



**Muḥammad Hijāb, the Falāsifah, Mutafalsifah and
Jahmiyyah: Laying the Foundations for the Dīn of the
Philosophers and Jahmites
Part 8: A Refutation of Hijab’s Slanderous
Accusations of Tajsīm and Kufr Against
Ahl al-Sunnah**

**Ibn Taymiyyah’s Refutation of the Arguments of the
Philosophers and Mu’tazilah Used by Hijāb to Accuse
Salafīs of Tajsīm and Kufr**

Abu ‘Iyaad



INTRODUCTION

Muḥammad Hijāb is upon the way of the Philosophers and Jahmites of **disputation with falsehood** and the **acquisition of creed through innovated means** which involves flawed arguments that ultimately necessitate the non-existence of Allāh, and this has been pointed out by Ibn al-Qayyim (see Part 2) and also Ibn Taymiyyah and (see Part 7). Further, those who innovate philosophical language into speech about Allāh, when they are refuted by showing them **the false necessities that arise from their own arguments and their own innovated, terminology**—and how this requires negation of what Allāh affirmed for Himself and negation of His very existence—**they fabricate charges of tajsīm and kufr**, following the footsteps of the likes of Ibn Sīnā, the Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah, who are Hijāb's salaf. **If you drink philosophy and kalām**, your end result will be to accuse the people of the Sunnah of **tajsim and kufr** because they rejected your bid'ah.

And it is not at all strange that the Jahmites, the Ash'arites, the **deniers of al-'uluww**¹ and the **sifat fi'liyyah**² and **khbariyyah**³ are the ones who have rallied around Hijāb, defending him and attacking us. **The midday sun does not require any proof.**

¹ Allāh's aboveness over His creation with His essence, names and attributes.

² Those attributes that return back to Allāh's will and power, His speech and His actions which He chooses to do as and when He wills.

³ The attributes which have come in the texts such as wajh (face), yadān (two hands) and which are accepted without asking how or making likenesses.

As such, it can be suspected that Hijāb is a **concealed Ash‘arite masquerading as a Ḥanbali**. However our estimation is that he is a confused individual, a chameleon, like al-Rāzī (d. 606H), who drinks from every fountain and eats from every table, without any tamyīz (distinction). And this is because his aim is to win debates, and not to identify the truth, adhere to it firmly and make his loyalty and friendship around it. That’s why he has Jahmites, Khārijites, Ṣūfis and others rallying to his support on social media.

In this article we are going to address Hijāb’s **game of smoke and mirrors** and his **use of evasion, diversion and bluster** as a means of fleeing from the central issue for which he has been criticised and in trying to make his false, slanderous counter charge of **tajsīm and kufr** to stick upon me and to overwhelm the sound criticism that has been made of his innovated speech, taken from the way of his predecessors, the Mutafalsifah, Jahmiyyah. Hijāb is an ideological descendent of those whom the Imāms of the Salaf spoke of and warned against and the way he is behaving is no different to that of his predecessors towards the people of the Sunnah.

IBN TAYMIYYAH ON THE DOUBT OF THE MU'TAZILAH AND PHILOSOPHERS

As explained previously, these people use innovated language in trying to argue for Allāh's existence, and in the process they can only argue for a necessary existence that is only **in the mind**, not in external reality. Then, when trying to distinguish this “necessary existence”—which to them is the creator—from His creation in debates with atheists, they speak of the creation with dubious, loaded, philosophical terms, “**composed, limited, finite, specified, particularised, material, corporeal**” and so on which the Qur'ān and Sunnah never came and which the Companions and the Salaf did not use in the derivation and affirmation of their creed and nor in their language of negation with respect to Allāh. This language, and what it ultimately demands—if logical coherence is maintained—sends the creator they argued for previously into non-existence.

This is because it demands rejection of the attributes, otherwise the argument fails. I proved this to be the case in analysis of two of Hijāb's debates in Part 7 and there are yet others in which it is even clearer. So they combine between two opposites, first proving His existence (in the mind only, with a wujūd mutlaq), and then negating His actual existence, because the philosophical argument ultimately requires this of them, and they are unable to answer the doubts of the atheists without falling into contradiction. This is binding for all levels of Jahmites, whether Philosophers, Mū'tazilites, Ash'arites or anyone who negated anything from the attributes.⁴ Let us now look at the doubt.

Ibn Taymiyyah was asked:⁵

⁴ These are the words of Ibn Taymiyyah which I shall present separately inshā'Allāh, later in this document.

⁵ Majmū' al-Fatāwā, 6/339 onwards.

سئل شيخ الإسلام : - قدس الله روحه ما يقول السادة العلماء - رضي الله عنهم
 أجمعين - عن جواب شبهة " المعتزلة " في نفي الصفات ؟ ادعوا أن " صفات الباري ليست
 زائدة على ذاته " لأنه لا يخلو إما أن يقوم وجوده بتلك الصفة المعينة بحيث يلزم من تقدير
 عدمها عدمه أو لا فإن يقيم فقد تعلق وجوده بها وصار مركبا من أجزاء لا يصح وجوده إلا
 بمجموعها والمركب معلول ; وإن كان لا يقوم وجوده بها ولا يلزم من تقدير عدمها عدمه
 فهي عرضية والعرض معلول ; وهما على الله محال ; فلم يبق إلا أن صفات الباري غير زائدة
 على ذاته وهو المطلوب

This question is about the doubt used by the Mu'tazilah (and also the Philosophers) who reject the attributes and say Allāh's attributes are not additional to His self (dhāt). They argue for this by saying:

"Either His existence is based on that specific attribute such that considering its absence would necessitate His absence, or it is not. If [His existence is based on it] then His existence has depended upon it, and thus, He became composed of parts, His existence would not be true without all of them [i.e. all His attributes]. And that which is composed is caused (ma'lūl).⁶

And if His existence is not based upon them (the attributes) and considering their absence would not necessitate His absence, then

⁶ It is clear from these sentences cited by Ibn Taymiyyah from the Mu'tazilah that the use of the verb (ta'allaqa) is clearly in the context of dependency, even though its meaning is "attached to". So they are arguing that if His existence is based upon the attributes, such that their absence means His absence, then His existence has become dependent on their existence, making Him composed, and thus only having a possible existence, not a necessary one, and this is the route of the Philosophers, whereas the Mu'tazilah would say that this makes Allāh ḥādith (of recent occurrence), like all the created things.

they are only accidental, and an accident is caused, and both are impossible for Allāh. Hence, nothing remains except that the attributes of the Maker are not additional to His self.”

This argument justifies the denial of the attributes by claiming that Allāh would be in need of His attributes for His existence if they were additional to His self, as opposed to being synonymous with His self, which is what the Mu‘tazilah claim. The Philosophers (Ibn Sinā) also came from the same angle, and Ibn Taymiyyah will mention this some pages later. Muḥammad Hijāb’s slander of tajsīm and kufr upon me is drawing upon this particular doubt of these factions of Jahmites, and this is when, in showing the flaw of his argument against atheists, I expressed a true meaning, which he, because he has the poison of the Philosophers and Mu‘tazilah, used to accuse me of tajsīm and kufr.

IBN TAYMIYYAH’S RESPONSE AND REFUTATION

First, Ibn Taymiyyah establishes with evidences that Allāh has the attributes of knowledge, power, mercy, will and might (‘izzah) as well as other attributes. He brings evidences for this.

Then he has some speech about the meaning of ṣīfah (attribute) and waṣf (description).

Then he goes on to speak about the word “dhāt”, which is “essence”, the essence of a thing that gives it its actual existence. He explains how this word came to be used through the word “nafs” (self), and was used for predicating attributes.

Some pages later he explains this doubt of the Mu‘tazilah and the Philosophers and says that since the Philosophers consider the most special and unique attribute of Allāh to be **necessary in existence by Himself** and those besides Him only having a possible existence, they treat the affirmation of the attributes as Allāh being in need

(iftiqār), due to composition (tarkīb), which prevents Him from being necessary in His existence by Himself (wājiban binafsihī). In short, Allāh would be in need of His attributes to exist and thus, He would be dependent, and this would prevent him from being “necessary in existence”.

And this can be seen here, wherein he describes this doubt as a mu‘taziliyy philosophical doubt:

وأما الشبهة الثانية - وهي شبهة " التركيب " وهي فلسفية معتزلية والأولى معتزلية محضة - فإن المعتزلة يجعلون أخص وصفه القديم ويثبتون حدوث ما سواه . والفلاسفة يجعلون أخص وصفه وجوب وجوده بنفسه وإمكان ما سواه فإنهم لا يقرون بالحدوث عن عدم ويجعلون " التركيب " الذي ذكروه موجبا للافتقار المانع من كونه واجبا بنفسه

He then explains that this argument can be responded to in two ways. First, by way of contradicting or invalidating it, by making use of a counterargument, or second, by resolving it, and what concerns us here is his response from page 348, which comprises a refutation of Muḥammad Hijāb’s wicked, baseless slander:

... أن الذي علم بالعقل والسمع أنه يمتنع أن يكون الرب تعالى فقيرا إلى خلقه ; بل هو الغني عن العالمين وقد علم أنه حي قيوم بنفسه وأن نفسه المقدسة قائمة بنفسه وموجودة بذاته وأنه أحد صمد غني بنفسه ليس ثبوته وغناه مستفادا من غيره وإنما هو بنفسه لم يزل ولا يزال حقا صمدا قيوما فهل يقال في ذلك إنه مفتقر إلى نفسه أو محتاج إلى نفسه لأن نفسه لا تقوم إلا بنفسه؟ فالقول في " صفاته " التي هي داخلة في مسمى نفسه هو القول في نفسه.

فإذا قيل صفاته ذاتية وقيل إنه محتاج إليها : كان بمنزلة قول القائل إنه محتاج إلى نفسه فإن صفاته الذاتية هي ما لا تكون النفس بدونها .

