

# Muḥammad Hijāb, the Falāsifah, Mutafalsifah and Jahmiyyah: Laying the Foundations for the Dīn of the Philosophers and Jahmites Part 10: The Weapons of Ḥijāb: Deliberate Lies and Wicked Slanders



**WHEN A MAN RESORTS TO CALCULATED LIES  
YOU KNOW HE IS IN THE THROES  
OF DEFEAT AND HUMILIATION**



**Mohammed Hijab**  
@mohammed\_hijab

Follow

Abu Iyaad mis-translates this Arabic script to this to justify his anthropomorphist statement.

Ibn Taymiyyahs Statement in Arabic  
وأما قيامه بنفسه فحق  
Abu Iyaads translation

‘Allāh’s existence depends on His essence’

11:10 PM - 3 Jul 2019

18 Retweets 121 Likes



7 18 121

## Introduction

In this series of articles I have made clear the erroneous methodology of Muḥammad Ḥijāb in relying upon the goods of the Mutafalsifah such as **Ibn Sīnā**, bundled with the goods of the **Mu'tazilah**, all packaged into a **trojan horse** through which one is led—by logical necessity, at the end of the affair—to rejection of Allāh's name, attributes and actions, to pure atheism, to the saying of the eternity of the universe, to the saying of the unity of existence and divine union, and to the justification of the doctrine of the Christians of the divine and human nature of Jesus (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام).

I presented two indisputable lines of **hard, empirical evidence**. **The first** was history itself, because this played out in history through the Ahl al-Kalām and then the Mutafalsifah, and these debates led to the emergence of bewilderment in the names and attributes and to the sayings of **ittihād** (divine union) and **waḥdat al-wujūd** (unity of existence). So this is not disputed and it is documented in the works of the Salaf, and the Imāms of Ahl al-Sunnah such as Ibn Taymiyyah (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ). **The second** was through a number of debates of Ḥijāb in which I demonstrated that what happened in those debates is exactly what I have been trying to tell him, that it is a replay, a re-run of the tale of al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān. In these debates Ḥijāb uses an argument which proves an existence in the mind (wujūd muṭlaq) and not an actual specific existence (wujūd 'aynī) of the entity he is trying to prove in external reality. From this point onwards, in order to distinguish between the creator and the created in external reality, he has to complete his method through the arguments of **tarkīb** and **ikhtiṣāṣ** which Ibn Sīnā devised by taking somewhat from the Mu'tazilah and the aim of which was to lay the foundations for the saying of the eternity of the universe, because he was supporting the beliefs of the Greek philosophers and trying to merge them with

Islām. So he basically, set out to game the Mutakallimīn, and he achieved his objective because many of them fell for the bait and hybridised their kalām with this falsafah. Hijāb is drawing from this pool of dung and puss.

The most interesting discussion of his was the one we covered in detail in **Part 8** of this series, with Aron Ra, a Christian theologian, a physicist and another atheist well-versed in kalām theology. and it provided undeniable, empirical evidence that Muḥammad Hijāb is simply a **Jahm bin Şafwān type of character**. A man who is given to debating, concerned only about winning, egotistical, amazed with himself,—“atheists must retract in front of me” syndrome—equipped only with the philosophy of the nations, ignorant of the correct understanding of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, of the madhhab of the Salaf. And in debates he only perpetuates confusion, and lays the foundations for utter misguidance.

So in that discussion:

—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**, that the Qur’ān is eternal. This was the kalām solution to the problem posed by Allāh’s chosen actions for their kalām theology and their proof for Allāh’s existence. This in turn opened the door for Christian arguments to justify their beliefs, as well as for ittiḥād, hulūl and waḥdat al-wujūd.

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

—He made the lowest denominator of Islām to be the affirmation of a “necessary existence”, which means **Fir’aun and pure atheists are Muslims**, for affirming a necessary existence, which to them is

an eternal, self-contained, independent universe. So this is affirmation of faith on the basis of what does not even reach the affirmation of a Creator, of al-Rubūbiyyah.

