

Muḥammad Ḥijāb, Debate Culture, Resorting to ‘Aql and Qiyās, Sanctity of the Dīn and Imām Mālik (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) as an “Intellectual Coward” upon Ḥijāb’s Secular Standards

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



Mohammed Hijab @mohamme... · 14h ✓

The hallmark of intellectual cowards is a non-willingness to challenge their ideas through debate.



In this article we present a quote from Imām al-Dhahabī’s Siyar regarding **organised kalām debates** that used to take place in **4th century ‘Irāq** and relate them to what takes place today. Likewise, we present numerous statements from Imām Mālik (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) to indicate that upon Ḥijāb’s secular standards, Imām Mālik—and in fact the rest of the Salaf pretty much—were **intellectual cowards**. Through this it will become more and more clear that Ḥijāb is a misguided innovator into whose heart, soul and mind, the shayāṭīn freely whisper, goading him on in his **deluded self-amazement** and **arrogance**. This is because he does not venerate the Tawḥīd of the Messengers as he ought to—because he is upon the Tawḥīd of the Mutakallimīn

which neglects Ulūhiyyah—and such a person, when this Tawhīd is deficient in a person’s heart—and which would otherwise make the heart be humble and submissive in ūbūdiyyah to Allāh—then it allows the diseases of the heart, such as **kibr** (rejecting truth and belittling people), **self-amazement**, and **narcissistic memes of self-love** to grow and take root, until a man begins to live in his dreams, thinking they are actual and real and that reality itself is the actual dream. And this is the situation of Hijāb.

ORGANISED INTER-RELIGIOUS KALĀM DEBATES

Imām al-Dhahabī relates in al-Siyar:

قال عبدُ اللهِ بنُ الوليد : سمعتُ أبا محمد بن أبي زيد يسأل ابنَ سَعْدِي
لما جاء من الشرق : أحضرت مجالس الكلام ؟ قال : مرتين ولم أعد ،
فأول مجلس جمعوا الفرق من السنة والمبتدعة واليهود والنصارى والمجوس
والدهرية ، ولكل فرقة رئيس يتكلم وينصر مذهبه ، فإذا جاء رئيس الكل
له ، فيقول واحد : تناظروا ولا يحتج أحد بكتابه ، ولا بنبيه ، فإننا لا نصدِّق
بذلك ولا نُقرُّ به . بل هاتوا العَقْل والقياس ، فلما سمعتُ هذا لم أَعُد ، ثم
قيل لي : ها هنا مجلسٌ آخر للكلام ، فذهبتُ فوجدتهم على مثل سيرة
أصحابهم سواء ، فجعل ابنُ أبي زيد يتعجَّب ، وقال : ذهبَت العلماء ،
وذهبَت حُرمةُ الدين .

ʿAbd Allāh bin al-Walīd said: “I heard Abā Muḥammad bin Abī Zayd asking Ibn Saʿdī, when he came from the east: ‘Have you attended the gatherings of kalām [debates]?’ He said: ‘Twice, but I never went back. In the first gathering they gathered the sects of **the**

Sunnah, the Innovators, the Jews, Christians, Magians and Atheists. Every group had a leader who would speak and support his religious doctrine. When any leader came, everybody stood for him and a person would say: **'Debate, but none of you can use his [religious] book as proof, and nor his prophet, because we do not believe in that, nor do we affirm it. Rather, bring reason ('aql) and analogy (qiyās).'**' So when I heard this I did not go back. Then it was said to me: There is another gathering for kalām. So I went and found them upon the very same way as their associates.' So Ibn Abī Zayd became surprised and said: 'The scholars have gone and the sanctity of the religion has gone.'"¹

And from this, numerous points of benefit can be taken.

Comments:

1. In Parts 1-12 of our series on this ignorant, arrogant pseudo-philosopher, drama-queen and actor known as Muḥammad Ḥijab we provided indisputable, empirical evidence that he is a caller to that misguidance against which the Salaf **raised their heads, screamed aloud with their voices and sharpened their pens**, in order to expose, refute and warn against it because of their long foresight that the end result of this kalām and falsafah would be the undermining of Tawḥīd and opening the doors for pure atheism. This is what took place a few centuries later. Ḥijāb has inherited these toxic goods because of his love for recognition and fame, exactly as Imām al-Lālikā'ī (d. 418H) explained in the introduction to his work, that those who loved fame and loved debating, they were the ones who were drawn to this kalām, because they saw within it an opportunity to realise their desires. Ḥijāb has fallen into what the Salaf feared, and

¹ Al-Siyar of al-Dhahabī (16/251-252).

this is apparent from him, in his speech and behaviour. We have proved this with indisputable empirical evidence. He can only affirm a wujūd muṭlaq for his “necessary existence” and because he uses dubious, ambiguous terminology therein, he is subsequently unable to distinguish the creator from the creation and crumbles when faced with doubts from Christian theologians or atheists well versed in kalām philosophy. Further, he treats affirmation of a “necessary existence” to constitute Islām, which is misguidance greater than that of al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān whose mental spasticity did not even reach the level that Ḥijāb’s has reached. And if Ḥijāb then adds some attributes to this “necessary existence”, such as being one and independent, then it does not take him past Rubūbiyyah, which is still not sufficient for Islām. And this innovated kalām led its people to neglect the affair of Ulūhiyyah, and this paved the way for shirk to appear in the ummah thereafter.