وكذلك إذا قلنا : ذاته موجبة لوجوده أو هو واجب بنفسه أو هو مقتضى لوجوبه . فلو قال قائل : يلزم أن يكون معلولا والمعلول مفتقر قيل له : ليست العلة هنا غير المعلول والمتنفي افتقاره إلى غيره وكونه معلولا لسواه . وأما قيامه بنفسه فحق . ثم هذه العبارات التي توهم معنى فاسدا : إن أطلقت باعتبار المعنى الصحيح أو لم تطلق بحال : لم يضر ذلك إذا كان المعنى الصحيح معلوما لا يندفع . فهذا المعنى الشريف يجب التفطن له فإنه يزيل شباها خيالية أضلت خلقا كثيرا .

“...that which is known through reason and revelation is that **it is impossible for the Exalted Lord to be in need of His creation.** Rather, He is the One free of all need of the worlds. And it is known that He is Ever-Living, Self-Subsisting and that His sanctified self is established by itself and it exists by way of His essence (dhāt). And that He is One (Aḥad), self-sufficient (Ṣamad), free of all needs by Himself, His existence and His being free of need is not derived from other than Him. Rather, He has never ceased to be, through His own self, Truth, Self-Sufficient, Self-Subsisting. **So can it be said regarding [all of] that: ‘He is in need (muftaqir) upon His self, or in need (muḥtāj) upon His self, because His self cannot be established except by His self?’⁷ Because speech about His**

⁷ This is addressing the Philosophers and Mu‘tazilah. That if we affirm that Allāh exists by way of His essence, then can it be said—upon your argument— that He, in His existence, is in need (muftaqir, muḥtāj) of His essence? It would be binding upon you to say this, and this invalidates your argument. As such, if anyone said the same about the attributes—because speech about His attributes is the same

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].’⁸

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.

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 (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.

⁸ 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.

So this noble meaning, **it is necessary to be wise to it**, for it removes **imaginary doubts** which have misguided a great number of creation.” End of his speech.

What this statement of Ibn Taymiyyah contains:

1. A refutation of the Mu‘tazilah and Philosophers who claim that Allāh would be in need of (or depend) upon His attributes, if they were additional to the self of Allāh, because this entails composition (tarkīb), which would make his existence to be ḥādith (originated) to the Mu‘tazilah, or mumkin (possible) to that Bāṭinī Kāfir, Ibn Sīnā.

2. That speech about the attributes is like speech about the essence (dhāt). So just as it is said: His essence is what necessitates His existence, or He is in need of His self for His existence then the speech is the same regarding the attributes, because the attributes are something that a being is never without. And this does not mean in any way, that Allāh is caused or is in need or dependent upon other than Himself.

3. Rather, the negation of Allāh being in need is with respect to what is besides Him, for He is not in need of anything besides Himself and He is self-sufficient with His self, with His attributes.

4. That there is no harm in the usage of such expressions when the correct meaning is being spoken of.

5. That it is necessary to be wise to this “noble meaning”, because it removes the imaginary doubts of misguided, wandering strayers such as that Bāṭinī Ismā‘īlī Shī‘ite known as Ibn Sīnā, the Mu‘tazilah and Muḥammad Hijāb all of whom were and are filled with hatred against those upon the way of the Salaf in the methodology of acquisition of their creed.

In light of the above: Muḥammad Hijāb has slandered me with tajsīm and kufr on the basis of a doubt that actually arises from the direction

of the innovations and heresies of the Mu‘tazilah and Philosophers, and from their poisonous, toxic, loaded speech, which they employ in faulty arguments for proving Allāh’s existence.

So my answer to **Hijāb the pseudophilosopher** is the same as the answer of Ibn Taymiyyah to Hijāb’s philosophical ancestors, Ibn Sīnā, whose flawed argument he is using, and the Mu‘tazilah. Which is that if I say Allāh showing mercy, or creating or speaking requires or depends upon His will and desire, and they are attributes of His own essence, and you consider this tajsīm and kufr, then you must likewise consider what the Qur’ān affirms of His self-sufficiency and self-subsistence to be tajsīm and kufr, because His existence requires His self, His essence. And no person of sound intellect says this. This is Ibn Taymiyyah’s answer to your imaginary nonsense.

Further, Ibn Taymiyyah said elsewhere, speaking about how the people of kalām, those who affirm the attributes, the Ash‘arites, how they argue for the attribute of life (ḥayāt) for Allāh:

“As for his saying [al-Aṣḥānī]: ‘The evidence that He is living is His knowledge and His power, due to the impossibility of knowledge and power being established with other than the living’. This is a well-known evidence among the Nuzzār (investigators).⁹ **They say: It is known that a condition (shart) for knowledge and power is life.** For whatever is not living, it is impossible for it to be knowing, because the dead cannot be knowing, and knowledge of this is necessary.¹⁰ And they may also say: These rational conditions do not oppose anything present or absent, for considering [the existence] of

⁹ Referring here to the scholars among the affirmers of the attributes.

¹⁰ Meaning this is elementary, necessary knowledge, that whatever is dead cannot have the attribute of knowledge and of power.

one who knows but who has no life is impossible by way of explicit (sound) reason.”¹¹ End of the quote.

Therefore, in the reasoning of Ash‘arites, knowledge and power are two attributes that require life, they cannot exist without life, and this is universal, it is a rational proof that applies to everything. Thus, Allāh’s knowledge and power are by way of His life, and life is a condition (shart) for these and other attributes. Thus, to say knowledge and power depend upon life, or to say that showing mercy or speaking or creating depend upon Allāh’s will and desire, then there is nothing in this which is tajsīm or kufr, rather, these accusations are insane ramblings of the Philosophers and the Mu‘tazilah of whom Hijāb is a tail end.

Ibn al-Qayyim said regarding the name al-Ḥayy (the Ever-Living):

“He, the Sublime, is living (ḥayy) in reality, and His life is the most perfect life, and the most complete. It is a life that makes all the attributes of perfection necessary as well as the negation of their opposites from all angles.”¹² Thus, attributes of perfection require life and perfect life necessitates perfect attributes.

And also:

“For life necessitates all the attributes of perfection, and no attribute from it is absent from it except due to weakness in life. So when the Exalted’s life is the most perfect and the most complete of life, affirmation of it necessitates affirmation of every perfection that opposes the negation of perfection in life. And it is through this rational method that the Mutakallimūn (people of kalām) of the affirmers (of attributes) affirmed for the Exalted the attribute of

¹¹ Sharḥ ‘Aqīdah al-Aṣbahāniyyah (1430H) pp. 450-451.

¹² Shifā al-‘Alīl (2/82).

hearing, seeing, knowledge, will, power, speech and all the attributes of perfection.”¹³

He is speaking here of the Ash‘arīs and their likes, and this is similar to what was mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah in the citation above with respect to knowledge and power being conditioned by life.

And Ibn al-Qayyim elaborated further:

“From the requisites (lawāzim) of life is the voluntary (chosen) action, because every living thing is acting (fa‘āl)... and when life necessitates action, and this is the third principle, then the only action that people comprehend [as being a real action] is the chosen, desired action that occurs with the power of the doer and his desire and his will... so the action and deed of a living, knowing being do not occur except by his will and power...”¹⁴

So this is something universal, there is no escaping from accepting this, that action requires will and power and that knowledge, power, desire, hearing, seeing, speech all require life.

All of this lays a good foundation for exposing Muḥammad Hijāb’s wicked slander and baseless accusation of tajsīm and kufr against me for speaking what is true and for aiding the madhhab of the Salaf in this subject area against his philosophical nonsense which he inherited from Aristotle and the Hellenized idol-worshipping nations and which he is using to malign those who inherit from the Prophets and Messengers, the Companions and the Salaf. So let us proceed to a discussion of this matter in more detail.

¹³ Badā’i‘ al-Fawā’id (2/184).

¹⁴ Shifā al-‘Alīl (2/82).

FIRST DOUBT OF MUHAMMAD HIJĀB

As for the first of his doubts, then he posted the following, and this is from Part 7 in the series (see next page):



Mohammed Hijab @mohammed_hijab · 7m

Replying to @AbuIyaadSP

Saying Allah has limited variables and is dependent is kufr akbar. You must repent for this at once

dependent on anything other than Himself.²⁵ And likewise, the atheists assert the same thing, the universe in its parts depends on itself, but as a whole, it is independent and requires nothing outside of itself. So this argument is unable to distinguish between these two, the creator and the created. When these poisonous principles are employed such as “Anything with limited variables is dependent” and “it is not possible for something with limited variables to forever exist” and “anything with such a description, which is finite in its composition, depends on something else in order for it to exist”, then they lead to atheism, because Allāh, with His essence, with His existent reality (qadr) and description (sifah) cannot be excluded from these statements, except with negation of all of His attributes, and this in turn leads to an existence in the mind only, not in actual reality. And hence, we can now understand the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah—because all of these arguments, debates already took place in history and led to confusion, misguidance—he says:

“The Philosophers who speak of an eternal universe are of two types: The pure atheists, negators, those who say the universe is eternal, obligatory in its existence, and their statement is of the same category of that speech that Fir’aun proclaimed... a rejection of the Lord of the Worlds...”

1



2



Ali AH @Alii_AH · 4m

Where did he write this?



RESPONSE

Muḥammad Hijāb employed deliberate deception in this very cheap attempt on his behalf. I responded immediately by adding a short footnote explanation to the original document without changing any of words referred to by Hijāb, because there was nothing to change in the first place. Here is what I added as a footnote, clearly indicating that it is an addition to the article:

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 argument is clear. Which is that if you employ this innovated speech, then the atheist will simply turn it around and apply it to Allāh, in order to prove to you, that Allāh is also dependent, finite, limited and so on, which is the same language you are using. And this is very clear throughout the article. This is because you chose philosophy and its dubious terms as the foundation for arguing and acquiring your belief. As a result, you must remain consistent with it and its necessities.

There is no dispute about this at all and it is abundantly clear, and no further explanation is necessary. To lie upon your adversary in this way is fujūr in argument. The text in red is my quotation of Hijāb’s statements verbatim, so he is actually highlighting his own speech. I explained this is innovated language **which can be turned around and applied to Allāh by atheists during debates** and Hijāb would not be able to exclude Allāh from entering into these dubious, innovated, philosophical terms, unless he rejects what is in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah and unless he rejects sound meanings. And this is what he did when he showed rejection against my speech in what follows:

SECOND DOUBT OF MUḤAMMAD ḤIJĀB

Hijāb posted this, which is really part of the first doubt, because it is all from the same passage:



Mohammed Hijab

@mohammed_hijab

Follow



Is Amjad Rafik a Mujjasim (anthropomorphist)?

