** (evidences) for those affairs in the best and most precise of ways, in the simplest of ways that are grasped by people of all levels. And these are the ways regarding which the people of kalām and falsafah erred, wherein aspects of truth<sup>3</sup> are drowned by the misguidance that comes with kalām and falsafah because of its dubious, poisonous terminology. So just like a scientist must resort to experiments and interpret them correctly, then a Muslim must return to the Book and the Wisdom and interpret them correctly, upon the understanding of the Salaf. But Hijāb did not say this. He returned the affair to **jidāl**, **khuṣūmah**, **mirāʾ** and so on, which is disputation, argumentation and so on. And from the foundations of the way of the Salaf is to abandon that, just as **Imām Aḥmad** (d. 241H) (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said in the opening of Uṣūl al-Sunnah:

“The foundational principles of the Sunnah with us are:

—Holding fast to what the Companions of Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) were upon. Guiding (oneself) by them. Abandonment of innovations, for every innovation is misguidance. Abandonment of controversies and sitting with the people of desires. Abandonment of quarrelling, argumentation and controversies in the religion.”

Imām Abū ʿUthmān al-Ṣābūnī (d. 449H) (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said, describing the traits of Ahl al-Sunnah (ويتقون الجدل في أصول الدين، والخصومات فيه، ويجانبون أهل (البدع والضلالات): “And they cautiously avoid argumentation in the

---

<sup>3</sup> And some of these aspects of truth may be also indicated in the Qurʾān and the Sunnah, however they are taken off course and misdirected and completed in false ways, leading to misguidance. This is the nature of kalām and falsafah, it contains ambiguities and dubiousity, and directs to falsehood by necessity. This is why the Salaf condemned it and condemned anyone who tried to acquire his creed by way of it.

foundations of the religion, and disputations therein. They shun the people of innovation and misguidance.”

And Ibn Qudāmah (رحمه الله) said in al-Lumuʿah: (ومن السنة: هجران أهل البدع، ومباينتهم، وترك الجدل والخصومات في الدين، وترك النظر في كتب المبتدعة، والإصغاء إلي كلامهم، وكل محدثة في الدين بدعة): “And from the Sunnah is to boycott the people of innovation, and to separate from them. To abandon argumentation and disputation (with them) about the religion and to abandon looking into the books of the Innovators and listening to their words, and every introduced matter in the religion is innnovation.”

Layth bin Saʿd (رحمه الله) said: “I reached the age of 80 years and I never debated a person of desires.”<sup>4</sup>

Abu Thawr said he heard Imām al-Shāfiʿī (رحمه الله) say: “When some of the people of desires (innovations) would come to Mālik, he would say: ‘As for me, then I am upon evidence, clarity in my religion and as for you, then go to a doubting person just like you and debate him.’”<sup>5</sup>

And al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (رحمه الله) said that a man came to him and said: “O Abū Saʿīd, I want to debate you.” So al-Ḥasan said: “Be away with you, for I know my religion, and only one who is doubtful in his religion will debate you.”<sup>6</sup>

And this is what I say to Hijab who is a person of desires: As for me, I know my religion and I know the Tawḥīd of the Messengers, if you are doubtful, then go and debate another doubter just like you.

Further, to attempt to mix and confound the truth, after it has been established, by using reason and rationalities is the trait of Iblīs.

When Iblīs was commanded by Allāh, he refused by resorting to his ʿaql and the use of analogy. So he contradicted revelation through

<sup>4</sup> Al-Siyar 8/144.

<sup>5</sup> Al-Siyar 8/99.

<sup>6</sup> Sharḥ ʿUṣūl al-ʿIṭiqād (1/128).

reason and analogy as Ibn al-Qayyim explains in the course of characterising the nature of what the people of kalām and falsafah embarked upon. So what Ḥijāb has stated here is “Satanic” in the sense that he has contradicted the criterion of truth with this call to debate through rationalities. Rather, what he should have said is: **“People who refuse to return back to the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, upon the understanding of the Companions, the Salaf, are like scientists who refuse to go to the laboratory...”** even though we do not like this comparison and do not agree with these types of words, but we are just explaining what would have been more correct and just. So by returning the affair to “debate” as the determinant of truth, then Ḥijāb is effectively dismissing the Book and the Sunnah upon the way of the Salaf as the source of truth which one simply verifies, and then accepts and submits to. So one uses reason to **understand the truth stated in these sources**, and then accept and submit to it. Not that you use debating, rationalities and so on to actually determine what the truth is, because that is simply judging to people’s desires and to whoever is able to overcome the other in debate. And in any case, the truth has already been made clear in this affair, and Ḥijāb’s dishonesty is plain for everyone to observe.