—He had to **flee from his own argument** in the end.<sup>1</sup>

In turn, Hijāb has no response except to use diversions, evasions and underhanded tactics to save his reputation. To the extent that he has become extremely nasty, vindictive and personal—revealing his true nature—and is now making open challenges for debates. Sorry, we are followers (**muttabiʿīn**) not innovators (**muttadiʿīn**). We are not confused about our religion such that debates are our means for its acquisition or corroboration. If you are confused and cannot distinguish between the Tawḥīd of the Messengers and the “necessary existence” of Firʿaun, Alex and Julie the physicist, let alone the Tawḥīd of the Mutafalsifah, **then please go and debate a lamp-post**, that will give you a greater chance of winning.

We do not debate with **insincere liars** who do not desire the truth and our way towards people like you is the way of the Salaf towards the Jahmiyyah and the Muʿtazilah whose way you are traversing.

As for the common Muslims, **we love them and desire guidance for them**, and hence, these writings are a sign of our genuine love for them, just as they are a sign of **our pity and mercy for you**. No

---

<sup>1</sup> He was unable answer the Muʿtazili 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 Muʿtazilah) 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 Ikhḷāṣ 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, and undermine his entire argument.

one has been more merciful to you in your entire life, not even your parents, than the mercy that these articles contain, because they are lifting mighty burdens from you and the burdens of your followers you will otherwise be made to carry. So be grateful and humble.

This brings us to the topic of this article

## THE SIGN OF DEFEAT AND HUMILIATION IS WHEN LYING BECOMES YOUR WEAPON

Hijāb is unable to fight the truth, so he has to resort to lying in order to save face in front of his audience. The best way to do that is through what he does very well. **Scandalmongering**. That is, to shock his social media following with whatever comes under the umbrella of scandal. Thus, he accused me of mis-translation. And this, as will be clear to everyone, was **a deliberate, calculated, intentional fabrication on his behalf**.

The big coward told this great lie, may Allāh bring him to justice:



Let us look at this passage, and then we will comment on it to explain what is going on, it is from page 9 of Part 8 in this series:

attributes which enter into the meaning of ‘His self’, then it is [the same as] speech about His self.

So when it is said: ‘His attributes belong to His essence’, and it is said: ‘He is in need of them’, then it is the same as the speech of the one who said: ‘He is in need of His self’. For His attributes of His essence, they are what [His] self is never without. It is likewise when we say: ‘An essence that necessitates His existence’ or ‘He is necessary [in existence] by His self’, or ‘[His essence] requires Him being necessary [in existence]’.

Then if a person was to say: ‘That necessitates that He is caused (ma’lūl), and what is caused is in need’, it is said to him: **The cause in this case is not other than the caused. What is negated is Him being in need of other than Him, and being caused by other than Him. As for Him being established by Himself, then it is truth.** Thereafter, these expressions which may give presumption of a corrupt meaning: **If they are used unrestrictedly upon consideration of the correct meaning, or are not used unrestrictedly at all, that will not harm when the correct meaning is known, it is not repelled.**

**My own speech addressing Hijab**  
**This is my own speech, not Ibn Taymiyyah’s**

about His self—then you cannot object to this, without contradicting yourself. So here, the argument against Hijāb is that if I say that Allāh’s ṣifāt fi’liyyah, such as showing mercy, creating and speaking require or depend on His will and wish (mashāh, irādah)—which is a true meaning—and you consider this to be kufr and taj̄sīm, then you have to be consistent and say that the statement, ‘Allāh’s existence depends on His essence’ or ‘Allāh is necessary in His existence by His self’ is also kufr and taj̄sīm, despite the fact that it is a true meaning.