After implying that Allah has "parts" in his previous posts it seems abu iyaad is now saying that Allah has attributes which are "dependent". He must either find statements from the salaf which say this or repent.

the negation of the very creator he is trying to prove, in a somewhat crooked manner, because he is not being straight with those atheists either.

2. Allāh's attribute of mercy (rahmah) and speech (kalām) depends on His desire (irādah), and His acts of creation depend on His will (mashī'ah), and thus some of His attributes depend on each other, and given that, He is still eternal in His existence and not

²⁴ Then there is some diversion from this topic and some wrangling about induction and the discussion eventually moves into another direction about multiverses.

Muḥammad Hijāb, the Falāsifah, Mutafalsfifah and Jahmiyyah ♦ 28

dependent on anything other than Himself.²⁵ And likewise, the atheists assert the same thing, the universe in its parts depends on itself, but as a whole, it is independent and requires nothing outside of itself. So this argument is unable to distinguish between these two, the creator and the created. When these poisonous principles are

RESPONSE

And this is with the following points:

1. I wrote a 40 page document, replete with evidence with respect to the precise nature of Hijāb's innovations in this subject area and with actual illustrations from his own debates to validate the truth of what Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in his refutation of Ibn Sīnā, the Mu'tazilah and others, whose way Hijāb is following.

2. Out of all of that, unable to respond, and completely ignoring the truth in what I wrote, he picked out **one sentence** which he used to slander me with accusations of tajsīm and kufr. And he did so on the basis of his own innovated language, upon the imaginary doubts of the Philosophers and the Mu'tazilah, who innovate into the religion with their toxic, loaded, dubious philosophical terms and then make accusations of tajsīm and kufr of those who reject their innovation and refute it and expose its false necessities.

3. Likewise, being a big coward, and scared to face the realities pointed out to him in my article, he deceptively led his followers to believe that I changed my original words, when I never did anything of the sort. Rather, I added two footnotes in response to his false claims **to relieve him of the burden of the sin** of those who may fall prey to his deception, spread untruths and fall into backbiting and slander. So this is what he said:



Mohammed Hijab

@mohammed_hijab

Follow



In minutes Abu Iyaad has changed his initial PDF without making an official retraction or repenting. What is worse is that he leaves in his PDF the word "dependence" in conjunction with Allahs attributes which he has no salaf for whatsoever. Academic weasel.

This is a deliberately calculated attempt by Muḥammad Hijāb to make light of his own misguidance and to cast doubt on my integrity in quoting and analysing his speech and his debates with accuracy and in conveying the refutations of the Imāms of Salafiyyah against his innovation and misguidance.

4. There is no retraction for me to make in the first place as has been made clear and secondly, the actual innovator is the one who uses the language of al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān, Ibn Ṣinā and other kāfirs in their theological speech, such as “Allāh is immaterial, incorporeal” and the first to use this speech was Aristotle and then the Hellenized Jews, Christians and Sabeans and al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān, the Jahmiyyah and Mu’tazilah. Hijāb’s debates are replete with this innovated language, so where is his Salaf? Rather, he opposes the Salaf in **the very foundation of ‘aqīdah**, in the foundations of the methodology of acquisition. In this alone he is a misguided innovator because if the Salaf in the first century hijrah heard his speech, such as Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, al-Zuhrī and others, they would have considered Hijāb a Jahmite, and al-Shāfiī would have had him beaten and paraded in the markets. Then he says that I have no Salaf whatsoever in a very particular matter, that has a very specific

context in the flow of the argument and in which I have stated what is actually true in its meaning. So how much more fake can you be when this is your reality. Muḥammad Ḥijāb is a trickster who relies upon the fact that his followers are ill-informed in these affairs and he uses deception in order to veil himself, a coward of great proportions.

5. The statement of Ibn Taymiyyah I quoted earlier in refutation of the Philosophers and the Muʿtazilah is a validation of everything I said in that particular section about Ḥijāb, his toxic philosophy and its poisonous language which does not prove a creator, but rather, His non-existence.

6. As for his claim that that I “implied Allāh has parts” then this is also a slander and it is the way of the Jahmiyyah against Ahl al-Sunnah and I refuted that allegation in detail in Part 6 of this series.


DOUBTS OF ḤIJĀB’S SUPPORTERS

Ḥijāb is **an outlet** for the hatred of the **Jahmites, Ṣufīs, Takfīrīs, Khārijites and others**, for it is these people who have come out on social media to support him, and they are as ignorant as Ḥijāb.


Claim: One of them—and He is a Ṣūfī Jahmite—said:



Yonis @Hala_hemlocc · 2d

So amjad is resorting to using the arguments held by atheists that state the  is dependent upon itself, to say Allah is the same in relation to His Divine Attributes?

سيحان الله

the  تشبيهه and تجسيم is clear, when the Mutakallimun used to refute atheists, now you have this.



Mohammed Hijab @mohammed... · 2d

Listen to Is amjad a mujjasim.m4a by Mohammed Hijab on #SoundCloud
soundcloud.com/mohammed-hijab...



3



Response:

My argument is explicitly clear in my speech and this Şūfī Jahmite has jumped on the bandwagon because of two reasons. First, Hijāb's deception and trickery in creating diversion and bluster around the central issue by trying to malign me with falsehood. And secondly, this individual has already been schooled upon the bid'ah of kalām, so it is natural to expect this type of language from a Jahmite, because it is native to him. As for Hijāb, he took one sentence of mine which comprises a true meaning and which was stated in the course of argument to show that Hijāb, by using the arguments of the Philosophers and Mu'tazilah, and using dubious, innovated terminology, would not be able to distinguish between the creator and created unless and until he rejects the attributes of Allāh and this will lead to the absurdity that both Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim pointed out, affirming His existence in the mind only through the proof of imkān and wujūb (possible and necessary existence)

and then rejecting His actual existence in external reality. I showed with citations that atheists like Fir‘aun accept there is a necessary existence, it is just the universe to them and it is independent, not requiring anything outside of itself. So when Hijāb uses this argument, and the atheists start asking questions about Allāh’s attributes, Hijāb will not be able to answer except by using tricks and deception against them, because his goods are flawed. And the perceptive observer will realise that this is what Hijāb often does in his debates.

Otherwise, if he was consistent, Hijāb will have to enter what are true meanings—such as Allāh’s ṣifāt fi‘liyyah depending on His will and power, or His life being a condition or requirement for His other attributes, none of which means He is dependent on anything other than Himself—he would have enter this meaning into these dubious terms, and as a result invalidate his argument, and thereby prove the non-existence of Allāh, the eternity of the universe in agreement with Fir‘aun or the unity of existence in agreement with the Ṣufīs.

There is a third discussion of Hijāb which makes this point even clearer and which I shall highlight in due course and it will validate everything I have said so far.

Muḥammad Hijāb is a trickster and an academic con-man, he knows how to evade, divert and bluster. This is the reason why he has resorted to scandalmongering to divert people’s attention away from knowledge-based, detailed criticisms of his falsehood, whether in creed or methodology.

Claim: The same Jahmite said all of the following:

-Tried to solve by making an analogy between Allah's ذات and the Universe, this is what Br Mohammed pointed out as being something that is very close if not is tantamount to kufr.

Not only that, using this argument only rebuffs the atheist in his quest to disprove Allah's wujud.

Response:

1. This Jahmite clearly does not understand. I pointed out that the atheist—using Hijāb’s argument and poisonous terminology—will turn it around on Hijāb and every other deluded, misguided Muslim who proceeds upon this path, and force him to reject the attributes and true meanings in the Book and the Sunnah, if he wants to remain consistent with his argument. As for myself, **I was not solving anything, because I did not create this problem in the first place.** Rather, it is a problem of the people of falsafah and kalām, and I proved through Hijāb’s discussions and debates that he is unable to get anywhere with this futile argument, **except to lay the foundations for rejection of a creator, atheism and the unity of existence doctrine.** All he is doing is arguing with atheists about something they already agree with. That there has to be a necessary existence. To them it is the universe, and to Hijāb it is a creator. Save that He cannot provide any sound argument to distinguish between the two in external reality, because the argument he is using, based on dubious, poisonous terms, is flawed.

2. In his next tweet the Jahmite Ash‘arī supporter of Hijab said:

I would respond by saying that using word dependent/contingent is incorrect in it's entirety, since it denotes a need which would nullify the necessary independence of Allah's existence as He is *المستغني عن كل احد*.

The word used in the manuals of aqidah is *تعلق*

All of this is meaningless waffle, because the Ash'arites have argued that life (ḥayāt) is a condition for other attributes, so apply the same accusation to those in your own school of doctrine. Rather, this is a rationality that all factions have to accept and none can deny it, because it is universal.

3. As for the issue of "ta'alluqāt" (connections, relationships), then this is in the manuals of the people of kalām—the Ash'arīs and Māturīdīs. They came across a problem in their theology.

If Allāh has the attributes of **knowledge**, **will**, **hearing**, **seeing**, **speech** and **power**—the six besides **life**— and these attributes have to relate to Allāh's creation, then how do you avoid affirming what they call ḥawādith (events, occurrences) from taking place in Allāh's essence which would invalidate their proof for Allāh's existence, because Allāh is supposed to be unlike all things besides Him, all of which are ḥawādith (recent, originated). So they invented this term called "ta'alluqāt" to somehow connect these attributes to the creation in a manner that does not undermine their theology.

To illustrate this problem: Before Allāh created the creation, did He hear what any of His creatures were going to say. Or did He hear it after He created them, whilst they were saying it? Allāh's hearing has to relate to His creation, but this poses the problem of something new arising with Allāh in that He heard something He did not hear previously and something has changed in His essence. Otherwise it

would mean that other things are eternal with Allāh, Allāh is always hearing and seeing created things in eternity. So, was Allāh always hearing you reciting the Qurʾān? Of course not. Allāh is hearing you now, as you recite it and he was not hearing you before creating you. but this would mean something new in Allāh’s essence according to them, the Ashʿarīs. So they invented these clever work-arounds to try and escape this problem. They are nothing but word games to patch up flaws in their kalām. These connections are either **imaginary** or **real**. If they are real, then they cannot avoid affirming what they call “ḥawādith” (events, occurrences, contingencies) in Allāh’s essence. Hence, the true outcome of their position is that they are just using these words as a cover, to refer to something which is only imaginary, in order to solve this problem in their theology. In other words, they concealed the problem and put it under the rug, by introducing terms that point to something imaginary, not real.

