



**Muḥammad Hijāb, the Falāsifah,
Mutafalsifah and Jahmiyyah: Laying
the Foundations for the Dīn of the
Philosophers and Jahmites
Part 9: Ḥijāb, Feigning Ignorance
and Imaginary Busts**

Abu 'Iyaḍ



INTRODUCTION

Muḥammad Hījāb is a **performance artist**, an actor, who is all about image. He knows how to manipulate his audience, pull their strings, pluck their emotions and lead them into aspersions about those whom he perceives as a threat to his image. Inwardly he is insecure. Outwardly, he behaves in a way that compensates for that. He is not interested in separating truth from falsehood, Sunnah from Bid'ah, the Tawḥīd of the Messengers from the Tawḥīd of the Philosophers, the speech of the Salaf (as properly understood), from the speech of the people of speculative, theological rhetoric.

Evidences for all of the above are already established.

In this article we aim to make the reader aware that Hījāb is either a calculated deceiver who feigns ignorance as and when it suits him, as a means of escape, or a rank ignoramus who does not have the intellectual capacity to understand what has been repeated to him in plain English over eight previous articles, and which others are grasping without any difficulties at all and in turn presenting to him.

This will be done by looking at a number of tweets which reveal a lot about Hījāb and his performance artistry.

BUSTED, BUSTED, BUSTED

Muḥammad Hijāb is a Mutakhabbiṭ, Murāwigh, one who fumbles and stumbles in his ignorance and then uses underhanded methods to hide that from public view. He might be versed in his philosophy—and even in that his is not straight—but he is a rank ignoramus in matters of creed and methodology, and we demonstrated that in Part 8 of this series wherein:

—He fell into of **tajsīm**, giving Allāh a “body” (jism), using the very standards of his own kalām and falsafah.

—He uttered a **statement of disbelief** by making what is created to be eternal with Allāh.

—He spoke with **the bid’ah of the Kullābiyyah**, followed by the Ash’ariyyah, that the Qur’ān is eternal, and this was their solution to the problem that Allāh’s chosen actions posed for their kalām theology and their proof for Allāh’s existence.

—He claimed Allāh’s attributes are His “**parts**”—invalidating his argument thereby.

—He had to **flee from his own argument** in the end.¹

So when these affairs were pointed out to him, and Hijāb did not actually read my document, as is evident. He did not read it fully, nor

¹ He was unable answer the Mu’tazili arguments that a Trinitarian Christian brought to him, and at the end he said we can never know the metaphysical reality of God by the study of “parts and wholes” despite the fact that his entire argument (taken from Ibn Šīnā and the Mu’tazilah) is based on proving that possible things are dependent because they are “composed” of parts, and that the necessary being is the opposite of that because it is not composed and therefore, is not dependent. He then links this directly to Sūrah Iklāṣ to describe the metaphysical reality of this necessary existence. The Trinitarian Christian showed Hijāb’s contradiction and Hijāb effectively, had no option but to fall into contradiction to allow himself to escape.

did he understand it, just like he has not understood what I have been trying to teach him from Part 1 of this series. Either that, or he is a calculated deceiver, playing a game.

So he posted a 10 minute audio on his Twitter feed, giving it the title, “**Abu Iyaad Busted**” or something like that, and I have not listened to it, nor his previous 20 minute audio, **as I do not listen to established liars and callers to innovation, once it is clear that they persist upon their innovation and misguidance and lack sincerity**, because the situation is already lost by that time. After that it is cringeworthy and poisonous to listen to such people. However, people relay to me what he posts and what he says, and it is only for the benefit of people, and not the likes of Hijāb, that articles continue to be written, because there still remain opportunities for people to be informed, illuminated about realities and about religion.