° In other words, the saying of the Philosophers and Mu’tazilah who use this argument can be treated the same way. It means that Allāh depends upon, is in need of, requires His own essence for His existence and hence, He is needy (muḥtāj, muftaqir), and thus His existence is only a possible existence, and thus He is no different to His creation.

## Comments:

1. First of all this piece from Ibn Taymiyyah was a decisive refutation of his feeble attempt to take my speech in which I was referring to Allāh’s chosen actions and I said that Allāh’s mercy, speech and acts of creation depend on His will and His power. This was the only thing he could find in order to attack me. And this is actually a correct and true meaning. So the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah above, was a refutation of this cheap attempt by Hijāb, and in this, he is simply using the argument of the Mutafalsifah and the Mū‘tazilah against me, which Ibn Taymiyyah is refuting.

2. In the main body of text, I have accurately translated the words of Ibn Taymiyyah (وأما قيامه بنفسه فحق), “**As for Him being established by Himself, then it is truth.**” Hijāb knew this full well, this shows that this was a cold, calculated, deliberate fabrication on his behalf.

3. Then in the footnotes, there is some speech of mine, which starts on the previous page. And in this footnote, I am elaborating on what this means for the argument of Hijāb against me. Now this is my own speech, it is not Ibn Taymiyyah’s speech and this is crystal clear to the reader. So he left Ibn Taymiyyah’s speech that I actually translated, and then went to my own speech. In this speech I said:

“So here, the argument against Hijāb is that if I say that Allāh’s *ṣifāt* *fi’liyyah*, such as showing mercy, creating and speaking require or depend on His will and wish (*mashī’ah*, *irādah*)—which is a true meaning—and you consider this to be *kufr* and *tajsīm*, then you have to be consistent and say that the statement, ‘**Allāh’s existence depends on His essence**’ or ‘Allāh is necessary in His existence by His self’ is also *kufr* and *tajsīm*, despite the fact that it is a true meaning.”

So the part in red underline, which is my own speech, was taken by Hijāb, in order to fabricate this lie against me, and as the reader

can this, this is a clear sign of deliberate dishonesty. This means Hijāb is an academic fraudster and can never be trusted again. I will also show separately that Hijāb cites statements of Ibn Taymiyyah to defend himself which he does not understand at all.

4. Now, even my own speech, in this footnote, there is absolutely nothing wrong with my elaboration, because this is explained by Ibn Taymiyyah himself, wherein he said:

ومعلوم أن افتقاره إلى الجميع هو افتقاره إلى نفسه، <sup>[\*]</sup> وقول القائل: مفتقر إلى نفسه<sup>[\*]</sup>، هو معنى قوله: هو واجب بنفسه؛ فَعَلِمَ أن وجوبه بنفسه لا يوجب الافتقار المنافي لوجوب الوجود.

“And it is known that His being in need of the whole, is His being in need of His self, And the saying of a person: **‘He is in need (muftaqir) of His self’ is the meaning of ‘He is necessary in His existence by His self’**. Thus, it is known that His being necessary in existence **by His self** does not necessitate that [type of] need [iftiqār] which negates His necessary existence.”<sup>2</sup>

My own elaboration in the footnote is the very thing said by Ibn Taymiyyah here and he was in the course of refuting the misguided Mutafalsifah and Mu‘tazilah who brought this doubt to justify negation of the attributes. The refutation is that: We do not accept your claim that it is binding that Allāh is in need of that of which He is composed [i.e. of the attributes according to them] and that this negates His necessary existence, this [reasoning] is prohibited. Meaning this claim is prohibited, rejected. Then he continues to explain that even if you [wrongly] treat attributes to be His parts such that He would be in need, or dependent on one of His parts [one attribute], then to be in need of all of His parts is more severe than being dependent on just

<sup>2</sup> Sharḥ al-Aṣbahāniyyah, (1430H) p. 65.



one. This is because the one who is dependent on all of the parts, is dependent on each one. Whereas the one who is dependent on just one part, it is not necessitated that he is need of any other part besides it. And then Ibn Taymiyyah says what I quoted above:

