

Muḥammad Hijāb, the Falāsifah, Mutafalsifah and Jahmiyyah: Laying the Foundations for the Dīn of the Philosophers and Jahmites Part 11: Psychoanalysis of Ḥijāb's Reactions, Replies to His Doubts and Prescribing His Medication



INTRODUCTION

We have provided **indisputable empirical evidence** in what has preceded that Ḥijāb—in his intellectual positioning—is on the side of the Mutafalsifah against not just Salafis, but against the Ṣifāṭiyyah amongst Ahl al-Kalām, the Ash‘arīs and Mātūrīdīs. This is because Ibn Sīnā’s arguments of **tarkīb** and **takhṣīṣ** which he is using are trojan horse arguments aimed at undermining the creed of the Ṣifāṭiyyah as well as to facilitate the development of the argument for the eternity of the universe, it being necessitated by Allāh’s essence (mūjab bil-dhāt) and hence, copresent with Him in eternity.

In this article we will embark upon a number of things.

—Briefly analyse Ḥijāb’s erratic, emotionally insecure responses to our articles in defence of Tawḥīd, Sunnah and the Salafi way.

—Reply to a number of his doubts.

—Prescribe medication for Hijāb’s sickness.¹

THE BLOOD CHOKE-HOLD

First, there are two types of chokes. The first is the **air choke-hold** which prevents air from reaching the lungs. A person can survive this for only a couple of minutes before passing out. The second is the **blood choke-hold**, which prevents blood from reaching the brain. A person can only last from **8-13 seconds** before passing out. Hijāb should know that Part 1 of this series put him in a blood choke-hold. Every part in the series thereafter represented **one second** in the duration of time. We are now in Part 11, and he has only a couple of seconds left before passing out. This is why Hijāb has been having violent spasms (i.e. vile behaviour).

From the signs of intelligence, level-headedness and humility, is to acknowledge the **predicament** you are in and to take the easiest way out before you do yourself some **serious brain damage**.

PSYCHOANALYSIS OF HIJĀB’S RESPONSES

So far, in response to the truth that has been elucidated in these articles with respect to Hijāb’s innovated manhaj in the acquisition of creed, Hijāb has used all of the following tactics:

1. Calculated **blatant lying** (see Part 10).

¹ **Disclaimer:** Our use of irony and sarcasm in our responses is simply returning something with its like, from the angle of justice, and it is not something we do from the outset, or in principle. Rather, we treat each person in the manner that they come to us. The sincere one is treated with sincerity of purpose, the harsh one with firmness in response and the condescending, arrogant, mocking, sarcastic, name-calling one with what is appropriate. We do not treat all of the opposers in the same way. Gentleness is always the starting point. However, some people take advantage of your gentleness in order to gain ascendancy with their falsehood and innovation, with the goal of trampling over you.

2. **Spiteful, vindictive** behaviour.
 3. **Fleeing** from the actual subject matter.
 4. Intimidation and bullying tactics **and inciting mob behaviour** among his social media following.
 5. Sowing the seeds of **doubt about my motivations** through psychological manipulation of his followers, implying that those who criticise him are “angry” or “sympathetic to atheists” and the likes.
 6. **Mockery, sarcasm** arising from his haughtiness.
 7. Trying to **misdirect his followers** from the angles of criticism and the flow of the argument being made.
 8. Trying to pretend the whole issue is simply about **the use of terminology** alone.
 9. **Calling for a debate**—as is the way of Ahl al-Bid‘ah, when their innovation is exposed and made clear—in order to confound the truth and to save their reputation.
 10. Going on the back foot with feeble excuses when realising that more and more people are beginning to **see right through his non-academic, intellectually spastic behaviour**, and his blatant lies.
- And more...

As the reader may appreciate, these are symptoms of a heart that is not desirous of truth. Hence, there must be some other processes taking place.

We have already alluded to his character previously:

A man given to debating, drowning in the philosophies of nations, concerned only about winning, egotistical, amazed with himself, haughty. His **inward insecurity** leading him to fabricate a public image of **an invincible man** through the use of social media and the tube in order to relieve himself of these insecurities. **Buffoonery** in the park, **scandalmongering**, **clickbaiting** and more. What we

have here is **a performance artist, an entertainer** who found an audience for his merchandise of philosophy and debate skills and has now become **a slave to the expectations of his audience.**

This is what happens to social media personalities. Outwardly, it appears that the audience is in need of the personality, but in reality, the personality becomes a slave to the expectations of the audience, and over time, the brain's dopamine output is hijacked, leading to addiction. Thus, **it is the personality that is addicted to the audience,** more than the audience is to the personality.

So Hijāb is a victim of this, as are many others, and in explaining this to him and in explaining his errors in religion, we are being more merciful to him (and his followers) than any person on the earth has ever been to him, including his parents and grandparents.

Imām al-Awzāī (d. 157H) said: “Never does a man innovate an innovation except that his fear (wara’) [of Allāh] is stripped from him.” As you can see, Hijāb has shown little wara’ by falling into all of those ten things we have just listed above.

Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161H) said: “Innovation is more beloved to Iblīs than sin, because sin can be repented from but innovation is not repented from.” And as you have seen, Hijāb is not repentant at all, but persisting in his misguidance, trying to validate it, and this is because innovation, unlike sin, is seen as guidance by he who is upon it, so how can he repent from what he thinks is guidance?

Hijāb’s behaviour is erratic and all over the place and it reveals a man who is not at ease. He has sprung to action because his public image has been tarnished—by his own misdeeds in reality. It is all about image. It is not about truth and guidance.

In turn, he has used his social media to denigrate me, lie upon me, behave vindictively, incite mob behaviour against me and so on. As I

said before, if this is to give you relief from life's hardships and stresses, and you have no other outlet, then I understand and empathise and it just increases me in the amount of pity for you and benevolence towards you in matters of the world. Thus, I have nothing personal in this. What bothers me is **your misguidance** and the fact that you are positioning naive, ill-informed Muslims who listen to you upon a particular route that leaves nothing but paths to misguidance in front of them, as has already occurred in history.

This **exact same misguidance** caused trials to descend upon this ummah. The rule of Banī Umayyah ended due to the bid'ah of al-Ja'd bin Dirham. The Mongols and Crusaders were unleashed by Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) with vengeance from the east and west respectively because of these bid'ahs of Ta'ṭīl which arose through kalām and falsafah—just like He unleashed punishments and calamities upon Banī Isrā'īl when they fell into what is similar and were led away from the Tawḥīd of the Messengers after being affected by the doctrines of the nations. And you, with your bid'ah, are a man who is positioned at this very junction, on the verge of destruction, calling others to destruction, perpetuating the causes of destruction.

So let me continue to save you from it by relieving you of your doubts (shubuhāt) and desires (shahawāt) such as your arrogance and haughtiness. Hijāb, you are like a drowning man whom others are trying to save and you seem to be intent on dying.