5. Then Ḥijāb says: **“Perhaps the reason is psychological with a false belief may be more comforting than the painful reality of a true one.”**

After making an incorrect analogy by replacing revelation with “debate”, Ḥijāb now brings the poison of the atheists themselves, because fundamentally, he is operating from their starting point, which is to make ‘aql the foundation, to start with philosophy and so called “first principles”, this is the starting point of knowledge and truth-validation, and thus all knowledge that is held, must be subject

to scrutiny, including aqāʿid that have come through revelation. And this is how they look at people of religion, that all they have are “beliefs” and that they are scared to have their beliefs scrutinised because of psychological reasons. So religious people are deluded because they prefer to hold on to their beliefs rather than face the pain of truth. Keep in mind that this entire discussion is not even about beliefs **but about the method of acquiring knowledge of Allāh and His names and attributes**. So why would Hijāb bring this line of attack in this particular subject matter, which is the way atheists view and attack religion. It is because he shares with the atheists in making reason (ʿaql) supreme, in making his “**politically philosophical arguments**” to be the end-goal, with the study of Islāmic sciences simply a means to that end. Thus, it is all about arguments, debates, reason and so on. It is about using ʿaql to do the evaluating and not to allow the Qurʿān, Sunnah and way of the Salaf to affirm what truth is, and for which ʿaql was given in order to understand this truth and then to accept and submit to it.

This statement of Hijāb would not be made by a person who truly respects revelation and the understanding and the way of the Salaf and gives it its proper place. Look at this, he mentions “**religious people**”, then he vilifies them for “**refusing to debate**” and then he says that perhaps they are **comforted by false beliefs** and **pained by true beliefs**” which are determined through debate. No mention here of revelation as criterion. All of this seems a bit like the language of Ibn Şīnā and the Mutafalsifah, those who claim that the Prophets and Messengers told lies to their people to make them believe false things so that through these things, they could be led to moral behaviour. And that they, the Philosophers, they are the ones who verify actual truths through reason and hence they are superior to the Prophets and their sciences are superior to those of the Prophets.

This is what I alluded to earlier, that when you use toxic, poisonous goods of idolatrous nations such as the Greeks, and Hellenized Jews, Christians and Sabeans, then that is inevitably going to carry through into the way that you start to perceive the sources of truth, which in this case is the Qurʿān, Sunnah upon the fahm of the Salaf. I discussed this matter five years ago in a lengthy article: “**The Divine Attributes: The Righteous Salaf vs the Heretical Kalam Schools - Part 2**” which the reader is referred back to for more details.<sup>7</sup>

So which false beliefs do we, O Hijāb, as people who follow the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allāh, and in establishing the Tawḥīd of the Messengers and as people who follow the creed of the Salaf, **what false beliefs do we have?** Would you care to outline them for us? What have we said outside of the Book and the Sunnah and the fahm of the Salaf? Rather, we are upon the Tawḥīd of the Messengers and you are upon the Tawḥīd of the Philosophers in which Julie the Physicist becomes a Muslim for merely accepting a “necessary existence”. And you wage war against us for pointing out your misguidance, on the back of your philosophy and debate culture, and now you start using the language of atheists against us for adhering to the Qurʿān, Sunnah and the way of the Salaf? This is a sign that this person has been forsaken and abandoned and good has not been intended for him.

## Conclusion

More and more of Hijāb’s **poison, misguidance and deviation** continues to appear through his tongue and pen. And through this, the proof continues to be established upon those who follow him and his desires and who ally with him in his hate-filled war against the

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.asharis.com/creed/?uylyooo>.

People of the Sunnah. All because his faulty goods taken from the Qarmāṭī Bāṭinī Shīʿite, Ibn Sinā, were refuted and empirical evidence was provided from his debates that he was led to statements of disbelief and had to abandon his own argument when a Christian theologian ripped him apart by bringing the arguments of the Muʿtazilah to show him the contradiction in his argument, and which, because he is upon bidʿah, he would not have been able to answer except with lies or further bidʿah, or concediing to atheism. So when this affair and many others were explained in order to warn Muslims and to prevent them from being sucked into this misguidance, Ḥijāb has embarked upon a war in order to destroy his adversary by any mean possible.

What a lowly, despicable character, may Allāh protect us.

Abu Iyaad

11 Dhul-Qaʿdah 1440 / 14 July 2019 v.1.02