This problem was so significant that some of the Ashʿarites had to return Allāh’s attributes of hearing and seeing to knowledge. In other words, they made hearing and seeing synonymous with knowledge. And when they did this, they gave the Muʿtazilah a means of refuting them by them saying that if you can make those two attributes return back to knowledge, then why can’t you make all the attributes to be synonymous with His essence, like we do. This is the nature of falsehood, it abounds with contradiction. In reality, the Ashʿarites must reject all six attributes and return them to life, and eventually reject life as well, and agree with the Muʿtazilah.

4. Lane’s Lexicon explains these terms:

[تَعَلُّقَاتٌ and مُتَعَلِّقَاتٌ are post-classical terms often used as meaning *Dependencies, or appertinences, of a thing or person: circumstances of a case: and concerns of a man.*]

Also, dictionary meanings of the verb ta‘allaqa with the particle (ﻻ), include “to be dependent on, be conditional on.” The argument of this Jahmite supporter of Hijāb the pseudophilosopher is finished.

In what has preceded we have refuted the slanderous charge of Hijab that has its basis in the heresies of the Philosophers and Mu‘tazilah. To further illustrate that this refutation is based on truth we are now going to provide a detailed analysis of **a very interesting discussion** that took place only some weeks back on **26th May 2019**. Note that I had not previously heard this discussion. What makes this discussion interesting is that Hijāb tries to use Ibn Sīnā’s argument of imkān and wujūb to a group of people and among them is Aron Ra, a prominent atheist, a young physics student called Julie, a Christian theologian and PhD student called Josh and an atheist wearing an orange cap whose name was John, if I recall correctly.

In this discussion we see many realities being uncovered, all of which validate everything that has been mentioned in this series. If you bear with patience and study the next section very carefully, you will benefit a great deal in this subject matter, and you will come to realise that the Salafī creed and methodology is truth. You cannot be upon any other methodology and be safe in your creed. Safety only lies in the way of the Salaf, and when you depart from that, you will become a caller to misguidance like this misguided innovator known as Muḥammad Hijāb.

Let us proceed:

UNDENIABLE PROOF THAT MUḤAMMAD ḤIJĀB’S INNOVATED PHILOSOPHY LEADS TO ATHEISM WITHOUT ESCAPE AND THAT HE IS A MISGUIDED INNOVATOR WHO CORRUPTS THE CREED OF THE MUSLIMS



1. Hijāb’s Argument and its Associated Language Taken From the Philosophers and Jahmites.

Let us take up the discussion at 1h:46m in this video wherein the pseudophilosopher Hijāb explains his deity to a prominent atheist as “**incorporeal, immaterial, one necessary being [which] is independent**” and this is a mixture of the language of the star-worshipping idolator, Aristotle, of al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān, of the Mutafalsifah like Ibn Sīnā and of the Mu’tazilah. It is not the language of the Prophets and Messengers and their followers.

Ibn Taymiyyah explained that this is the language of the Jahmites who say “Allāh is not a jism”, and they use Ṣūrah Ikhhlāṣ in their polemics, but they use it from a trajectory other than that of the Salaf,

from other than its intended meaning. He said: “Sūrah Ikhlāṣ was used as proof by those from the innovated kalām who say that the Exalted Lord is a body, material (jism), like those who agreed with Ḥishām bin al-Ḥakam [al-Rāfiḍī] and Muḥammad bin Karrām and others. And [also] those who negate that and say Allāh is not a body, such as Jahm bin Ṣafwān and Abū al-Ḥudhayl and others.”¹⁵

So who are your salaf, Hijāb? They are the misguided innovators such al-Ja’d and al-Jahm whom the rulers of the time executed for their heresies, and which they were led to by the same kalām you are employing here. They are the same innovators who came to debate Imām Aḥmad during the trial, those who accused him of tajsīm and kufr using the same philosophical language you are using. They are the ones who used Sūrah Ikhlāṣ for their philosophical Tawḥīd, which they based upon negation of jismiyyah from Allāh, and which Imām Aḥmad refuted in detail in his book al-Radd ‘alal-Zanādiqah wal-Jahmiyyah. They are the same ones who misguided the rulers into executing thousands of scholars from Ahl al-Sunnah on the basis of this very kalām that you are using.

But out of justice, as we have made clear in our articles, we do not accuse you of holding their doctrines. Rather, we state the evident truth that you are a chameleon, an intellectually confused individual who uses toxic, trojan horse arguments whose outcomes are evil, an individual who does not have the intellectual capacity to grasp this reality, or who simply refuses to, and is therefore an open caller to misguidance. A potential Jahm bin Ṣafwān in the making, because as of yet, no one knows your real doctrines. What is your position on Allāh’s ‘uluww and His istiwā’ and His ṣifāt fi’liyyah and khabariyyah

¹⁵ Majmū al-Fatāwā 17/296. As for Ahl al-Sunnah, they reject this language and do not use it, neither in affirmation nor in negation. This is because this is dubious language loaded with philosophical concepts and which leads to misguidance.

aside from the seven that the Ash‘arites affirm. No one knows this and you are a suspected Ash‘arite masquerading as a Ḥanbali,¹⁶ until you make these affairs clear.

2. Hijāb then says he can prove this deity he so described from “first principles” and that he can prove it right now, that he can prove “God exists” from “first principles”. Then he proceeds to use the argument of Ibn Ṣīnā of **imkān and wujūb** (possible and necessary existences) in a long-winded, torturous manner, embedded with the completion of this argument of **tarkīb** and **ikhtiṣāṣ**. 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 muṭlaq (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

¹⁶ Ash‘arites like al-Bāqillānī (d. 403H) used to use the label of “Ḥanbalī” as a cover and as a means of protection, while they were acquiring their religion through industrial strength kalām and promoting it to people. They deceived numerous later Ḥanbalīs, such as the Timīmī family of Ḥanbalīs in the 5th century hijrah, who then ascribed this kalām to Imām Aḥmad, while he was completely free from it.

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.

3. Hijāb tries to explain this argument, and we are not going to analyse this part of the discussion in great detail, as we have already elaborated on this in previous parts. However, what makes this discussion really interesting is that there are couple of other individuals present. There is **Aron Ra**, the atheist. One is a **Christian** who is doing a PhD in Christian theology and another is an older gentleman, an atheist, who appears to be informed in matters of Islāmīc creed, and ask Hijāb some difficult questions, as a result of which Hijāb utters statements of kufr (disbelief).

And we will demonstrate the establishment of the rule of justice in that if you accuse a Muslim of what he is free of—such as accusing me of tajsīm and kufr—then you will be or will have been put to trial with the very thing you slandered others with. This will be explained in due course inshā’Allāh.

4. Hijāb struggles to get his argument across, but this is partly because Aron Ra is not really informed in this arena and does not understand the terms and thus has a problem following the argument and does not understand how the categories of possible (mumkin), necessary (wājib) and impossible (mumtani‘) work. At one point from

(1h:50m:25s) when Hijāb uses his argument that “you have possible existences and you must have a necessary existence because if you only have possible existences which can be any other way, then it is conceivable that this world would have been any other way.” Then Aron Ra responds by saying that there are billions of worlds just in this galaxy. In other words, all possible existences have already been covered by multiple universes, and “every other way is probably out there”. As such, in the combination of all of these universes, everything is covered and hence, it would not need anything outside of it. There is no evidence for “multiple universes”, so this is pure speculation, however, the argument is valid, as a logical argument. Hijāb tries to twist this as being in agreement with what he is saying, so Aron Ra disagrees and says: “No, I am saying that there are all kinds of variations.”

At this point (1h:53m:33s) the Christian theologian jumps in and makes a valid point: “Even if your argument [works], there is a gap between the necessary being and God.”

This Christian is absolutely correct and it is what Ibn Taymiyyah pointed out. That the Mutafalsifah, like Ibn Sīnā only establish an existence in the mind, not in external reality, and this “necessary being” cannot be treated as “God” because of the gap that lies between a general, unqualified existence in the mind and what is in external reality. So the Christian has pointed out the incompleteness of the argument, and here we see the contradiction and deception that people like Hijāb used against atheists. In his Oxford debate with Alex, Hijāb boldly claimed that if Alex agrees that there is a necessary existence, then “that is God”. He made that jump, when the argument does not actually allow him to. And this is where the argument must be completed through the arguments of **tarkīb** and **ikhtiṣāṣ** using dubious, toxic philosophical considerations whose

outcome is denial of a creator in external reality. So this Christian continues to make this valid point much to the annoyance of Hijāb and Hijāb is upset that a Christian is heckling him whilst he is speaking to an atheist. So this shows that when Hijāb is dealing with an atheist, such as Alex, who is not wise to this, he will try to get away with this. But then, when he is interrogated by someone familiar with this subject matter, then Hijāb will play other games and tricks in the course of discussion, as we shall see.

The Christian says: “You can establish a necessary existence of this being, OK, but that does not mean that there has to be, it has to be God.” We refer to reader to Part 7 of our series and in particular the three citations we made from Ibn Taymiyyah elaborating on this point. The Christian then says that he believes there are good arguments for God’s existence but that this one is not very good.

5. Next, at (1h:54m:15s) there is some confusion about what Hijāb means by possible existences, Aron Ra confuses this as being opposed to impossible existences, he thinks there are only two opposing categories, possible and impossible. A lady who until this point is a bystander explains that there is a third category called necessary.¹⁷

6. This leads into a minor discussion or debate with this lady about what is “necessary” and how it is defined it and Hijāb protests that this term, “necessary” is what Ibn Sīnā, al-Farābī and some Western philosophers call it. Aron Ra then says that nobody is understanding the argument, and Hijāb says that “You are supposed to be an

¹⁷ In this classification, there are **possible** things, which may or may not exist, **impossible** things which cannot not exist and what is **necessary**, that which must exist, and does not require anything other than itself to exist.

atheist specialist.” This actually reveals the weakness of these types of abstract philosophical arguments in that most people, even prominent atheists, are not going to follow them because of their lack of clarity, and dubious language and they require a person to be well-versed in philosophy and logic. And this is the foundation of misguidance. The Prophets and Messengers never employed these means as they **the weakest methods** that prove nothing but an existence in the mind, not in external reality. Then they lead to great confusion and misguidance, as is proven by history. This is different to the method of the Qur’ān which proves an actual, specific existence for the creator, **a wujūd ‘aynī**, and we can elaborate upon this in a separate article inshā’ Allāh, to explain what this means.