2. In the above narration, Ibn Saʿdī mentions how these kalām gatherings were based upon ʿaql (reason, rationalities) and qiyās (analogies). This was because each party rejects every other party’s book and prophet, and hence they had to use logic, philosophy, rhetoric and so on, in order to overwhelm and defeat their opponents. This type of affair appeared and became widespread because the true scholars had gone or dwindled and the sanctity of the Qurʾān, Sunnah and way of the Salaf had been removed from people’s hearts. Effectively, people’s hearts inclined away from learning and acting, away from seeking knowledge. Instead, they found relief and entertainment in attending and observing these debates, which became spectacles and shows.

3. This is the very same thing which is happening today on a larger, and more easily accessible scale with the Internet and social media and which has put millions to trial in their dīn. This is because with the barriers to communication and broadcasting gone, **every person with desires and ambitions can come along and raise himself as a scholar**, as a personality and use ways and means that will earn him followers, subscribers and lovers. When such ambitious people observe that the people have turned away from knowledge—because its path is hard and tiring—and observes that their hearts are empty and yearning for something easier and less burdensome than Sharīʿah knowledge, they saw an opportunity to build audiences from this pool of people, millions of them, from all sorts of sects, backgrounds and orientations. And this is where people like Hijāb come on the scene, to give such audiences entertainment, feel-good factors, and outlets for their cheap and worthless opinions on social media platforms. Once, they have received their entertainment, then these people can move on and continue playing Grand Theft Auto, or listening to rap, or watching their favourite sports, or catching up on the latest soap or movie. So these are the types that become attracted to these types of outlets. These are the same types that Dajjāl will lure, and of course his lying, deception, trickery will be on an altogether different level.

The debate culture and what it brings of commotion and drama is one such means that is used for building audiences, filling empty hearts and triggering dopamine releases.

Imām Mālik (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said: **“The reports (āthār) do not diminish among a people, except that desires (ahwāʾ) emerge from them.”**² The āthār comprise the transmitted knowledge from the

² Al-Harawī in Dhamm al-Kalām (no. 869).

Prophet and his companions. Desires refer to innovations. This is because in the absence of revealed knowledge, then people are left to their own opinions, views, rationalities and so on and hence the criterion of truth is no longer the Qur’ān, Sunnah upon the understanding of the Salaf, but whoever won the debate, or got the upperhand, and was able to belittle his opponent more effectively.

4. In these types of debates, the aim is to win through the use of logic, philosophy and rhetoric and the better debate skills a person has, the more likely he will appear to overwhelm his opponent, even if his opponent has more knowledge and is upon the truth. This fact was recognised by the Salaf, and from them was Imām Mālik (رحمته الله), and it was mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) and others. For knowledge and truth is one thing and debating is another thing.

5. So then it just becomes a matter of who is most skilled in debating and in this respect Imām Mālik said: “[Is it the case that] every time a man comes to us who is better in debating than another man, wanting us to reject what Jibrīl brought to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) [that we should do so]?”³ Mālik used to refuse debates when the people of desires would come to him, as we find in some narrations and would say to people: “I am upon clear evidence from my Lord, I am not in doubt about my religion” and “You are a doubter, so go and debate a doubter like yourself” and words to this effect.

And Ibn Taymiyyah speaks about the Salaf prohibiting debate with Innovators and mentions types of people:⁴

³ Kitāb al-Īmān of Ibn Baṭṭāh (no. 582).

⁴ Refer to Dar’ al-Ta’āruḍ (7/174).

a) **The Sophist**, and that is the one wants to debate after the evidences and proofs have already been established, and this is the category that Muḥammad Hijāb falls into.

b) **One who is of corrupt intellect** and is unable to know the truth, and Hijāb also falls into this category.

c) One with whom debate is **not of any preponderant benefit**, and Hijāb falls into this category as well.

And **Imām al-Ājurri** (d. 360H) (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) also discussed this issue of debates and explained that debates were forbidden by the leading Imāms of the Salaf, and if a person comes as one seeking direction and guidance, then he should be guided with knowledge from the Qurʾān, Sunnah, sayings of the Companions and of the scholars of the Muslims. And if he comes wanting to argue, this was disliked by the scholars, and that one should beware of such people. And if it is argued that such people will be left alone upon falsehood and that one cannot remain silent upon their falsehood, then al-Ājurri states: “Your silence towards them and boycotting of them is more severe upon them than your arguing with them, and this is what those who have preceded from the Righteous Salaf, from the scholars of the Muslims, have said.”⁵ And similar words can be found with Imām al-Lālikāṭī in the opening to his Iʿtiqād.

6. The intent here then is that upon the standards of Hijāb—**and these are secular standards, they are not the standards of the Sharīʿah**—upon these standards, Imām Mālik was “**an intellectual coward**” because he refused to debate innovators like Hijāb from the people of kalām and falsafah and people of innovations such as al-Qadar and al-Irjāʾ. As for us, we are upon the way of Imām Mālik, and

⁵ Al-Sharīʿah (1/451).

of al-Shāfiʿī and Aḥmad, and the Imāms of the Salaf, because this was their way. We and those whom we follow are not “**intellectual cowards**”. Rather, the truth—which has become evident to people of sanity and reason—is that you, Ḥijāb, are an **intellectual spastic** save that your arrogance prevents you from acknowledging it.

And all praise is due to Allāh and may Allāh send ṣalāt and ṣalām upon His Prophet, his family and companions.

Abu Iyaḍ

12 Dhul-Qaʿdah 1440 / 15 July 2019 v.1.02