THE DOUBTS OF HĪJĀB

Hijāb has brought numerous doubts, which he has put in front of his followers and the aim behind them is **to make himself appear the victim**, to make it look like he has been oppressed, and this is after his attempt at slandering me with tajsīm on that issue of “dependence” was thrown back at him and when his blatant lie in

accusing me of mis-translating the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah backfired upon him and he was caught out as a blatant liar. So his tactic now is to operate from **the angle of damage limitation**. Meaning to say, “I did something wrong, OK, but I have been oppressed too, and so really, we are on an equal footing.” No, this is not true, ever. So let us proceed to his doubts and annihilate them one by one, inshā‘Allāh.

In Part 10 of this series, I said the following about Hijāb:

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

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

He is now playing the victim on these issues.

1. Falling into Tajsīm

Recall that Hijāb tried to accuse me of tajsīm because I said that Allāh’s *ṣifāt fi’liyyah*, such as His acts of mercy, acts of creation and His speech “depend” on His will and power, which is a correct and true meaning, and this was the only thing he could use as misdirection and diversion, even though this was stated in the flow of argument to show him that the atheists will use this against him, and that is what had actually happened, a month earlier in one of his discussions. So I have already responded to that accusation and refuted him amply and sufficiently. In fact, I will give him even more on that subject matter, this time through **Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī** as cited by Ibn Taymiyyah, inshā‘Allāh, a little later in this article.

As for this issue of tajsīm:



Mohammed Hijab @mohammed_hijab · 17m

It is clear the opposition now has to resort to clear lies because they couldn't deal with the arguments. Even if we assume I am a Kafir Jahmite (as you are trying to portray) it still doesn't take away from my arguments ;)

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

where did i say this?



1



1



6



So let us understand the psychological tricks being played here:

First: I exposed Hijāb as a blatant, calculated liar in Part 10 of this series, and this was because he was the one that could not deal with the arguments. So what academic shysters like Hijāb do is to reverse the charge and to throw the very things they have been guilty of upon their opponents.

Second: Notice how he is trying tell his audience that he has been declared “Kafir Jahmite”, as a means of playing with their emotions and eliciting their sympathies. **No such thing has been said about him.** Rather, we have stated that the origins of his kalām and falsafah come from those who were Jahmite Kāfirs, like al-Jahm or Bāṭinī Qarāmiṭī Kafirs like Ibn Sīnā, that he is treading a dangerous path

and that he is drawing harm upon himself, other Muslims and this ummah with this misguidance.

Third: As for his “arguments”, then he has none at all, as has been made clear already. And as for his misuse of a statement of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding specialist terminology, then we will address that later in this article.

After these initial points, let us validate our statement that he fell into tajsīm, giving Allāh a “body”, using the very standards of his kalām and falsafah.

To do this, we must understand the issue of **jurisdiction**, which is the right or authority to interpret and apply the law.

You, Hijāb, are operating within **the jurisdiction of kalām and falsafah**. I am operating within the jurisdiction of **the Book and the Sunnah and the understanding of the Salaf**. As such, you cannot apply your law to me, as I have not subscribed to it, or made it a foundation in the acquisition and validation of my belief. However, I can enter into your jurisdiction and do one of two things. I can convict you based upon your law, and I can also convict you based upon my law, because my law is superior to yours. However, it is sufficient for me to convict you upon your own law, to the satisfaction of all others who are in the same jurisdiction as you, and who may not agree with my law being made the foundation.

So this is what I am going to do.

In your jurisdiction there are **definitions of “jism”** (body) given by the Mutafalsifah and the Mutakallimah. They include:

- Whatever occupies space
- Whatever has spatial extension
- Whatever accepts length, breadth and depth

And so on... and these can be found in the books of Ahl al-Kalām.

Thus, when you said to Julie the physicist—yes, the one you converted to the “Islām” of Fir‘aun and pure atheists, which is belief in a “necessary existence”—when you said: **“Yes, your God is that, the only difference between my God and your God is size.”** Then, by affirming “size” for God in relation to Julie’s “muon”—then **within your jurisdiction**, you have fallen into tajsīm and have given a “body” (a jism) to “God”. And every Ash‘arī and Māturīdī **must** support me in this and be on my side against you, otherwise **they must apostatise from their innovated kalām creed.**

I am **correctly interpreting and executing the law** upon you to your complete satisfaction and to the satisfaction of all those who reside in your jurisdiction. **This is why no Ash‘arī or Māturīdī can be standing with you.** They must be standing behind me, and if not, they are pusillanimous cowards.

However, even this is an over-simplification.

This is a more complete picture:

Jurisdiction			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Naql + Aql Law & Order Uniformity	<input type="checkbox"/> ‘Aql (Alleged and Deformed) Lawlessness, Chaos, Law of the Jungle Disunity, Variation, In-Fighting, Contradiction		
Qur‘ān, Sunnah & Fahm of Salaf	Kalām of Ash‘arīs & Māturīdīs	Kalām of Mu‘tazilah	Falsafah of Ibn Sīnā & co.

Hijāb, you are over there with Ibn Sīnā and you’ve hybridised his dung with the puss of the Mu‘tazilah, and it is out of that cesspit that you have emerged. So basically, we are stepping in to your

jurisdiction and to the satisfaction of all parties who consider ‘aql (reason) to come before naql (revelation) and overrule it, we are simply using that same alleged ‘aql with its philosophical foundations to first **interpret**, then **execute** the law, forcing you to remain **logically consistent** upon it and then **sentencing** you with a stretch in prison as discipline for your tajsīm.

And in this, the Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs must rejoice and be with us for having laid down their law upon the criminal. However, instead they have joined you, in order to defend you in falsehood. So much for their steadfastness upon their innovated **Tawḥīd of ajsām and a‘rāḍ** (bodies and accidents).

In contrast, you cannot do the same to us.

Your philosophical necessities don’t apply to us, because we are not in your jurisdiction and we reject this as a foundation in speaking about Allāh in **affirmation** or **negation**. You cannot apply your law in our arena because it is illegitimate and we reject it. However, we can enter into yours—by virtue of the fact that we are upon the true law, the law that establishes order in beliefs and statements—and we can lay down the law, convict you, lash you, beat you and imprison you, whether by **authentic revelation**, **sound reason** or the **necessities of your own law**. I have used the third. You attributed “size” to your “God” and described Him as a larger version of Julie’s fundamental particle, the muon, which is what is supposed to **give mass** to other particles, itself having a mass of $1.883531627 \times 10^{-28}$ kg.

This, O child (**boy, boy, boy, boy, boy**), is tajsīm.

Thus, you need to quit the pretence of being the lion in the jungle of kalām and falsafah because you will be very quickly captured and put in the zoo.

This is clear, it is the absolute end of the matter and no appeals are allowed.

2. The issue of “Dependence”

This issue has already been addressed with sufficiency. In Part 8 I cited three extremely important statements from Ibn Taymiyyah about the nature of the argument being used by Hijāb and how it does not prove a creator at all, does not separate atheism from affirmation of Rubūbiyyah (and even that is not Islām), and that this argument only proves an existence in the mind, and as for external reality, it can only be completed with negation of Allāh’s names and attributes, thereby rendering Him non-existent. Hijāb completely ignored the substance of that article and he found **one statement** of mine, in the flow of argument, in which I explained that the *ṣifāt fi’liyyah* or *af’āl ikhtiyāriyyah* (Allāh’s chosen actions, like speech, creating, showing mercy) depend on His will (*mashī’ah*), desire (*irādah*) and power (*qudrah*). So he took the word “depend” and because he is poisoned with the poison of Ibn Ṣīnā, and his argument of *tarkīb* which was taken from the *Mu’tazilah*, Hijāb used that poison of that *Bāṭinī Kāfir* to accuse me of being a “*mujassim*”, a wicked slander on his behalf.