In putting out these posts, these audios, all of this is evasion and diversion from Hijāb and it is playing tricks with the minds of his audience, by using sensational titles which oppose the realities. Then he tries to raise himself and denigrate his adversary by playing psychological games with his audience. Abu Iyaad is refuting me because he is an angry person, “don’t be so angry” and so on. So he puts these ideas into the minds of his audience, leading them to question the sincerity of those who speak about his errors.² Hijāb uses logical fallacies, he is versed in this matter, he knows how to

² We refute people like Hijāb to make their severe errors known to the Muslims, out of love for and sincerity of purpose towards the common Muslims—and the common Muslims love Islām and they desire guidance, but it is the likes of Hijāb who act as hindrances and barriers to the people from gaining true knowledge, the real beneficial knowledge, which takes place in mosques and with scholars and students of knowledge. However, Hijāb and company do not provide that, they provide entertainment, sensationalism, a debate culture, scandalmongering, and through this, they hinder Muslims all across the world from the truth.

divert, be underhanded, misdirect and so on. In any case, take a look at this conversation:



Abu E'sa @AbuEesa_r · 4h

Replying to @mohammed_hijab

Brother mohammed, regardless of his political views and extremism against other muslims, it seems that some of what he is saying calls for more research on your part. Ignore the person if necessary but tradeat the arguments and claims on their merit



2



Mohammed Hijab @mohammed_hijab · 4h

Like what?



2



2



Abu E'sa @AbuEesa_r · 50m

Like the possibility of using philosophical arguments and language leading to a point which puts the user in a position where he has to deny, make tawil or tahreef of the attributes of Allah if he is consistent. It has historical precedence after all.



2



Mohammed Hijab @mohammed_hijab · 33m

Yes but some of this language was used by most of the scholars of Islam like واجب الوجود is continually used by ibn Taymiyyah



1. A brother called Abu E’esa has read some of our articles and has grasped them to the degree that he can see the nature of Hijāb’s errors and points out to Hijāb that he must treat the arguments upon their merit and not use other unconnected issues.

As for political views and extremism, then our views on politics are based upon the Sunnah and upon the Salafī understanding of al-Qaḍā wal-Qadar and affirmation of wisdoms and reasons behind Allāh’s actions (al-ḥikmah wal-ta’līl fī af’āl Allāh) and of connecting causes with their effects in both the creation and the command (al-khalq wal-amr). As for ignoramuses like Hijāb and people like him, then they disagree with our views in this area because they do not understand these affairs, because they do not have any foundation in this, in the Salafī creed, and thus wander blindly taking ideas and statements from every school and every figurehead.

And as for extremism against other Muslims, then we love the common Muslims, and we love guidance for them. We distinguish between the common Muslims and the callers to misguidance, such as Hijāb, who hinder the common Muslims from learning the way of the Salaf and draw them instead to falsafah and kalām. So when we refute them and their errors, then they present this as “extremism against other Muslims” as a means of shielding themselves from valid criticism and to avoid acknowledging their errors. And so this is the game that Hijāb plays.

To date, he has been unable to address my critique of his errors, **in substance**, and with integrity. Rather, he has used diversions. As for the people of the Sunnah, they write, they author, and they make clear their views and the erroneous views of those whom they criticise, and had this not been the case, then Islām would have undergone tabdīl, like the Islām of Moses and of Jesus. But actors and performers like Hijāb, they know that as soon as they put pen to

paper, what are their sources going to be in **the foundation of their speech in creed**. They are Ibn Sīnā, al-Farābī, the Muʿtazilah, Leibniz, Godel... So how are they going to refute people of the Sunnah?!

Hence, Hijāb is playing games, taking cheap shots, and has not even read my articles properly, as is clear from his comment at the end. And the most he has done is to see what he can find, isolate and then use against me as a means of protecting his status.

2. Then Hijāb says: **“Like what?”**

So here, Hijāb is either feigning ignorance and knows full well or he has not actually read and understood my articles, because he is intellectually defunct.

3. Then Abu E’sa demonstrates a better understanding and a sharper mind than Hijāb. He summarises what my article and all previous ones have established in one simply, easy to understand, very concise sentence:

“Like the possibility of using philosophical arguments and language to a point which puts the user in a position where he has to deny, make tawil or tahreef of the attributes of Allah if he is consistent. It has historical precedence after all.”