7. At around 1h:56m:30s, getting frustrated that the atheist is not getting the argument, Hijab pulls out his mobile phone and the analogy he is going to give does not make things easier and simpler. Aron Ra is getting impatient. Hijāb argues that by connecting many mobiles phones together to share the charge, the charge will run out. The Christian theology student is also getting frustrated and asks what this has to do with **necessary** and **possible**. The Christian persists in making his point, telling Hijāb that this is not about Christianity or Islām, it is about making a good argument, and of course Hijab does not have a good argument here, because he will eventually struggle to differentiate Ibn Sīnā’s “necessary existence” in the mind, from creation when cross-examined on the issue of the attributes by the two people who are actually informed in the subject matter, the Christian and the man in the orange cap. Hijāb is getting visibly frustrated. He continues with his phone analogy by which he is demonstrating that all the phones are dependent, they need charge. He makes the argument that “if you have a world only of limited,

dependent things, all of them depend on another thing, and if this is in the context of existence, you will not have existence because you have to have something which depends upon nothing in order for everything else to exist.” Now this as we said before, there is a line of reasoning which is correct, whereby you arrive at the necessity of something being necessary in its existence, there has to be one thing that is like this but the problem lies in when you describe this thing with innovated language, “immaterial, incorporeal, unlimited in its variables” and so on, and this in turn demands rejection of Allāh’s attributes which in turn demands negation of His existence, and Hijāb will fall into this problem a little later in the discussion. You should be informed here that at the end of this discussion, **he will completely contradict himself**, in his cop out with the Christian theologian, who points out the flaw in Hijāb’s argument by using the arguments of the Mu’tazilah against him.

8. At around 2h:00m the discussion moves to the sun being a source of power but which itself is dependent on other laws. Aron starts to get the line of reasoning now and Hijāb explains that a chain of dependent things must stop at something that is necessary. Aron interprets this to mean the Big Bang, and Hijāb explains that this has nothing to do with a beginning or the Big Bang, that this argument he is using is a matter of dependence and independence. Aron Ra says he is not getting the argument and Hijāb says that this is not his argument, “it is the argument of Ibn Sīnā, Leibniz, Godel...” Aron still believes that Hijāb believes in a “Big-Banger” and in the exchange that follows the discussion amounts to Hijāb interpreting his “necessary existence” to be God and Aron saying it is basically the universe, or an energy source for the universe. So here we come to what Ibn Taymiyyah said in what we cited from him, in three citations,

that no atheist will disagree that there is a necessary existence. They will say it is the universe itself.

Hijāb asks whether Aron can refute this or not—keeping in mind that Hijāb’s argument does not prove a wujūd ‘aynī (specific, actual existence in external reality) and Aron says: “I don’t need a refutation of it, you ended the whole thing on an assumption that was not warranted by [word unclear] principles... that you assume there is a God.” Meaning, you have jumped from your argument of possible and necessary existence to a God, and this was the same thing the Christian theologian told him earlier, and this is the same that Ibn Taymiyyah explained. That this argument only proves a wujūd muṭlaq (in the mind only) which can then be interpreted by a believer as God, by an atheist as a self-contained universe and by a Şūfī as a merger between the creator and the created, without distinction between the two. So the most amazing thing here is that what the atheist, Aron Ra and the Christian are telling Hijāb is actually true. This is why these types of people who resort to kalām and falsafah, they will fall into **safsatah fil-‘aqliyyāt** (sophistries in reason), and will deny clear truths, or operate upon ignorance of them, feigned or real.

9. Discussion with a Physicist and the “God Particle”

At 2h:03m:15s the young lady jumps in and contends that fundamental particles don’t depend on anything. This is an argument to say that the “necessary existence”—which is not disputed by atheists—does not have to be God, and that the universe is made of fundamental particles which don’t have to depend on anything. A discussion ensues, and Hijāb turns the table and asks this lady for proof of this, while she protests and says since Hijāb is the one making the claim, then the burden of proof is upon him to show that

the fundamental particle does depend on something outside of itself. In other words, he has to show why the “necessary existence” is God and not the “god particle” so to speak. So now an argument erupts with both parties claiming that the burden of proof is on the other. She says: “You’re the one trying to prove something to me, the burden of proof is on you.” And Hijāb counters by saying that she has made the claim and needs to prove it.

At 2h:04:00s Hijab boasts that “the New Atheist movement is crumbling right in front of me” because they can’t deal with this argument allegedly, and here **Hijāb is in cloud cuckoo land again**, revealing him as a clown, a fantasist, and self-loving narcissist—and the actual realities are something else. For upon scrutiny, Hijāb will not be able to distinguish his “necessary existence” from the “possible existence” except by rejection of what has come in the Book and the Sunnah of attributes and actions for Allāh that are tied to His will and power. So Hijāb continues in his vainglorious boasting: “Listen, I can’t believe it, all it took was a little bit of pointing out the argument and the whole new atheist movement, in front of my very eyes...” Hijab here is in his dreams, he is having a dream, where fantasies become real, and then, you are rudely awoken, and perhaps you realise you need to take a shower, which is what is going to happen later, at the end of the discussion. So the lady asks him to stop preaching, or grandstanding as the man in the orange cap points out, and to make his argument.

The lady repeats again that all she is saying is that Hijāb has to show that fundamental particles depend on something for his argument to hold.

Hijāb says that they depend on the laws of nature, the laws of physics. The lady asks him for these laws of physics and Hijāb does not answer but refers the lady to a book called “Just Six Numbers”

which Hijāb says discusses the six fundamental constants. Then Hijāb takes the discussion into a diversion by discussing a constant called “n” which refers to “nature”—and all of this is waffle and diversion from the actual discussion. There is some talk about the connection of maths to physics. They come back to “n” being the nature constant, which the lady rightly points out is mathematically meaningless and Hijāb then gives its value as 0.07. All of this is frivolous speech which is going nowhere. This is the nature of these, dry, philosophical, wandering discussions, where truth is not arrived at. At 2h:07m:25s, the lady once again tells Hijāb that he has to show that particles are dependent, for his argument to hold.

It is here that Hijāb asks the lady: “Do you believe that particles are independent?” And what Hijāb is going to do here is be heavy-handed with this lady and turn things upon her. She asks: “Of what?” Hijāb says: “Please, dont retract your argument... you are saying that particles are independent.” She says: “To the best of my knowledge there are a certain amount of fundamental particles... what I am basing this off is the standard model which is the best model we have of the universe right now. Its incomplete, all physicist will admit it is incomplete.” Hijab then says: “But, you said fundamental particles don’t depend on anything.” She explains: “...they are not composed of anything else.” Hijāb then gets aggressive and heavy-handed, which is unnecessary and he tries to intimidate the lady: “You said, unless you want to retract that statement, which is what every atheist does in front of me, you said that fundamental particles don’t depend on anything.” She says: “I believe that to be the case, I do not claim that is true.” He asks the same question again and she says again: “I believe that to be the case, I am not saying that’s true.” So Hijāb says: “Thank you for saying that because now what you have shown is that you believe in the existence of an independent being”—which

is the fundamental particle—and Hijāb laughs to those around him in the gathering. The lady says: “You know how many fundamental particles there are?”

Hijāb says: “Before you were saying there is no such thing as a necessary thing, but now..., hold on, I know you are going to retract your statement because that is what every atheist does in front of me.” The lady says: “You’re putting words in my mouth.” Hijāb says: “You just said that fundamental particles are not dependent on anything, by definition what you’re effectively saying is that fundamental particles are independent.” The lady says: “Technically, what I mean when I say fundamental particles... I am just explaining what the standard model says... fundamentally, according to quantum field theory, fundamental particles are just energy spikes in a field.”

Hijāb says a little later: “You have given me exactly what I wanted. In the beginning you said that I have to prove a necessary, independent being. Now you’ve just said that you believe that fundamental particles are not dependent on anything. Now all I am saying as a Muslim is that my understanding is that...” and the lady interjects, and pay attention to this: **“So God is a muon”** which is a fundamental particle. Hijāb says: **“Yes, your God is that, the only difference between my God and your God is size.”** So here, by this comment, Hijāb has contradicted himself, because now he affirms jismiyyah for God. By affirming “size”¹⁸ he has defined and particularised God, he has made takhṣīṣ, to use his own ambiguous, toxic, trojan-horse philosophy. And this entire argument falls to the ground, but none of the participants and listeners are wise to this.

¹⁸ He has opposed what Ibn Sīnā required in this proof, that the necessary existence is a **wujūd muṭlaq bi shart al-itlāq**, it has to remain an existence in the mind, free of every single qualification or specification.

And here is justice. He accused me of being a mujassim on account of his faulty philosophy and I am free of that walḥamdulillāḥ and Hijāb will be taken to task for his wicked slander on the Day of Judgement and he will carry the burden of all those who followed him in that. And in turn, by his own standards, he has become a mujassim for giving corporeality, embodiment (jismiyyah) to Allāh, upon the foundations of his own bid‘ah!

Then Hijāb speaks complete and utter nonsense: “You need to understand you are not an atheist anymore in front of me. I have converted you straight to Islam. All you need to know now is the right attributes of God and the Prophet Muḥammad is the Messenger.”