So in Part 8 (pp. 7-10), I addressed this issue by citing from Ibn Taymiyyah a decisive statement in this respect which demolished Hijāb’s slander. Then, I also added the fact that Hijāb is actually stood with Ibn Sīnā against all of the *Ṣifātiyyah*, including the *Ash’arīs* and *Māturīdīs* when he makes this argument. This is because some of the *Ash’arites* use a rational argument to prove the attribute of life (*ḥayāt*) for Allāh, which is to say knowledge and power cannot be except with life, so life is **a condition**. And this approximates—in the argument of Ibn Ṣīnā and philosophers—to dependence or need (*iftiqār*). So Hijāb would have to accuse *Ash’arites* as well.

Further, in Part 10, when he blatantly lied in accusing me of mistranslating Ibn Taymiyyah’ speech—a calculated move on his behalf

to dismiss all of what has been said about him by casting doubt on my integrity—I cited from Ibn Taymiyyah when he was in the course of summarising the arguments of the Mutakallimīn (like al-Ghazālī) against the very accusation that Hijāb brought, and in the course of that Ibn Taymiyyah said that the statement “He is in need of His own self” is **the meaning** of “He is necessary in existence by His self”. In other words, the very thing which Hijāb attacked me for, **is the very meaning** of what he affirms as “wājib al-wujūd bi nafsihī”. So this means Ibn Taymiyyah is now a mujassim and ironically, so is Hijāb. And this is the depth of ignorance and desire that Hijāb is wallowing in, being in compound ignorance about it.

However, we want to complete this and add more because a job well done is better than a job done.

Ibn Taymiyyah also brings the counterarguments of al-Rāzī against this same doubt of tarkīb and iftiqār (composition and dependence), and we will not lengthen this affair by citing them all, however Ibn Taymiyyah nicely summarises the essence of them in a passage:

فهذا الكلام من الرازي يبين أن وقوع الكثرة مما لا بد منه، وأن الممتنع في واجب الوجود إنما هو احتياجه إلى أمر خارجي، وأما كون ما يدخل في مسمى «واجب الوجود» مما يتوقف بعضه على بعض، فذلك لا ينافي وجوب الوجود.

“So this speech from al-Rāzī explains that the occurrence of numerousness (kathrah)—[i.e. when speaking of Allāh’s essence, names and attributes]—is something that is inescapable and that what is impossible regarding the necessary in existence is Him being in need of an external

matter. As for what enters into the meaning of “necessary in existence”, being from that [where] some of it depends upon (yatawaqqafu... ‘alā) other [than it] then that does not negate being necessary in existence.”²

This is a tremendous statement packed full of benefit for the reader, in addition to comprising violent, mass slaughter upon the army of Hijāb’s doubt. And we can elaborate upon this with the following:

1. First of all, note that in refuting the doubt of Ibn Sīnā and the Mutafalsifah of tarkīb and iftiqār, Ibn Taymiyyah is actually summarising and presenting what has been said previously by the likes of al-Ghazālī and al-Rāzī, the latter being a chameleon, often contradicting himself, having diverse conflicting views. And this is the reality of the people of kalām and falsafah. Confusion comes with the territory. So this shows us exactly where Hijāb is positioned. He is not even with the Mutakallimīn, rather he is with the Mutafalsifah, the likes of Ibn Sīnā in waging war against all of the Şifātiyyah, which include Ahl al-Sunnah and then the kalām groups, the Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs. So how pitiful that Hijāb the pseudophilosopher does not even know in which territory he is and against whom he is fighting. And likewise, how pitiful it is that the Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs are the ones who have rallied in support of Hijāb, a Falsafiyy Mutakhabbiṭ, ignorant of the Tawḥīd of the Messengers, against a Sunni Muthabbit, invalidating the spurious Tawḥīd of the Philosophers. And this is what happens when you ride upon bid‘ah, **it will eventually take you for a ride in oceans of misguidance.** This is why there is no escape for any Muslim except to be a Salafī, Sunnī, Atharī if he wants firmness upon the dīn of Allāh (ﷺ) and save himself from

² Sharḥ al-Aşbahāniyyah (1430H) p. 85.

what happened to the Jews and Christians of tabdīl, taḥrīf (alteration, distortion), hardening of the heart and all those other things that follow on from inclining away from right guidance.

2. The statement of Ibn Taymiyyah: “So this speech from al-Rāzī explains that the occurrence of numerousness (kathrah) is something that is inescapable...”

This means that all factions, whether the Philosophers, the Ahl al-Kalām or Ahl al-Sunnah, the Salafīs, then every faction, they must accept the notion of “numerousness” and this simply means multiple descriptions or attributes or names for Allāh or for what they refer to as “necessary in existence” (wājib al-wujūd). This is because there is nothing in existence (creator or created) except that **it must have at least one attribute in addition to its own essence**. Hence, there is Allāh (His essence) and there is His existence. However, this separation is made in the mind only, but as for external reality, then His essence is His existence, and there is nothing that separates from Him which we call “existence” and which therefore entails “composition”, such that it can be said that Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ), for His existence, depends on His self and is therefore in need, and thus, this is composition, and therefore disbelief—as would be argued by the Mutafalsifāh, a feeble argument, and from whose direction Ḥijāb has come in order to fight against the truth and engage in slander. So upon this basis, every single faction, must accept that when we speak about Allāh, then affirming multiple descriptions, attributes and names is inevitable for all parties concerned. As a result, the Philosophers have no argument against the People of Kalām and the Mu‘tazilah have no argument against the Şifātiyyah.

3. The statement of Ibn Taymiyyah: “...and that what is impossible regarding the necessary in existence is Him being in need of an external matter...”

Thus, this whole issue of being in need, being dependent, then what is impossible in this regard is Allāh being in need of, or dependent upon **what is other than Himself**. And this is the meaning of those names such as al-**Ghaniyy**, al-**Ḥayy**, al-**Qayyūm**, al-**Ṣamad** and so on. And the innovators, the Mutafalsfifah, the Mutakallimīn and Muḥammad Hijāb, they approach these names from a different trajectory as we mentioned before. They do not see these names as they are correctly understood. Rather, they come to these names from the angle of their kalām, their falsafah, their toxic bid'ah. So when an ignorant person hears them speak about Tawhīd, and they mention these names, and speak of them through their own bid'ah, then that person will think that they are making tanzih, when they are actually operating on foundations of misguidance, and this shows the great danger of this affair. So when a Sunnī, Salafī, Atharī mentions these names, it is not the same as when a Bid'iyy, Falsafiyy, such as Hijāb, mentions these names and uses them in arguments, because at minimum, they mix truth with falsehood in the meanings they present, if it is not complete falsehood. Thus, the negation of “being in need” and so on, in the language of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, all of it is in relation to what is other than Allāh, what is other than His self.