So if others are able to grasp what is going on, then there is no excuse and justification for Hijāb, the philosopher, to feign ignorance.

4. Then Hijāb responds:

“Yes, but some of this language was used by most of the scholars of Islam like واجب الوجود is continually used by ibn Taymiyyah.”

So this reveals one of two things. Either Hijāb is lost, confused and bewildered and simply does not understand this subject area and is unable to grasp the nature of my criticism against his approach or he is a deceiver, a liar, playing a game. Because it is not

possible for people besides you to read the articles and grasp the issue and for you, a “philosopher and logician”, to be stumped by it. Let me quote here what I have said in my articles so far:

First: I cited a number of statements of Ibn Taymiyyah³ to make clear that to argue that that which is possible in existence requires that which is necessary in existence is sound as an argument in itself, however, this does not prove a wujūd ‘aynī, but a wujūd muṭlaq. And in this, there is no dispute between Fir‘aun, pure atheists, and Hijāb. Everyone must affirm a wājib al-wujūd. So Hijāb pretends not to grasp this, or he genuinely does not get it. The issue is not about using this term, or whether Ibn Taymiyyah used it in his discussions. Ibn Taymiyyah used it in the course of critiquing this method, which is what I have been trying to show Muḥammad Hijāb, the underhanded pseudophilosopher. So establishing that there is a wājib al-wujūd does not establish Tawḥīd al-Rubūbiyyah. Basically, you haven’t even moved away from atheism at this point. From here, the argument has to be augmented, and so Hijāb follows Ibn Sīnā, the Bāṭinī Kāfir, in his arguments of tarkīb and takhṣīṣ, in order to arrive

³ From them:

a) "All that this [argument] comprises is that within existence, there is an existence that is obligatory. And this is accepted by those who deny a Maker, such as Fir‘aun, and the pure atheists such as the Philosophers, the [Bāṭinī] Qarāmītes and their likes. And they say: ‘This existence is obligatory in its existence by itself.’ And the statement of the people of the unity [of existence]—those who say that existence is one —also leads to this outcome..."

b) "And all it achieves is that about which there is no dispute between intelligent people, of the affirmation of the existence of that whose existence is necessary by itself. As for affirmation of the Maker of the universe, then this method does not achieve that, except upon the foundation of rejecting the attributes upon which they based their [version of] Tawḥīd. And this is a corrupt proof"

the “metaphysical reality” of this wājib al-wujūd and show why it is not the universe, but a “God”, which he then describes through innovated, philosophical language, that in turn demands, through logical necessity, the rejection of what came in the Qur’ān and Sunnah of names, attributes, descriptions and chosen actions for Allāh. This then leads to the existence of this “God” being negated in external reality, and thus, leads to back to atheism, and this is the inevitable outcome of the acquisition of creed through all these methods of falsafah and kalām, whether the evidence of **hawādith** and **a’rāḍ** of the Mutakallimīn, or that of **tarkīb** of the Mu‘tazilah and Ibn Sīnā or **ikhtiṣāṣ** of Ibn Sīnā.

It is not possible for any person of sound mind with a university education or even less, not to have understood this much from the articles, let alone the self-described “philosopher and logician”, Hijāb.

Second: Here are numerous statements from my articles:

In Part 1:

They [Aristotle, al-Farābī, Ibn Sīnā] established a “first cause” or a “prime mover” or a “necessarily existent” and then proceeded to describe this entity in such ways that rendered it non-existent, existing only in the mind as an abstraction.