And this is truly laughable, because till this point, Hijāb has not been able to distinguish between God as a creator and God as a particle in the discussion with this lady. And these discussions have taken place in history and they are not new. Ibn al-Qayyim said in al-Şawā‘iq regarding the Philosophers, like Ibn Sīnā:

“As for the Tawḥid of the Philosophers, it is to deny the quiddity (māhiyyah)¹⁹ of the Lord that is additional to His existence...”—[a reference to the statement that Allāh is not a jism, He is not corporeal, not a body, which is an innovated, dubious statement, uttered by Aristotle, the Philosophers, al-Jahm and others]—“...and rejection of the attributes of His perfection. That He has no hearing, no seeing, no power, no life, no desire, no speech, no face, no hands and that there are not to be found two in Him, two meanings, one of which is distinguished from the other, at all, because if that were the case, He would be composed and would be a composed body and hence, would not be ‘one’ from every angle. **Thus, they made him to be of the same category as the indivisible particle (al-jawhar**

¹⁹ This means the reality of His essence, in other words to deny that there is a reality to His essence, even if we do not know it.

al-fard), which cannot be perceived, seen, and in whom one side cannot be distinguished from the other. Rather, this indivisible particle's existence is possible [in the real world], but this 'one' which they have made into the Lord of the Worlds, His existence is impossible [upon this version of Tawḥīd]."²⁰

So this is where Hijāb is, he took this lady's statement that fundamental particles are independent (do not need anything outside of themselves) and stated that she has affirmed something that is of necessary existence, and then claimed he has converted her straight to Islām(!) So he affirms Islām for her, without her having affirmed any creator for the universe (rubūbiyyah) and without her having affirmed the prophethood of the Prophet! This is the Islām to the pseudophilosophers! It is simply to affirm the existence of a "necessary existence" and upon this Fir'aun is a Muslim, and all pure atheists are Muslims!

Hijāb! Come to the Salafi mosque in Birmingham, sit in the lessons of Abū Khādījah, Abū Ḥakīm and Abū Idrīs, or to the primary school alongside seven year old kids, and learn the meaning of the kalimah "Lā ilāha illallāh" so that you are able to distinguish between the dīn of Islām, the dīn of Fir'aun and the dīn of Aron Ra, and the dīn of this poor little physicist lady whom you intimidated and scared away from Islām with your pompous arrogance, intellectual trickery and vainglorious boasting.

Ibn Taymiyyah pointed out, as we have cited in the previous part in this series: **"All that this [argument] comprises is that within existence, there is an existence that is obligatory. And this is**

²⁰ Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursalāh (pp. 929-930). Meaning that the existence of this creator they assert, can exist only in the mind. Whereas the existence of a fundamental, or indivisible particle could technically exist in the real world.

accepted by those who deny a Maker, such as Fir'aun, and the pure atheists such as the Philosophers, the [Bāṭinī] Qarāmites and their likes. And they say: **'This existence is obligatory in its existence by itself.'**²¹ And the statement of the people of the unity [of existence]—those who say that existence is one²²—also leads to this outcome, for they say, at the end of the affair: **'There is nothing that exists separate from the heavens and earth, and there is nothing except the existence of the possible existence.'**²³

And also: “And this method [of Ibn Sīnā] is not the method of the earlier people of kalām and their leading scholars. Just as it is not the method of the ancient Philosophers and their leading scholars.²⁴ **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**

²¹ This would mean that matter is eternal and this universe has always been in existence. And note that when this argument is used, this is exactly what atheists will say. They will say we agree there is a necessary existence, and this to us, is the universe as a whole, as that is all there is and will ever be, and it needs nothing outside of it to exist.

²² Meaning, that there is no distinction between creator and created, that all of existence is one, and they consider this to be Tawḥīd, whereas it is in fact atheism.

²³ Sharḥ al-Aṣbahāniyyah (1430H) pp. 49-50.

²⁴ In other words, the Mu'tazilah and Ash'ariyyah did not use this argument that Hijāb is using, and nor was it the argument of the ancient Greek philosophers. This was an argument that Ibn Sīnā devised, in his shrewdness, in order to lead those who use it to the doctrine of the eternity of the universe. This is because he will establish that the universe is only possible in its existence with respect to itself, but obligatory in its existence through Allāh, who is obligatory in existence. This is the meaning of “mūjab bil-dhāt”, necessitated by Allāh's existent. Because of these types of arguments, people were led to the doctrines of ittihād and waḥdat al-wujūd. This shows the truly toxic nature of this method of Ibn Sīnā.

upon which they based their [version of] Tawḥīd. And this is a corrupt proof.”²⁵

So there is no disagreement between Hijāb and the atheist lady, they both agree there is something independent and hence, necessary in existence, and to Hijāb, its just a matter of “**size**”, so his “God” [the “God” of the Philosophers and Jahmites] is bigger than her god which is a particle. So this is tajsīm and kufr, it is explicitly so on the basis of the kalām and falsafah he is following because he made a comparison between Allāh and created things on the basis of a quality, size, that necessitates embodiment. Thus, he accused me upon falsehood, of what he himself had fallen into in reality.

The lady then mocks: “Is Muḥammad the prophet of a muon, an electron...” and we obviously reject this, but she is finding what Hijāb said to be absurd, and she is correct in finding it absurd. Just because she said a fundamental particle is independent, it has now become God! And she has now become a Muslim!

Hijāb has not been able to distinguish the “God” he is arguing for, which is the “God” of the Jahmiyyah and Mutafalsifāh, with the muon the lady is speaking of. And he will only be able to do so through means that necessitate the rejection of that “God” in external reality, if and when he starts to describe this “God” in terms of what came in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah.

This was realised by the Bāṭinī Kāfir who devised this proof in the first place and this is why he said about this necessary existing being: “**wujūd muṭlaq bi sharṭ al-iṭlāq**”—which means it can only be an abstract, generalised existence with the condition of unqualification, meaning that you cannot qualify this “necessary existence” in any way or form, with any qualifications, descriptions,

²⁵ Sharḥ al-Aṣbahāniyyah (1430H) pp. 313-316.

particulars and so on. So it remained an existence in the mind only. So Hijāb would be forced back into this direction.

We are now at 2h:11m and what takes place now is just some gymnastics back and forth, and the physicist lady then says that the particles are interdependent, and what she likely intends is when they come together to form something, they are interdependent in that sense, but as individual particles, to exist, they do not need other particles, this is what she likely intended. So Hijāb took the opportunity to accuse her of contradicting herself, when that is not really the case. You can have bricks that make a wall, in making the wall all the bricks are interdependent, but each brick does not need any other brick for its own existence, and this is what she intended. She protests: “You’re putting words in my mouth.” And Hijāb then very rudely dismisses her. This is calling people to Islām!

If you understood and grasped Part 7 of this series, you will know by now that Hijāb has not achieved anything at all in his discussion, except the use of tricks in the course of argument, such as reversing questions, putting words into other people’s mouths, shifting burdens of proof, and not actually listening to what they are saying, as well as using bully tactics. And by all of this, we are not sympathetic to the views of the atheists, they are upon falsehood. However, Hijāb has not proven the existence of a Creator, in fact he cannot by this method, and all he has arrived at is the religion of Fir’aun and of pure atheists, that there has to be something that is necessary in existence. This is agreed upon by all people, and it exists only in the mind, until you start describing what this thing is. And because your argument is based on dubious terms, “material, composite, specified, limited” and so on, then you will be forced to describe the creator you are arguing for in terms of the same language in reverse that actually

renders him non-existent in external reality. Otherwise, you will contradict your argument. And this is what is going to happen next!

10. The Orange Cap Guy and Allah’s Speech, and the Qur’ān.

So the physicist lady—after being converted to Islām by Hijāb—then walks away.



And it is clear that Hijāb did not treat her nicely as he was only interested in **winning the debate** as is the way of philosophers. A person of Tawḥīd and Sunnah, a follower of the Prophets and Messengers, would not behave in this manner, and would not have used faulty, toxic goods, and would have used an approach that reaches the soul and argues on the basis of what is simple, easy to understand and not in dispute. And in general, this is what you see, when a Sunnī Muwaḥḥid speaks, people are more easily drawn to Islām but when a Bid’iyy Mutafalsif speaks, then it repels people and there is nothing there which appeals to the fiṭrah or to a person’s sensibilities. It is just dry, convoluted discussions going nowhere.

So now **the orange cap guy** enters, and this is where it gets more interesting, because this guy is versed in Islāmīc creed and the various controversies that came through the route of the Jahmites and the people of kalām. So here, Ḥijāb is going to be tested, and he will utter statements of kufr (disbelief) and the futility of his argument will be exposed, then he will try to flee on his heels and end with a cop out, and contradict himself and dismiss his entire argument.

At 2h:12m, the gentleman asks him: “Is the Qur’ān contingent?” Meaning, is the Qur’ān possible, dependent, accidental.” Ḥijāb says: “No, absolutely not.” So here, Ḥijāb has fallen for the bait and has set himself up to utter a statement of kufr some minutes later. And this is because Ḥijāb is not filled with Sunnah and the madhhab of the Salaf and with studying their works under scholarly guidance. Rather, he has filled his belly with falsafah, kalām, taken from the Greeks, Europeans, Bāṭinī Kafirs like Ibn Sīnā, chameleons like al-Rāzī and others, and a container can only pour out what it has been filled with. So he answers incorrectly, and if he actually understood my speech in Part 7, the very speech he used to accuse me of tajsīm and kufr, he would have realised that it provides the answer to this very issue in which he is going to be led to uttering kufr by this shrewd, well-informed non-Muslim, who is an atheist.

The man then says: “So the Qur’ān is not contingent?” Ḥijāb replies: “No, because it is an attribute of God.” The man says: “I knew you were going to say ‘no’... so it didn’t need God?” Ḥijab says again: “It is an attribute of God” and the man says: “Is it dependent... is it interdependent?”

By Allāh, you need to pause and reflect for a moment here and you need to appreciate the truths that have been brought home to you about the dīn of the Jahmites by the likes of Ibn

Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim and the Salaf like Imām Aḥmad, because they were all wise to this.

What is going on here and in what is to follow in the rest of this discussion is **EXACTLY** what I have been telling Hijāb from Part 1 of this series.

And so Hijāb has a portion of this verse:

إِنَّ شَرَّ الدَّوَابِّ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ الصُّمُّ الْبُكْمُ الَّذِينَ لَا يَعْقِلُونَ

“Indeed, the worst of living creatures in the sight of Allāh are the deaf and dumb who do not use reason.” (8:22).

And this verse:

أَفَأَنْتُ تُسْمِعُ الصُّمَّ أَوْ تَهْدِي الْعُمْىَ وَمَنْ كَانَ فِي ضَلَالٍ مُّبِينٍ

“Then will you make the deaf hear, or guide the blind or he who is in clear error?” (43:40).