4. The statement of Ibn Taymiyyah: **“As for what enters into the meaning of “necessary in existence”, being from that [where] some of it depends upon (yatawaqqafu... 'alā) other [than it] then that does not negate being necessary in existence...”**

So this statement—as we said—comprises “mass slaughter”, it is a violent, gory, merciless killing of the army of Hijāb's doubt.

In order to understand this, then we know Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) has a true and real existence, outside of the mind, and in His existence, He is established by His self, and He is other than the creation, which He

created outside of His self. This self, or His essence, Has names, attributes, actions and has descriptions. And all of this together, would enter into what the people of innovation speak with, this term, “wājib al-wujūd”, the necessary in existence. So when we now speak about these affairs and say for example:

—Allāh **depends on His self** for His existence.

—Allāh’s knowledge and power **depend on His life**.

—Allāh’s chosen acts (such as mercy, creating and speaking) **depend on His will and power**.

and so on... none of this would negate Him being “necessary in existence” because none of this entails that Allāh is in need of other than His own self. In fact, this is the very meaning of “necessary in existence by His self” as was said explicitly by Ibn Taymiyyah when we quoted from him earlier:

ومعلوم أن افتقاره إلى الجميع هو افتقاره إلى نفسه، ¹ وقول القائل: مفتقر إلى نفسه*، هو معنى قوله: هو واجب بنفسه؛ فعلم 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.”³

And importantly, all of what has been said above has been said **in the flow of a counterargument against this doubt**. Even though the meaning is sound, in normal speech we would not say this, but one cannot be accused of misguidance, even if it was said.

³ Sharḥ al-Aṣbahāniyyah, (1430H) p. 65.

So with that, Hijāb’s doubt has been mercilessly slaughtered and sent into **non-existence in external reality**, and now exists only in his mind, just like the “necessary existence” of the Bāṭinī Kāfir, Ibn Sīnā whose doubts he is relying upon in making spurious charges of tajsīm and kufr.

3. Ascribing “Parts” to Allāh.

Next, we come to the issue of “parts”.



First: What happened in that conversation dated **26 May 2019** is that he had already said, more than a minute and a half earlier, that his own speech is “**a part of me**”—setting himself up for error—and that it is “**intrinsic to me**” which is the saying of the Mu’tazilah of making attributes synonymous with essences, because it means “belonging to the essential nature of a thing”. So he is all over the place, uttering contradictory statements within the same breath. He then claimed that the attribute of speech is a “**part of Allāh**”, then a little later he said it is “**part of His attributes**”—which was still

wrong—then later he said it is “**one of His many attributes**”. And further down in the discussion he says “**I don’t believe God has parts**”. This can be found on pages 55-56 and then page 61 of Part 8 in this series.

Second: I decided to take him to task for saying that speech is a “part of Allāh” because Hijāb does not have any firm grounding in this subject area and he is speaking on a whim and is all over the place. There is a difference between a slip of the tongue or pen on the one hand and speaking upon ignorance and uncertainty on the other. Further, when Hijāb says: “part of His attributes”, then that is no different to saying “part of Allāh”, because the saying of Ahl al-Sunnah is neither to say Allāh’s attributes are Him and nor to say they are other than Him. Given that, when Hijāb says, speech is “**part** of His attributes”, then this wording is still incorrect and does not deliver him. Rather, what is correct is that it is from His attributes, which Hijāb did say later. All of this shows a man who is not upon any firm grounding. So he has been taken to task for speaking and debating upon ignorance, upon speculation, upon uncertainty, and to speak about Allāh without knowledge is from the greatest of sins.

Further, in another video published on **21 June 2019** but which appears to be an older video, because the publishing account holder added “old is gold” to the title (so we don’t know how old it is), Hijāb is having a debate with another Christian, and Hijāb says the exact same thing when the same topic is raised again:



At 11m:32s in this video⁴, the following exchange takes place:

Christian: “The attribute of God is not God right? And only God is uncreated...” Hijab: **“Who told you that the attribute of God is not God?”** Christian: “Is it God?” Hijab: **“We believe that its part of God’s nature.”** Christian: “It is part of God?” Hijab: **“Yes.”**

And then the exchange continues.

So once again, this is something Ḥijāb has repeated at least twice, in the context of the same issue. As for your mubāhalah, then I provided the readers with enough of your statements to make it clear to them that as the discussion progressed, your statements varied, until you said: “I don’t believe God has parts” and the reader can clearly see that. Also, if I wanted to resort to these tactics, Ḥijāb, I could say to you: “Let’s do mubāhalah if I mistranslated Ibn Taymiyyah’s speech as you claim”, “Let’s do mubāhalah if I am a mujassim as you allege, while you use Ibn Ṣīnā’s argument”, “Let’s do a mubāhalah if I affirm ‘parts’ for Allāh as you allege, while you

⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ktjY2LvEx5s>

use the Mu‘tazilī argument”. I can do the same. All you are doing is playing games in front of your audience.

4. The “Debate” Tactic Used by the Innovators of Old

After Hijāb was exposed and refuted for his orientation and his trojan horse of tarkīb and takhṣīṣ injected into imkān and wujūb and empirical evidence was provided from the historical record in the second to seventh centuries of Islām and also from his discussions to prove the veracity of the criticism, Hijāb used one of his numerous tactics. He called for a debate about the issue, and he also tried to reframe the issue as well, trying to make it look like as if the contention is only about the use of terminology.

So I stated in Part 10:

“Sorry, we are followers (**muttabi‘īn**) not innovators (**muttadi‘īn**). 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 Fir‘aun, 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 Mu‘tazilah whose way you are traversing.”

And this stands and does not change.

However, I will agree to debate you in front of my Lord and your Lord in this subject matter on the Day of Judgement and I will justify my statement that you are a misguided innovator, calling others to misguidance, wanting in intellect, diseased with pride, arrogance. So as for this debate, then yes. And inshā‘Allāh, I hope to be stood behind the Salaf and the Imāms of the Sunnah, because I am simply

following them and upon their way, whilst you will be behind Ibn Sīnā and the heads of the Mu'tazilah in this matter. I agree with this debate, if Allāh wills, but as for what you are calling for, then that is simply a ruse to give you the chance to confound the truth and the Salaf were wise to tricksters like you. I repeat my advice to you, go and debate a lamp-post and post the video on your social media and tube for the entertainment of your followers.

Further, what is strange is that Hījāb is boldly asking for debates—and this is just part of the circus for his audience—yet when he is requested for clarification by others who appear to have grasped these issues, he flees on his heels!

I was sent this interesting conversation by someone:



Abu Nu'aim Abdullah @AbuNuaimA · 2h ✓

I read those PDFs. The main criticism is not on the contingency argument's soundness. It's on the supplemental tarkib & ikhtisas arguments you bring to prove the necessary existence is Allah, & not merely some other existence. I haven't yet seen an answer to this. Have you one?



Mohammed Hijab @mohammed_hij... · 1h ✓

Salaam yes please watch my video on FB I explicitly mention Tarkeeb and Takhsis



Abu Nu'aim Abdullah @AbuNuaimA · 37m ▾

1. Afraid that hasn't clarified. By using tarkib & takhsis you open the door to rejection of names & attributes – e.g. by saying Allah is immaterial and incorporeal. So this is to deny Allah is in a location when it is clear from many āyāt & ahadith that Allāh is above...