And:

So when Muḥammad Hijāb comes out with the argument of Ibn Sīnā of imkān and wujūb, possible and necessary existence, **and takes it through to its intended full logical conclusion and outcome, entering right into the description of the entity that is being proven...**

And:

... It is important to note that the Qurʾān and Sunnah have come with proofs (āyāt, barāhīn) to establish Allāh’s existence with **an existence that is ‘aynī** (a proof that points to a specific, actual existing entity, in external reality, in a direct, indisputable manner)... As for the method of the Philosophers and the Mutakallimīn, it is through the use of analogies and logic that do not establish an existence which is ‘aynī but only **mutlaq** (absolute, non-specific, in the mind only)... This opens the door for long-winded, philosophical debates, and also the injection of principles, that in turn render the proof to be such that it cannot be reconciled with the Creator described in the Qurʾān and the Sunnah, and requires a rejection of His attributes and actions if logical coherence and validity of the proof is to be maintained

And:

The methods used by the Philosophers and Ahl al-Kalām, despite having some elements of truth, are deficient, comprise falsehood and point to the opposite of what they were intended to establish. On account of all of these proofs, that of *ḥudūth al-ajsām*, that of *tarkīb*, and that of *ikhtiṣāṣ*, the Philosophers and Mutakallimīn rejected Allāh’s names, attributes and actions, showing their convergence and agreement on this matter in principle

And:

This diety [ob Ibn Sīnā] is “immaterial, incorporeal”—which is the slogan innovated into Islām by al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān, that “Allāh is not a jism”, and which was used to deny all the attributes. It is a diety

that is not “composed of parts” which is the argument used by the Mutafalsifah and the Mu‘tazilah to reject the attributes and by the Ash‘arites to reject the *ṣifāt khabariyyah*...

And:

...due to their use of arguments in which falsehood is mixed with elements of truth, and which in turn require them to use **a particular language** in describing the deity whose existence they establish through such methods—whether in affirmation or negation, **though particularly in negation**...

And in Part 4:

To Muḥammad Hijāb:

In my three previous articles, I explained the errors you fell into in taking the argument of Ibn Sīnā of *imkān* and *wujūb* for proving Allāh’s existence to its **intended outcome** which is laying the foundation for **the rejection of Allāh’s attributes** (*dhātiyyah* and *ṣifātiyyah*) and His ‘uluww, and your use of language, within the context of this argument, that necessary follows in affirming His oneness upon the way of the Mutafalsifah and negators among the Mutakallimīn—that He is “not material, not parts, not composed”. I explained that this is not the language of Tawḥīd that the Prophets and Messengers came with, and nor is it the language of the People of the Sunnah in affirming their creed with respect to Allāh. All of this is very clear in my articles, and the nature of my criticism is very clearly spelled out such that there is no ambiguity.

And at the end of Part 4:

Rather, you have only displayed your ignorance in this. I

explained that these types of philosophical proofs have aspects of truth but that they only establish a **wujūd muṭlaq** (non-specific, abstract existence), and then they are injected with false principles in order to qualify that abstract existence into what appears to be a creator, but in reality, only lays down a path for the eventual rejection of that very creator, if followed through logically. his diety [Ibn Sīnā] is “immaterial, incorporeal”—which is the slogan innovated into Islām by al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān, that “Allāh is not a jism”, and which was used to deny all the attributes. It is a diety that is not “composed of parts” which is the argument used by the Mutafalsifah and the Mu‘tazilah to reject the attributes and by the Ash‘arites to reject the *ṣifāt khabariyyah*...

And at the beginning of Part 5:

We explained in previous parts that Muḥammad Hijāb is laying down a path for the rejection of Allāh’s ‘uluww and His Sīfāt. And this is because he followed the way of Mutafalsifah and negators of the Mutakallimīn in augmenting their abstract philosophical proofs that only prove a **wujūd muṭlaq** (abstract, non-specific) for the entity they are trying to prove, in this case, that which is *wājib al-wujūd* (obligatory in existence) and which does not equate to Allāh, creator of the heavens and earth. As a result, they have to add to this in order to prove that this entity is one, and in doing so, they propound a philosophical *Tawḥīd* through ambiguous language, which is not the *Tawḥīd* of the Messengers, and is in actual fact, **a trojan horse** for the rejection of the *Tawḥīd* of the Messengers. This requires them to use a certain language in the affirmation of creed such as “He is not a body, not in a location, does not have parts, is not composite and so on” in order to prove His oneness.