This “necessary existence” you argue for with an argument that achieves only an existence in the mind, when you are scrutinised with respect to its attributes and actions, you are going to be forced to deny its existence in external reality to remain consistent, and this is by way of denying either:

- a) names, attributes, descriptions and chosen actions
- b) attributes, descriptions and chosen actions
- c) **or chosen actions (tied to Allāh’s will and power).**

Whatever rung you are on in ladder of falsafah and kalām²⁶, your position is such that in order to remain logically coherent, you will be forced to negate Allāh’s existence altogether.

In short, you will have used a method to prove Allāh’s existence in the mind only, which is His non-existence, then after that you will

²⁶ Whether you are a Philosopher like Ibn Sīnā, a Jahmite, or a Mu’tazilite, or Ash’arite.

adopt a theology in which His existence has to be denied in external reality. What an evil combination!

So let us continue: Hijāb replies: “The Qurʾān is a subgroup of an attribute of God, which is speech.” The man asks: “Which came first?” Hijab replies: “**No, it was there at the same time, it was always there, its eternal.**”

So here Hijāb has said the Qurʾān is eternal, the Qurʾān is “qadīm” this is a bidʿah. It is the saying of the Kullābiyyah and Ashʿariyyah among the Jahmiyyah and they said this because they deny Allāh’s chosen actions, those actions which occur by Allāh’s will and power—the one’s I mentioned, such as mercy, speech, creating in the quote which Hijāb used to accuse me of tajsīm and kufr. So they had to deal with the issue of the Qurʾān. So they said, it is a meaning (maʿnā) established in the self of Allāh, eternally with Him. And this is how they got around the problem. But this did not explain the issue of the Arabic Qurʾān we have, which is heard and recited. We shall come back to this a little later.

So Hijāb, by failing to say—when asked at the very beginning “Is the Qurʾān contingent”—that “The Qurʾān is the speech of Allāh and Allāh’s speech is through His will and power, He speaks as and when He wills through His will and power”—then he has set himself up for uttering a statement of kufr, which he will do so in a few moments. So again, this is justice. Weeks ago, he himself had already fallen into the very tajsīm and kufr he accused me of a few days ago. And he has fallen into actual tajsīm and kufr, in explicit words, upon his own philosophy.

So Hijāb said: “**The Qurʾān was always there, it is eternal**”. But now another person enters the discussion and diverts away from the flow of this discussion for a couple of minutes.



The man in the orange cap patiently waits and at 2h:14m:51s, he takes his opportunity to come back in to deliver **Hijāb a killer blow, knock him senseless, and draw him to utter kufr**—and we do not rejoice with this, but this is the inevitable outcome of being on a **pompous intellectual high** due to sniffing excessively on the intellectual dung and puss of Ibn Sīnā, the Bāṭinī Kāfir who gamed the Mutakallimīn with this argument of his (possible and necessary existence) and which he devised in order to allow him to argue that the universe is possible in existence by itself, **but necessary in existence by other than itself**, by Allāh’s essence, so it is eternal. Hence, it and Allāh are both eternal, which is just atheism. And this is a conclusion, that Hijāb cannot avoid, if he affirms the attributes, or Allāh’s chosen actions, from which is speech. So we are now going to see the effects of sniffing the dung and puss of Ibn Sīnā on the face of Muḥammad Hijāb.

So this man says: “Sorry, the Qur’ān is outlining things that the recitation does outline, creates determinism doesn’t it, really? Which

is the argument from... you do believe in determinism?" Hijāb says: "We believe God is a determiner". The man says: "Everything is determined, no free will." The man then says: "If you're creating a Qur'ān saying all these things happened. It talks about the Bible, it talks about the past, talks about the future... then it's all determined isn't it." As this man is talking Hijāb is feeling uncomfortable and he breaks the flow of the man's speech by asking him his name. The man continues: "... then its all determined isn't it... and there is no free will and you haven't really demonstrated, the way you tried to demonstrate to Julie and to Aron, **how the Qur'ān and Allāh can be non-interdependent, eternal and not dependent on anything else and yet the Qur'ān is determined, is dependent on all of the things that the Qur'ān describes.**" This is something very deep here, and Hijāb does not have knowledge to first to even grasp it, let alone see through it, and let alone answer it.

Hijāb simply says here: "I understand where you are coming from because there is a misunderstanding of Islamic theology." The man interjects and says: "This was a big thing wasn't it..." and Hijab mentions the Mu'tazilah and Imām Aḥmad, and says that he himself is a Ḥanbalī, which is a lie, because no true Ḥanbalī ever based his religion on falsafah and kalām, so this is a raw lie from Hijāb. Rather, **he a pseudophilosopher Jahmite** in his approach, it is impossible for him to be a Ḥanbali in creed, because that is the Salafī creed, and what Hijāb is upon is dung and puss, whereas what Imām Aḥmad and his students were upon refreshing, pure, wholesome milk. The man says: "A lot of people were killed over this, weren't they?" Hijāb says: "**Not really**... some people were tortured", and this is not true, Hijāb made light of the miḥnah, the trial, which lasted over the reign of four rulers, and in which at minimum, hundreds were killed, being very conservative. Then Hijāb says: "We were on the side of those

guys that were tortured...” and this reveals that Hijāb is a rank ignoramus and is clueless or is a liar. Rather, the method he is upon in acquisition of creed, then he is upon the way of the Mutafalsifah, Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah, and he would have been among those who argued against Imām Aḥmad and accused him of tajsīm and kufr—because of his ignorance.

Hijāb then comes with his answer: “So in Islamic theology, the Qur’ān is not created...” so this is correct. He continues: “...according to the Sunnī understanding, it is not created, obviously the Mu‘tazilis were a group of people that became extinct, they believe it was created, but we don’t believe it. So because it is not created... and they [the Mu‘tazilah] have their own theology by the way...” The man interjects and says “Not contingent, yeah.” Hijāb says: “So because it’s not created...its like I am speaking to you now right, my speech is part of my attribute, its part of me. Because my speech is part of me.” And so here, Hijāb is setting himself up for someone to say that Allāh’s speech is a “part” of Him as well, hence, Allāh is made up of parts and is therefore composed and therefore dependent. and that is the route of the Mu‘tazilah in their version of Tawḥīd, in negating composition through attributes.

Hijāb is lost at this point because he is grounded in dung and puss (falsafah and kalām) and is not grounded in wholesome, pure milk, the purity of revelation. And now he is waffling. He started by saying his attribute of speech is a part of himself (thus attributes can be said to be parts), next he says : “So speech is an attribute of me, but its an attribute which is intrinsic to me. So in other words, the speech of Allāh is intrinsic to Allāh, and the Qur’ān is a subset of that speech. Meaning, **it is also eternal just like Allāh.**” So once again, for the second time, he has explicitly stated that “the Qur’ān is eternal, just like Allāh” So this is a bid‘ah and it is the bid‘ah of the 3rd Wave

Jahmites²⁷, the Kullābiyyah and Ash‘ariyyah and this is not the saying of Ahl al-Sunnah, not of Imām Aḥmad and others.

The man then says: “But you could say the same about reality, you can say the same about reality, it is an expression of Allāh.” This man here is implying **the unity of existence**, that creation is an expression of Allāh Himself, and he is tying this to Hijāb’s answer about the Qur’ān, which he answered with bid‘ah, that the Qur’ān is eternal—and he failed to distinguish between the speech that is eternal as an attribute of Allāh (in its type, naw’), and speech that returns back to Allāh’s irādah (desire), and hence, the Qur’ān, as speech is not eternal, because Allāh spoke it when He willed to speak it, He is not always, eternally speaking it. And this is like when Allāh spoke to Moses (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام), after He created Moses, and He will speak to the Believers on the Day of Judgement and so on, so all of this speech is tied to Allāh’s desire to speak, His will. So Hijāb failed to make this distinction because he is not upon the Salafi creed and is ignorant of it. So when this man treats the recitation of the Qur’ān which we hear and recite, as being the attribute of Allāh, eternal with Him, according to Hijāb’s innovated answer, then he took it to the next logical step, which is to say in that case, if something that is an eternal attribute of Allāh is present with us, and it is recited and heard, then all of reality is simply an expression of Allāh, and this is the saying of **the unity of existence** of Ibn al-‘Arabī and disbelievers like him, where creation is simply a manifestation of Allāh’s attributes. So this man took Hijāb’s bid‘ah to its logical destination.

Hijāb then corrects the man and says: “It is an expression of His attribute of creation.” And the mans says: “Its also, its also eternal.” In

²⁷ The original Jahmites are first wave, the second wave were the Mu‘tazilah and the third wave were the Kullābiyyah and its branches, and they are the Ash‘ariyyah and Māturīdiyyah.

other words, he simply took Hijāb's answer to its logical destination, but Hijāb now rejects this and says: "It could have otherwise not been the case, so... the universe can be taken out of existence, whereas Allāh can never be taken out of existence." So now this man catches Hijāb out a second time and asks him: "Can the Qur'ān be taken out of existence?" Hijāb answers: "The Qur'ān in the recitational form cannot be taken out of existence. In physical form, like in books and stuff, yes [it can]..." The man interjects and say: "No, I am not talking in physical form, so you are effectively saying that the recitation is eternal and even as a recitation, its quite difficult to have a start and a begining of something that is eternal." Hijāb says: "We don't have a start." The man says: "Well, the beginning of the recitation." Hijāb says: "It was always there." Then the man says: "Yes, I know, but when it's spoken by God, that recitation..." Hijāb aims to clarify: "But because the speech of Allāh is one category and the subset of that is the Qur'ān. **That Qur'ān is eternal.**" So here for the third time, he has declared the Qur'ān to be eternal, which means this is not a slip, but something established in Hijāb's belief and understanding, and this is a statement of bid'ah, and we can now suspect Hijāb to be a **concealed Ash'arī** masquerading as a Ḥanbali. 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, and because this man pulled him apart and led him to what is worse

than the bid‘ah he spoke with first, which is when he said the Qur’ān is qadīm (eternal). However, this is the saying of the Ash‘arites, and perhaps he meant to say that the Qur’ān is in the Preserved Tablet, and this is what the Ash‘arites say, that Gabriel transmitted it to the Prophet from the Preserved Tablet, they deny that Allāh spoke it with a voice. So the language of Hijāb here is the language of an Ash‘arite, because he has not affirmed anywhere here that Allāh spoke the Qur’ān to Jibrīl, and He has not affirmed anywhere here that Allāh’s speech is by His will and power, rather Hijāb is answering with words that are from the direction of the bid‘ah of the Ash‘arites, that the Qur’ān itself is eternal. However, he made a big error when he said it is eternal in the Preserved Tablet, making this created thing eternal with Allāh, whereas the Ash‘arites say it is eternal in Allāh’s self as a meaning.