Abu Nu'aim Abdullah @AbuNuaimA · 23m ▾

2. above the 7 heavens, over His Throne. So is Allāh in no location? Or is he one with His Creation? In which case, either Allah is not eternal, or His Creation IS eternal due to it being one with Him. If it is eternal, then what difference is there between...



Abu Nu'aim Abdullah @AbuNuaimA · 21m ▾

3. between believing that the Universe is God, or a Muon is God, or Allāh is God? Because now EVERYTHING is eternal! So this leads right back to atheism. So this is partly what I believe the PDFs are saying: that...



Abu Nu'aim Abdullah @AbuNuaimA · 19m ▾

4. that by using the necessary existence argument, you MUST supplant it with tarkib, takhsis, etc. By doing so you open the door to all these other doubts, and fitan which may confuse the Muslims and the atheists can easily work around them. So although the necessary...



Abu Nu'aim Abdullah @AbuNuaimA · 17m ▾


5. necessary existence argument may be logically sound, it does not agree with the Qur'an and Sunnah due to what else it NECESSARILY ENTAILS, and so Islam contains within it many other, stronger, unbreachable arguments to prove that Allāh exists, and He is the One Creator...



Abu Nu'aim Abdullah @AbuNuaimA · 16m ▾

6. Creator worthy of our worship, over the Throne, who is Perfect in His Names and Attributes, and Who Sees all, Hears all, knows all, and the rest of what He has described Himself with in the Qur'an, or by way of His Messenger peace be upon him.



 **Abu Nu'aim Abdullah** @AbuNuaimA · 16m ▾
7. And that's only one aspect that is mentioned in the documents. There are many others which are just as concerning. End thread.

 1   1 

 **Abu Nu'aim Abdullah** @AbuNuaimA · 1m ▾
Bonus 8: And now I'm blocked with no response. That's not a rousing display that you have confidence in your argument, I must say.



The screenshot shows a Twitter profile for Mohammed Hijab (@mohammed_hijab). The profile picture is a circular image of a man with a beard, with a red square obscuring his face. Below the name and handle, there is a message: "You are blocked from following @mohammed_hijab and viewing @mohammed_hijab's Tweets. [Learn more](#)". At the bottom of the profile card, there are icons for reply, retweet, like, and share.

Hijāb cannot even engage someone who has understood and presented the essence of the argument I raised, and he blocked that user. That's not a sign of confidence, and then he requests a debate! As I said, Hijāb is but a **performance artist** and whereas a circus clown juggles with balls and skittles to amaze the audience, Hijāb juggles with kalām and falsafah to show what an amazing and clever debator he is. It is not about truth and falsehood, or corroborating the Tawḥīd of the Messengers and distinguishing it from the doctrine of

Fir‘aun, Ibn Sīnā, the unity of existence and so on, but it is all about winning debates with the toolset of kalām and falsafah.

Finally, I am upon the advice of the Imām of Ahl al-Sunnah, **Imām Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal** (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ), the Subduer of Innovation:

Ḥanbal bin Ishāq bin Ḥanbal related that a man sought permission from Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal to attend the gathering of the people of kalām and to debate against them. So Imām Aḥmad wrote back with the following:

“Bismillāhir-Raḥmānir-Raḥīm: May Allāh be benevolent to you and repel every evil and cautionary matter from you. That which we used to hear from the people of knowledge and found them to be upon is that they used to hate kalām and sitting with the people of deviation. Rather, the affairs lie in submission and halting at what was in the Book of Allāh or the Sunnah of Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). Not in sitting with the people of innovation and deviation in order to refute them. For indeed, they will [seek to] deceive you, and they do not return [to the truth]. So safety—if Allāh wills—lies in abandonment of sitting with them and [not] disputing with them about their innovation and misguidance.”⁵

Imām Aḥmad (d. 241H) 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.

⁵ Al-Ibānah of Ibn Baṭṭah (no. 462).

—Abandonment of quarrelling, argumentation and controversies in the religion.”

And **al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī** (d. 110H) said: “Do not sit with the people of desires, even if you think you have the answer.”⁶ And **al-Ḥasan** and **Muḥammad bin Sīrīn** (d. 110H) used to say: “Do not sit with the people of desires, not listen to them, nor debate with them.”⁷

So this is what we are upon.

5. The “Credentials” Tactic

I have been informed that Hijāb has used the tactic of questioning credentials, even though nobody knows his credentials. This is another ruse, another trick played by academic conmen like Hijāb who know of logical fallacies and how to make use of them in order to win debates and make light of their own misguidance, after it has been exposed for everybody to see.

Suffice it to say that when Hijāb’s existence in external reality was only an **unrealised possible existence (wujūd mumkin)**, one in the mind only, when he was still in his father’s loins—without intending any disrespect whatsoever to his father, may Allāh grant him the good of this life and the next if he is alive and grant him abundant mercy and forgiveness if he has passed away—then at such a time I was reading from the Salaf and from Ibn Taymiyyah. Whilst Hijāb was in his nappies I was translating from Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā and from al-Madārij of Ibn al-Qayyim and from the tafsīr of Ibn Kathīr. And shortly after Hijāb learned to speak, I along with Abu Ṭalḥah Dawūd Burbank (رحمته الله), was translating the texts of creed from the Salaf and refuting Jahmites such as Nūh Keller. And with Abu Khadeejah, the three of us were publishing and disseminating

⁶ Dhamm al-Kalām of al-Harawī (no. 765).

⁷ Ibid. (no. 766).

the creed of the Salaf. Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) knows that I had no real desire to mention any of the above, save from the angle that since Hijāb is arrogant and condescending towards Salafis, and uses sarcasm, and aims to belittle them, then I am simply mentioning these affairs to expose his arrogance and to put him in his proper place.

As for the issue of credentials and tazkiyāt (commendations), then Allāh is the One who distributes fiqh (comprehension) between His servants—to whomever He intends to show goodness. Having credentials or tazkiyāt are not conditions for having fiqh. Rather, even with credentials and commendations, people can still manifest the ignorance of laymen and be upon misguidance.

This meaning can be found with the major scholars of today such as **Shaykh Ibn ‘Uthaymīn, Shaykh al-Fawzān, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Muḥsin, Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī, Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī, Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghudayān**⁸ and others. Their statements provide evidence that whilst credentials and commendations are no doubt of some value, they are not proof of fiqh in the religion. Further, they explain that commendations are not a condition for teaching, though they are desirable, and that they can also be misused. What is required for teaching is thorough understanding of the subject matter at hand. I translated ten or so of their statements on this subject six years ago.

In any case, the foundation is to take from the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah and to return affairs which are difficult or unclear back to them so as to avoid errors in one’s understanding.

As for Hijāb, not only are you upon bāṭil, you are defending it as well. You are doing so with arrogance, and the use of despicable, underhanded tactics. So even if you had a thousand qualifications

⁸ All of these statements were published on <http://www.manhaj.com>.

and a thousand commendations, ultimately, it would be your speech and your behaviour upon which you would be judged and that would reveal the true reality of those qualifications and commendations. As Shaykh Rabī said, it is a person's own actions that comprise his tazkiyah, not what is on paper or what is said by others.