And the opening of Part 7:

In previous articles we cited **Ibn Taymiyyah** and **Ibn al-Qayyim** on the argument of **the pseudophilosophers**, such as the Bāṭinī Ismāʿīlī Shīʿite, Ibn Sīna. This argument establishes a **wujūd muṭlaq** (abstract, non-specific, in the mind) of something whose existence is said to be necessary (wājib al-wujūd)—meaning its existence does not need others. To this, atheists simply reply that the universe, as a whole, has a necessary existence, and that's all that there is, even if internally, parts of it depend on others. In response, when this argument is taken to its completion through the concepts of **tarkīb** (composition) and **ikhtiṣāṣ** (specification), it requires rejection of the attributes and rejection of the Creator himself, and ultimately leads back to atheism on the basis of its dubious terminology.

And in Part 7:

This argument would not be objected to by Firʿaun and pure atheists as all people of intelligence are in agreement that there has to be something with a necessary existence. For this reason, it is pointless to argue this with atheists, as they are in agreement with it.

And in a footnote in Part 7:

Meaning, that the basic reasoning in it is sound. To say that if something needs other things besides it to exist, and it can both exist and be absent, and as such its existence is only a possible existence. That all such things must require something whose existence is obligatory, and thus there must be an obligatory

existence, meaning something that does not depend on others for its existence. So this is sound... However, the argument only proves a wujūd mutḥaq (abstract, general, unqualified, non-specific) in the mind for the entity in question that is said to be of “necessary existence” and requires completion.

And in Part 8, we spelled it out lucidly and clearly:

As we have explained before, first you say that things that are only possible in their existence (they could exist or not exist), and that they require what is necessary in existence (what does not need, require, or depend upon other than itself to exist). So at this stage, this is sound, but all you have done is affirm **an abstract existence in the mind only**, because it is mutḥaq (general, non-specific). This “necessary existence” you have argued for is not anything specific, and hence it does not distinguish between an eternal creator or an eternal universe in external reality. So this argument now needs to be completed, and it is done by demonstrating how the universe is only possible through dubious, ambiguous philosophical terms, by saying it is **material, confined, limited, specified, particularised** and so on. These words are such that they can be equally applied to Allāh on the basis of what has come in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of attributes and actions. As a result, the eventual logical outcome of this argument is that you proved Allāh’s existence in the mind, but denied an actual existence for Him in external reality. And this is what happened to the people of falsfah and kalām. And anyone who uses this approach, **then this has to be the outcome for logical coherence to be maintained**. And what will happen in the middle is **pointless, frivolous argumentation with atheists** and setting up Muslims for confusion in their religion in the process. And this is what Hijāb is

doing, he is an ignorant, vainglorious, arrogant misguided innovator who misguides others, as we shall prove below.

Third: After all the above, how can this “philosopher and logician” come back and say to the brother, who summarised all the above in a concise paragraph, doing well in that, and say:

“Yes, but some of this language was used by most of the scholars of Islam like واجب الوجود is continually used by ibn Taymiyyah.”

This shows that this man is either a **mutalā'ib**, **mutajāhil**, **mutabālid** (playing games, feigning ignorance and stupidity) or he is in actuality fact a **mutaballid** (dull, stupid), just a more sophisticated one at that. It is known that **sophisticated stupidity** brings way more harm than does simple stupidity upon individuals, societies and nations.