“And it is known that His being in need of the whole, is His being in need of His self, And the saying of a person: **‘He is in need (muftaqir) of His self’ is the meaning of ‘He is necessary in His existence by His self’**. Thus, it is known that His being necessary in existence **by His self** does not necessitate that [type of] need [iftiqār] which negates His necessary existence.”<sup>3</sup>

5. This is just one angle of refutation. The second angle is also a refutation of Muḥammad Hijāb, the tail end of the Philosophers and Mu‘tazilah. In this second angle, Ibn Tamiyyah explains that what is rejected is that the necessary in existence (wājib al-wujūd) should be in need of (which means, depend upon) **other than His self**. As for whatever comes under the meaning of “His self”, then it is not outside of His self such that it should be said at all that Him being in need of it negates His being necessary in existence by His self. In other words, the whole issue is that **Allāh is not in need of anything outside of His self**. As for all of this speech that you, the Mutafalsifah and the Mu‘tazilah are using, this is innovated, misguided, false speech, wherein you treat the attributes as parts<sup>4</sup> and then claim that Allāh would be in need of His parts. And that even if it is said: “Allāh depends on His self for His existence”, or “He depends on His attributes”, like Ibn Taymiyyah mentions in the earlier quote, then this

---

<sup>3</sup> Sharḥ al-Aṣbahāniyyah, (1430H) p. 65.

<sup>4</sup> And the strange thing is that Hijāb himself considered Allāh’s attribute of speech to be a “part of Allāh”, thereby, falling into tarkīb (saying Allāh is composed of parts) and thereby giving Christians the opportunity to justify their doctrine of the Trinity and the divine and human nature of Jesus.

is no different to what you, the Philosophers say, that Allāh is necessary in His existence **by His self**. It's the same meaning. Hence, you are falling into the same as what you are accusing us of, and hence, your proof (of wujūb, imkān, completed with tarkīb) is invalidated and falsified.

6. The perceptive reader will also have noticed that Hijāb's accusation falls upon Ibn Taymiyyah. Because Ibn Taymiyyah said that when a person says: "He is in need of His self", which is no different conceptually to saying: "He depends on His self", then it is the very meaning of saying "He is necessary (in His existence) by His self". So Ibn Taymiyyah is the one who said this, and thus Hijāb is effectively accusing Ibn Taymiyyah of being an anthropomorphist.

**So this is misguidance upon misguidance, slander upon slander, lie upon lie. All because of an inflated ego coupled with compound ignorance (jahl murakkab).**

So this is the only issue Hijāb managed to find which he got totally wrong, through which is slandering me with accusations of tajsīm and kufr, may Allāh bring justice for his evil and protect his followers from his pathetic lies. Hijāb is a drowning, misguided, lying innovator who has exposed his trued colors.

And now, laughably, he is pretending to his audience as if he understands the writings of Ibn Taymiyyah, when he is just a pathetic actor, with difficulties in comprehension. **Hijāb, leave theology and choose another profession.** You do not have the intellectual ability in this field, and you are also **a proven, established liar and academic con-man**. The evidence is as clear as the midday sun. Mislead and deceive your social media following as much as you want, they will not avail you when you are faced with your intellectual crimes on the Day of Judgement. This is because you are laying down the intellectual foundations for the Tawḥīd of the Philosophers

which must end in pure atheism, or the unity of existence and divine union doctrines which leads to the saying of the Christians. And you do not have the foresight to see this because you are not grounded in the creed and methodology of the Salaf. And then you add to your crimes by waging a war against those who show mercy to you by showing you your errors and their disastrous outcomes through actual, observed incontestable empirical evidence.

Abu 'Iyaad

@abuiyaadsp ♦ salaf.com

2 Dhū al-Qa'dah 1440 / 5 July 2019 v. 1.04