Throughout history there are instances of when the Innovators, like some of the Mu'tazilah for example, far excelled over many of the scholars of the Sunnah, those upon the way of the Salaf, in the field of language for example. There are many instances of Imāms of the Sunnah making mistakes in Arabic grammar and likewise, Imāms in language, making mistakes in recitation of the Qur'ān. Some of them were non-Arabs who were not skilled in Arabic but they were firm upon the Sunnah, Imāms for their people—and examples have been given by scholars. So these types of affairs—qualifications or expertise in certain areas or lack thereof—are not proof that you are upon guidance.

In short, just another cheap diversionary tactic.

6. The Academic Integrity Tactic

After Hijāb made his false slander of tajsīm and then kufr akbar against me because I mentioned that Allāh's mercy, speech and acts of creation depend on His will and power, as occurs in Part 7 of this series on page 28, I updated the article by adding two footnotes responding to each of his two false claims, with the main text unchanged. I indicated that these are updates to the article, added the date, and quoted the claim of Hijāb and gave my response. This is perfectly acceptable and there is nothing wrong with this at all. Hijāb, in his desperation, and being a scandalmonger by nature, he tried to make a mountain out of this.

Here are the two updates:

²⁶ [Update 28/06/2019](#): Hijāb has criticised me for saying Allāh has attributes which depend on others. [Response](#): The above speech of mine is a reference to And:

²⁸ [Update 28/06/2019](#): Hijāb commented on this passage: “Saying Allah has limited variables and is dependent is kufr akbar. You must repent for this at once.” [Response](#): This is nowhere to be found in my speech. Rather, the flow of the Hence, there is nothing in this for Hijāb.

7. The Tabdīr Tactic

Tabdīr is when a person who is upon the Sunnah is expelled from the Sunnah when he opposes a foundation from its foundations, after the proof has been established and he persists upon it. The issues in which he may err are of two types. Clear, major innovations in which the proof is already established and openly known, such as Sūfism, Khārijism, Jahmism and so on, in which case he is an innovator. And deep, intricate issues which require recourse to scholars, and require, advice, guidance, and establishment of the proof.

As for when a person is **already upon bid’ah**, such as Hijāb, and is a caller to it, and such a person wages war against the people of the Sunnah, and engages in defence of his bid’ah, then declaring him an innovator is no different to describing any person by any of his recognisable features. Thus, it is like saying: So and so is tall, so and so is short, so and so is generous and that is because these are factual descriptions of that persons reality. **Hijāb is a misguided innovator**, and the Salaf considered the people of kalām to be misguided and callers to misguidance. In fact, they even considered a person who arrived at the Sunnah, **but through the route of kalām** to also be outside of the Sunnah. So not only do you have to be on truth, but you have to come to it through the correct route as well.

8. Slander, Denigration and Mockery

Someone sent to me via email a screenshot of a tweet of Hijāb in which he makes reference to “Milkshaykh”.

I will explain what this is and exactly what Hijāb is doing—and in this he is following the traits and behaviours of the disbelievers mentioned by Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) in the Qur’ān, the way they behaved after the falsehood they were upon was refuted with rational and revealed evidences, of the use of mockery.

Over ten years ago, in 2008, I began to promote the importance of healthy nutrition, diet and lifestyle among Muslims in general, with the principles of the Prophetic Medicine as a broad base. As part of that I spoke on what is found in in the Sunnah in numerous narrations of the beneficial effect of cow’s milk, that is fresh cow’s milk fed on their natural grass diet. Nations have consumed milk for thousands of years without any issues until the industrial revolution in Western nations led to the pollution of both the water and milk supplies in urban centres. To cut a long story short, this led us to where we are today of the large-scale production of poor quality milk from unhealthy cows fed on unnatural grain-based diets, boosted with hormones to increase yield, and fed with antibiotics, by necessity, and then heat treated to make it safe to consume. So I spoke on this and other issues, much to the dislike of some doctors. These doctors—and there were five of them altogether—felt threatened that their qualifications in allopathic medicine were being undermined. That people were turning to a model of health founded on **precaution** and **preservation**—the Prophetic model—which was perceived by them as undermining their profession, their expert status and “authority-figureness”. That people were moving away from a symptom-treatment model of disease to a health-centred model instead, which is the better part of medicine. So they tried their

hardest to attack me, even trying to get refutations against me from scholars, but all of their plots failed. This is despite the fact that what I was speaking about was fresh milk from farms certified by relevant health authorities. I opposed neither the religion, nor any regulations. Hence, they had no room to behave the way they did.

In order to clarify the issue to them, I wrote a lengthy document in which I brought evidence from the Sunnah, the ḥadīths of **Ibn Mas'ūd, Ṭāriq bin Shihāb, Suhaib, Mulaykhah** (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ), seven ḥadīths altogether, and gave them a detailed treatment of the history of the milk industry from the late 1800s, as well as evidence from academic research on the superiority and health benefits of fresh milk, alongside evidence that it has been used successfully in the cure of many chronic diseases in the appropriate settings, in order to show the superiority of the guidance of the Prophet (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ).

They were unable to answer this, and then began to reframe the issues, on a backfoot, and in a cowardly manner, they embarked on a mission to bring me down by soliciting refutations from scholars, in which they failed alḥamdulillāh. Then each of them starting writing feeble refutations and responses and advices, all but fleeing from the issue and using arguments of authority and ad-hominem attacks.

Some years later, one of these individuals found himself in Jeddah wherein he met a **misguided, corrupt, evil individual** by the name of **'Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker** of Brixton, a raw hater, full of envy and jealousy. So somewhere in this line of transmission, whether this doctor or 'Abd al-Ḥaqq, they fabricated a lie in that Abu 'Iyaad suffers from diarrhoea and that is why he cannot handle milk and needs fresh milk. So he coined the term "Milkshaykh". The aim of this is to mock, ridicule and belittle and to paint a picture of your adversary in the most horrendous and denigrating of ways when you have no other argument left, all out of pure malice and viciousness of heart.

So ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq then began to say this in some of his online videos, may Allāh give this man what he deserves—and I say this not for saying what he said about me, as that does not bother me one iota, **but because he intends by that to hinder people from the truth that we, as Salafis, carry.** And so anyone who is like that, one who hinders people from guidance, we ask Allāh to bring him to justice and halt him in his tracks. But as for the one who lies and slanders and tries to harm us due to trying to aid his self, because he cannot control his desires and rage, and is simply seeking an outlet, but he does not intend hindrance, then we ask Allāh to guide him, pardon him and aid him against his soul.

So what Muḥammad Hijāb is doing is that after his innovation and misguidance was refuted and he was exposed as a blatant liar, and he had no other route, he then went searching to see what filth, lies and slanders he could find to denigrate me. And this is what he found and then he began to use this on his twitter as has been forwarded to me. Look at how these misguided individuals inherit this wicked behaviour from each other.