Fourth: I analysed three discussions of Hijāb in detail, the debate with Alex at Oxford, the debate with the three atheists in the park, and then the third longer one with Aron Ra, the physicist lady, the Trinitarian Christian theologian and that atheist who was well-versed in issues of Islamic creed. Through these discussions, I showed in great detail and in ways that are indisputable, the correctness of the position of the Salaf towards misguided innovators like al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān, al-Ja'd bin Dirham, and the kalām schools, the Mu'tazilah, Kullābiyyah, Ash'ariyyah and Muḥammad Hijāb. In that discussion, Hijāb's argument was destroyed and he fell into numerous errors and his escape routes could only have led him to atheism, validating the doctrine of the Christians, or the unity of existence. These things actually happened in history, and this is exactly how they happened!

And this is what we have been trying to show him.

Fifth: In his sensational “Abu Iyaad Busted” thread aimed at psychological manipulation of his followers, Hijāb is presented with his errors by other users, such as his statements which afford that his “God” is a bigger indivisible particle than Julie the physicists “fundamental particle” and his statement of making something eternal with Allāh, whilst fumbling and stumbling to deal with the issue of Allāh’s speech and the Qur’ān.

So he says: **“If I said that I take it back and repent.”** And hence, the man who started his thread so boldly, “Abu Iyaad Busted”—ends up having to make retraction and repentance. And it also shows that he did not even read the article fully or properly in the first place.



Atheer @Atheer96277555 · 7h



Replying to @mohammed_hijab

concealed Ash'arī masquerading as a Hanbali. Hijāb continues: “It was only transmitted to the Prophet by the Angel Gabriel, **which was already there eternally in what we call the Lawḥ Maḥfūz, the Preserved Tablet**, which is an entrenchment of [unclear] codifications... and then that was transmitted to him.” So first of all, here **this is a statement of kufr**, because **he made something created, which is the Preserved Tablet, eternal alongside Allāh**. Now we will be just and say that if this speech was replayed to Hijāb, he will denounce it, and even though he fell into a statement of disbelief, he fell into it due to his ignorance, his lack of understanding, his bid'ah,



Mohammed Hijab @mohammed_h... · 7h



If I said that I take it back and repent .



:

Closing Note:

In closing, Hijāb must decide:

Does he want to meet Allāh as one who misguided the Muslims in their religion, poisoned them with toxic, trojan-horse arguments, and set them up to fight with faulty weapons, paving the way for them to be led to confusion and bewilderment, being unsure as to whether evidence for the eternity of the creator is stronger or evidence for the eternity of the universe is stronger, as happened to the Mutakallimīn such as al-Rāzī, whose path Hijāb is taking. All of this has played out in history already.

Does Hijāb want to pass out like this?

May Allāh send ṣalāt and salām upon His Messenger, his family and companions.

Abu ‘Iyaad

@abuiyaadsp ♦ salaf.com

1 Dhul Qa’dah 1440 / 4 July 2019 v. 1.0

NOTE: The only one “like” Hijāb has on his twitter account is of a post by a Ṣūfī Ash‘arī Jahmite who accuses Salafis of being “Mujassimah” and who praises the open caller to shirk, Muḥammad ‘Alawī al-Mālikī who was refuted by the Scholars of Tawḥīd.

This establishes Hijāb conceals his true beliefs whilst pretending to be a “Ḥanbalī, Atharī” because by a person’s company, likes and dislikes, he reveal what he conceals.

Ibn Baṭṭāh related in al-Ibānah that Imām al-Awzā‘ī (d. 157H) said: (من ستر علينا بدعته لم تحف علينا ألفته) “Whoever conceals his innovation from us, will not be able to hide his friendship.” However, Hijāb is not really hiding his bid‘ah, because that is clear. Rather, he is deceiving

people by claiming to be “Ḥanbalī, Atharī”. And he is only making things even clearer by his friendships, loyalties and “likes”.

Tweets 137 Followers 12.8K Likes 1 [Follow](#)

Likes

 **Younes Ghannouchi** · Jun 28
Replying to @mohammed_hijab

It's about time the Mujasimmah who clothe themselves as Atharis are put on the spotlight, with their bogus creed of affirming every single attribute as being part of Allah's ﷻ, even jf it may be running, jogging or walking.

An ominous theology.

2 1 4