This behaviour is the behaviour of the disbelievers towards the Prophets of Allāh. Moses (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ) was mocked by Fir‘aun for his flaw in speech. It is the behaviour of the People of Bid‘ah towards the Scholars of the Sunnah and their followers. These are the vilest and lowliest of methods to reject the truth. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Kinānī al-Makkī (d. 240H), who debated Bishr al-Marīsī al-Ḥanafī al-Jahmī, was ugly. He was not given beauty. And in the course of argument he was mocked for that by that misguided Jahmite’s followers as occurs in al-Ḥaydah:

قال عبد العزيز: فقال لي المأمون وأي شيء أردت بهذا القول، وما الذي دعاك إلى ذكر هذا؟ فقلت سمعت بعض من هاهنا يقول لأمر المؤمنين: يكفيك من كلامه قبح وجهه، فما يضرني قبح وجهي مع ما رزقني الله عز وجل من فهم كتابه، والعلم بسنة نبيه ﷺ فتبسم المأمون حتى وضع يده على فيه، ثم قلت: يا أمير المؤمنين أطل الله بقاه فقد رأيتك تنظر إلى هذا النفس وانتفاخ الجص وتذكره، وسمعت عمرا يعيب ذلك ويدعو إلى صانعه، ولا يعيب الجص، ولا يدعو عليه، فقال المأمون: العيب لا يقع على الشيء المصنوع، وإنما يقع العيب على الصانع. قال: قلت: صدقت يا أمير المؤمنين، ولكن هذا يعيب ربي لم خلقتني قبيحا فإزداد تبسما حتى ظهرت (ثناياه).

So ‘Abd al-‘Azīz said to al-Ma’mūn that he heard someone in the gathering say: “Sufficient for you with respect to his speech is the ugliness of his face.” And then he said: “The ugliness of my face does not harm me alongside what Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) has bestowed upon me of the understanding of His Book and knowledge of the Sunnah of His Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ)...” And then al-Ma’mūn smiled and said: “Blame does not fall on anything which is made, rather it falls on its maker.” So ‘Abd al-‘Azīz said: “You have spoken the truth O Chief of the Believers. But this one blames my Lord, [saying]: ‘Why did he create me ugly?’” So then al-Ma’mūn continue smiling until his front teeth were seen.”

And ‘Abd al-‘Azīz also said:

فوالله يا أمير المؤمنين ما أبالي إن وجهي أقبح مما هو، وإني أحسن من الفهم والعلم أكثر

مما أحسن

“By Allāh, O Chief of the Believers, I do not care if my face is uglier than what it already is, but I am more handsome in understanding and knowledge than he is handsome (in appearance).”

Look at this reply of a scholar of the Sunnah who demolished a misguided innovator, Bishr al-Marīsī and his misguided, sarcastic, arrogant followers, disdainers of truth.

So these are the ways of misguided innovators who have filth in their hearts, and which—unless they are tested and put to trial—remains hidden from their followers, those who have been misled to believe that such people are the vanguards of Islām, of pure thought and speech, when they are the vilest, most vicious of people, and that would never have become known, had their racket not been uncovered by the decree of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ).

So when it is the case that even if your accusation was true, you would have no argument to reject the truth, then what about when your accusation is false and nothing but a vile slander?

So people who use such methods, they are blaming the action of the decreer of decrees— Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ)—because such affairs have no connection to truth and falsehood, and thus it cannot be except mockery and blame of the action of one who decrees.

It is clear that Hijāb is a sick individual, who needs medication.

PRESCRIBING HĪJĀB’S MEDICATION

By now, HĪjāb should realise the relationship here is like father to child, like physician to patient, like subduer to subdued, and he should know that he only has a few seconds left before he passes out due to the blood choke-hold he has been caught in from the first moment.

Whatever his outcome, he needs medication, and so we prescribe the following to him:

1. Three teaspoons of **extremely bitter humility** after Fajr and Aṣr with no sugar allowed, and after having first removed the clothing of haughtiness, arrogance and disdain.

2. A weekly reading, not of Thalāthat al-Uṣūl wa Adillatuhā, as that is a little advanced, but of **al-Uṣūl al-Thalāthah**, the shorter, simpler one written for kids. This is a good start for knowing the reality of the Tawḥīd of the Messengers and the difference between it and the Tawḥīd of Bāṭinī Kāfirs like Ibn Sīnā or the “necessary existence” of Fir’aun, Alex, and Julie the physicist, which does not even amount to the ma’rifah of al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān’s īmān, which at least reached the level of al-Rubūbiyyah. The Salafi Mosque in Birmingham can accommodate you in their children’s classes.

3. A daily gradual detox reading to completion of Abu Ismā’īl al-Ḥarawī’s “Dhamm al-Kalām”, to be continued without interruption for the next six months. To be topped with Ibn Qudāmah al-Maqdisī’s “al-Radd ‘alā Ibn ‘Aqīl” for good measure.

4. The above should be coupled with **daily coffee enemas** to help clear your liver and remove that aggregation of dung and puss of Ibn Sīnā and the Mu’tazilah from your colon, which is no doubt, causing the **diarrhoea of bid’ah and ḍalālah** you are suffering from, conceptually speaking, and this is truth. Hijāb, please note that this measure is something that **even Ash’arī and Māturīdī physicians would have to prescribe upon you** by medical necessity. It is a matter of consensus among the Ṣifātiyyah. This is evidence-based medicinal treatment. Ibn Taymiyyah validated the counter-arguments of al-Ghazālī and al-Rāzī against Ibn Sīnā and the Mu’tazilah, which means that you are an extremely sick person, and even Ahl al-Kalām themselves need to treat you, because you are a disease.

5. Come off the **Interwebs** and spend more time with your family and children. If the “internet kill switch” was ever activated, you would have no social media and no tube. This could prove fatal, similar to how when drug addicts’ brains have been totally hijacked and their emotions, mood and motivations are totally controlled, requiring a continuous supply just to keep going. I fear that this is the direction that you are going with your ego, and the “Hero of Islām”, “Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb” memes that Satan is deceiving you with and likewise, deceiving your shallow followers with.

These are five essentials for Hijāb’s path to recovery, let him ignore this medication at his peril.

CLOSING NOTES AND BENEFITS

There are some important observations that should not be missed whether you agree with us or disagree with us.

1. Anyone who has followed this saga over the past few weeks will have realised that truth, reason and “sound logic” in its proper place is not with Hijāb but it is with the followers of the Sunnah, those upon the way of the Salaf. However, these individuals always try to portray to the masses that Salafis are backward, ignorant, unsophisticated, and not very intellectual. To the common person, these deviants are refined, educated, sophisticated, and they perceive that these individuals are the ones who are helping Islām, refuting atheists and uniting Muslims and so on, when the actual reality is the other way around. This is because the common masses are not upon knowledge and they have no **furqān** (criterion) and **tamyīz** (discerning ability) and overwhelmingly, because they have raw love for Islām unqualified with knowledge, they are easily led by their emotions. Further, many of these types of people are put to trial by sin and Satan convinces them of avenues and paths that amount to

an easier route of salvation for them. Thus, seeking actual knowledge is made to appear as boring and monotonous and watching debates and spectacles brought to them by performance artists like Hijāb is easy connection to religion and a dopamine release mechanism. From here Satan builds these personalities until they become heads of misguidance, announcing war against the People of the Sunnah who are the ones who bring real knowledge, real understanding and true guidance to the people. They are the ones who pave the way for true, genuine unity, not the artificial, fake unity of the likes of Hijāb and company.

So one can see that in this field, the truth lies with the followers of the Salaf, and since there can never be any conflict between sound reason and authentic revelation, then it means reason (‘aql) is actually with the Salafīs, not the Innovators. As for innovation, then as you have seen, it is contradictory, it is the law of the jungle, and there can not be any coherent reason within it.

We have demonstrated that amply wherein Hijāb for example, in one and the same breath, will use words that bring together two opposites, For example his saying that his speech is “**a part of him**” and then in the very next statement, “**it is intrinsic to me**”. So the first is affirmation of tarkīb in his essence, and the second is the very negation of speech by making it the essential nature of his essence. So its combining between what the Mu‘tazilah reject as tajsīm and kufr and what they affirm as their Tawḥīd (attributes synonymous with the essence). And this is binding upon every innovator who leaves the way of the Salaf, he will be led to contradiction and confusion at the end of the affair, this is binding upon every innovator in every field. This is why it is obligatory upon every single Muslim after the fitnah, after the killing of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه), to be upon the way of the Salaf. Because that fitnah is the start of all fitnah in this ummah

and that event will lead to the last fitnah, that of Dajjāl. Ibn Kathīr, the famous historian and Qur’anic commentary, relates the statement of Ḥudhayfah (رضي الله عنه), **“The first of the tribulations is the killing of ‘Uthmān and the last of them is the appearance of the Dajjāl (Anti-Christ).”**⁹

Muḥammad Ibn Sīrīn (d. 110H) said: “If Dajjāl came out in time, the people of desires (meaning, innovations) would follow him.”¹⁰

And **Muṭarrāf bin ‘Abd Allāh** said: “Most of the followers of Dajjāl are the Jews and the People of Innovation.”¹¹

So everyone who does not adhere to the way of the Salaf, then he will be prone to the fitnah of Dajjāl, who is the greatest deceiver after Satan. Hence, the Khārijites, the Rāfiḍites, the Ḥulūlīs, the Ittihādīs, and those who cannot distinguish between the Tawḥīd of the Messengers from the Tawḥīd of the Philosophers and Bātīnī Kāfirs, from the “necessary existence” of Fir‘aun, Aron Ra, Alex and Julie the physicist, such as Muḥammad Hijāb and his likes, they are the ones who will be prone to the fitnah of Dajjāl, the greatest deceiver after Satan.

2. Just as we have demonstrated that the Salafīs are upon the truth, clearly and manifestly, in this subject area, by virtue of them being followers and not innovators (muttabi‘īn ghayr muḥtadi‘īn) and that the people of kalām and falsafah are upon error and misguidance, then the same is the case in other fields of knowledge. From them is the issue of the rulers and the calamities that befall the ummah and issues of unity. However, there are innovators like Hijāb who spread doubts in this area and make accusations against the followers of the Salaf, similar to what they make in the field of the

⁹ Al-Bidāyah wal-Nihāyah (Dār Hajar, 1418H) 10/330.

¹⁰ Dhamm al-Kalām of al-Harawī (no. 783).

¹¹ Ibid. (no. 784).

attributes. Hijāb accused me of tajsīm (anthropomorphism) and this is because he is upon the way of Ibn Sīnā and Ahl al-Kalām. And he is upon utter falsehood in all of that. Similarly, when they say “Jāmīs, Madkhalīs” and accuse us of being stooges, slaves to the rulers and so on, those who hate Muslims and so on, they are in error in this field too, and just as their ignorance in the field of the names and attributes is apparent, and reason (‘aql) is not with them, then it is the same in the case with the issue of the rulers, of politics, of unity and so on.

This is because the issue of the rulers and calamities is not disconnected to the issue of Tawhīd itself, to the issue of al-Qaḍā wal-Qadar, to the asbāb and musabbabāt (causes and effects) which are from al-Qadar itself and from the issue of the wisdoms and reasons behind Allāh’s actions (which are rejected by Ash‘arites), and how all of this is connected to the creation and the command (al-Khalq wal-Amr). So the Salafi analyses and sees whatever is taking place around him through this vision, through this lens. In turn, they are accused with all sorts—because their views and positions are in accordance with revelation and not the ahwā (desires) of people—similar to how they are accused of being Mushabbihah and Mujassimah in the field of the attributes, because their views are not in accordance with kalām and falsafah. However, the truth is with them in that field also. And once more, it is among the Khārijites that Dajjāl will appear, and that is because they are misguided in their politics and thus prone to being manipulated and used, because they follow desires. Similarly with the people of kalām and falsafah, they follow ra’ī, and they are inevitably led to confusion and heresy.

3. One of the most amazing things to come out of this saga with Hijāb is that we have observed followers and sympathisers of **Yahyā al-Ḥajūri** and **Muḥammad bin Ḥadī** come out in defence of Hijāb, to

take issue with the fact that he has been correctly described as an innovator. While it is shocking to see Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs siding with Hijāb, when they would have no reason to do so, because upon their theology, Hijāb would be misguided too, then how much more shocking is it to see these types of people come out sympathetic to Hijāb when he is truly a ṣa‘fūq among the real ṣa‘āfiqah.

And then along comes ‘**Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker** of Brixton, another sore loser, vindictive, full of hate and malice and he has joined forces with Hijāb.

Consider the situation:

A man brings arguments of Ibn Ṣinā, a Bāṭinī Ismā‘īlī Shī‘ite, which do not prove Allāh’s existence and which were engineered to undermine the Ṣifātiyyah (affirmers of the attributes, both Ahl al-Sunnah and the Ash‘arīs), and to lay down mechanisms for arguing for the eternity of the universe alongside Allāh, and he considers mere affirmation of a “necessary existence” to be Islām, when it does not even reach the level al-Rubūbiyyah, and this would mean Fir‘aun and pure atheists would be Muslim for just affirming a “necessary existence”. So imagine a man comes along with this and spreads it in the ummah to potentially millions of Muslims, and then imagine a Sunnī Muwaḥḥid, upon the Tawḥīd of the Messengers, comes to aid the cause of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ), His Book and His Messengers. Then that misguided person wages war against such a one and tries to bring him down, mock him, revile him and so on.

What would you expect from any person claiming Tawḥīd and Sunnah? Even the Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs would be forced to aid this person in their speech and consider him correct, because Hijāb’s arguments of tarkīb and ikhtiṣās undermine the Ash‘arite creed.

Hence, this shows the utter misguidance of people like Baker, and those Ḥaddādī followers of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī and Muḥammad bin Hādī

who have come out on social media defending Hijāb and attacking us. This is utterly disgraceful and it shows the evil effects of bid'ah upon hearts in that they are blinded from truth, until they are no longer able to distinguish white from black in the broad daylight of the midday sun.

We ask Allāh for sincerity and firmness.

May ṣalāt and salam be upon the Messenger, his family and all of his companions.

Abu 'Iyaad

@abuiyaadsp ♦ salaf.com

4 Dhū al-Qa'dah 1440 / 7 July 2019 v. 1.07