The man then says: “Philosophically, I think you have made a sufficient argument.” And we don’t know what to make of this, because this man is clearly well informed about doctrines of various sects, and perhaps he may have achieved his objective of leading Hijāb to misguidance, and left Hijāb thinking that what he said is correct, when in it is falsehood, innovation and misguidance, with some personal flavour of Muḥammad Hijāb added to it, making something created to be eternal with Allāh. Hijāb tried to answer with the answer of the Ash‘arites, but he messed it up, and alongside saying the Qur’ān is qadīm, eternal, he also made the Preserved Tablet eternal as well.

So in any case, the orange cap man brought the doubt that the Mu‘tazilah brought against Ibn Kullāb, who was given to philosophy and disputation and was not grounded in the Sunnah. They said that the attribute of speech is such that it must be successive, have composition, a beginning and so on, and Ibn Kullāb could not answer

them through reason, and he had to flee from this, and it led him to deny that Allāh’s speech is tied to His will, for fear of affirming events (ḥawādith) in Allāh’s essence, because this would clash with the proof for Allāh’s existence, hūdūth al-ajsām, of which Ibn Sīnā’s proof that Hijāb is using is a more toxic, plagiarised variation. So Ibn Kullāb invented a new doctrine and said Allāh’s speech is just a meaning in Allāh’s self and it is eternal with Him, so this led to the saying that the Qur’ān is eternal, this where this bid’ah came from.²⁸ This is the bid’ah that Hijāb is uttering here. And this man brought the very same doubt as the Mu’tazilah, this is exactly what this man was saying, when he said: “The Qur’ān is determined, is dependent on all of the things that the Qur’ān describes” and when he was referring to its recitation, all of this requires composition, succession, a beginning, so if it is an eternal attribute of Allah as Hijāb told him, then the creation can also be said to be an eternal attribute of Allāh, its just an expression of Allāh. So from here we can branch out in the saying of the people of divine union and unity of existence.

So let us cite here from Ibn Taymiyyah:

السلف قالوا : القرآن كلام الله منزل غير مخلوق وقالوا لم يزل متكلما إذا شاء . فبينوا أن كلام الله قديم ، أي : جنسه قديم لم يزل . ولم يقل أحد منهم : إن نفس الكلام المعين قديم ، ولا قال أحد منهم القرآن قديم . بل قالوا : إنه كلام الله منزل غير مخلوق . وإذا كان الله قد تكلم بالقرآن بمشيئته ، كان القرآن كلامه ، وكان منزلا منه غير مخلوق ، ولم يكن مع ذلك أزليا قديما بقدم الله ، وإن كان الله لم يزل متكلما إذا شاء ؛ فجنس كلامه قديم . فمن فهم قول السلف وفرق بين هذه الأقوال زالت عنه الشبهات في هذه المسائل المعضلة التي اضطرب فيها أهل الأرض .

“The Salaf said: ‘The Qur’ān is the Speech of Allāh, revealed, not created.’ And they said: ‘He never ceased as one who speaks when

²⁸ Imām al-Sijzī (d. 444H) discussed these details in his book “*Al-Radd ‘alā man Ankara al-Ḥarf wal-Ṣawf*”

He wills.’ So they explained that the speech of Allāh (as an attribute) is eternal. Meaning, in its genus it is eternal, it has never ceased [as His attribute]. But not a single of them said that any specific speech is eternal and not a single one of them said: ‘The Qur’ān is eternal’. Rather, they said: ‘It is the speech of Allāh, revealed, uncreated. And when Allāh spoke the Qur’ān through His will, the Qur’ān is His speech, and it was revealed from Him, uncreated. Alongside that it was not eternal with the eternity of Allāh, even though Allāh has never ceased being one who speaks whenever He wills. So the genus of His speech is eternal. So whoever understood the saying of the Salaf and distinguished between these various sayings, the problematic doubts in this affair which have confused the people of the earth will cease from him.’²⁹

He also said:

وكلام الله : تكلم الله به بنفسه ، تكلم به باختياره وقدرته ، ليس مخلوقا بائنا عنه . بل هو قائم بذاته ، مع أنه تكلم به بقدرته ومشئته ، ليس قائما بدون قدرته ومشئته ... ولم يقل أحد منهم : إن القرآن قديم.

“And the speech of Allāh, Allāh spoke with it Himself, with His choice and power. It is not created, separate from Him. Rather, it is established with His essence, alongside Him having spoken it with His power and will. **It is not established without His power and will...**³⁰ and not a single one of them said: ‘The Qur’ān is eternal’.”³¹

We have good grounds to suspect Hijāb to be a **concealed Ash’arī masquerading as a Ḥanbalī**. He is as fake a Ḥanbali as

²⁹ Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (12/54).

³⁰ And hence it can be said that it depends on His will and power which is a correct and sound meaning that I explained and for which Muḥammad Hijāb slandered me with accusations of tajsim and kufr.

³¹ Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (12/566-577).

are Chinese fake designer labels. And this explains why he has so much hatred and enmity against Şalafīs, why he slandered me with the accusation of tajsīm and kufr, and why the Jahmite Ash‘arīs are the ones who are supporting him on social media. We have therefore rendered spurious his claim of being a Ḥanbalī, kadhdhāb!

11. The Christian Theologian and the Dīn of the Mu‘tazilah



We are still not done yet, **the bid‘ah festival** continues with Hijāb as host. So next, at 2h:18m:47s the Christian theologian steps in and he comes with the doctrines of the Mu‘tazilah. He says: “But then there is an eternally existing thing with Allāh, which is not Allāh.” Hijāb says: “**No, no, we say that’s part of Allāh**”.

So now, Hijāb scores again, he is obviously good at this game. First, he accused me of tajsīm upon falsehood and oppression, and he fell into it himself, in explicit words by saying the difference between his “God” and that of Julie’s is “one of size”—which upon the principles of Ahl al-Kalām and Philosophy is tajsīm. Second, he accused me of kufr upon falsehood and oppression and he fell into a

statement of kufr himself, making the Preserved Tablet eternal with Allāh. And now, he says that the attribute of speech is “**part of Allāh**”, so Allāh’s attributes are His parts! And recall that he also slandered me earlier by saying that I say Allāh “has parts” and I never said any such thing, rather I have always been trying to tell him that it is inevitable that he is going to fall into this by virtue of his argument, and this is exactly what had already happened, **weeks earlier**. So now, Allāh’s attributes are His parts, His speech is “part” of Him.

Nice, one Hijāb. I wonder if you would have outdone al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān in innovating into Islām if you had been present in that time debating with Hindu, Sabean, Greek, Christian and Jewish philosophers based on reason and logic as your foundations. You share the same traits with al-Jahm: loving disputation, aiming to win debates at any cost, ignorance of the Sunnah, disdain towards its people, pompous arrogance, vainglorious boasting.

The Christian (Josh) says: “Yes, but its not Allāh... is it identical to Him.” Hijāb says: “We say it is a part of... part of Allāh’s attributes.” Hijāb then says: “...Well its like saying: Is His mercy Him?” The Christian says: “So I am asking you, is that identical?” Hijāb says: “Its one of His many attributes.”

The man in the orange cap says: “But his merciful acts are different from His mercy right?” And this man is alluding to a correct meaning, but the wording is not quite right. Allāh’s acts of mercy are from His mercy but they arise from Allāh’s will, so they are *ṣifāt fi’liyyah*, they return back to His will, or these acts depend on His will, as I explained, and there is no caution in saying this as it is a correct meaning as we have already established from Ibn Taymiyyah.

The man then actually clarifies: “But... His merciful acts are different from His mercy... His mercy is an attribute but His merciful acts **are contingent**.” Here Hijāb did not respond to this man or

correct him. So contingent means that His acts are conditional, depend on something else, and Allāh’s actions are by His will and power, and if you say this, you have not made Allāh “dependent”, since Allāh is self-sufficient in Himself, in His essence and His attributes, He is not dependent on anything other than Himself. On this very basis the Ash‘arites and others argued for the attribute of life (ḥayāt) through His knowledge and power with the argument that life **is a condition** for these (and other) attributes, stating that this is something universally known, it is simply a rationality. Just as it is universally true that no voluntary act takes place except by choice, by will and power, then likewise there is no knowledge and power, except with life. So they used the word “condition” (shart) for the attributes, and I used the word “depend” in speaking about Allāh’s chosen actions, but this was in the course of argument against Hijāb, in telling him that atheists are going to use this against you, and you will be unable to separate between the creation and the created. This was before I analysed this discussion of Hijāb. And this is exactly what has been going on in this discussion. So Hijāb must repent from slandering me upon falsehood, and then repent himself for falling into the very things he slandered me with.

Then the Christian comes back and says: “Classical theism says...” and this term Classical Theism, this is the term for the theology of the Greek Philosophers, and the Ahl al-Kalām from the Jews, Christians and Muslims who use this innovated negatory language, “Does not have a body, does not have parts...” and so on.

So this Christian continues: “Classical theism says: “There isn’t anything in God which is not God, so God’s attributes are identical to God.” So here this Christian is bringing the doctrine of the Mu‘tazilah, because they said that affirming attributes for Allāh is composition (tarkīb), which leads to either composition (for the Philosophers like

Ibn Sīnā) or multiple eternal entities (for the Mu'tazilah). So they explain away the attributes by saying they are synonymous with God's essence, so as to avoid Him being only possible (mumkin) or emergent (hādith).

Notice how now Hijāb's entire argument is destroyed. He has not proved any Creator in external reality through his argument, it is an abstract existence only, in the mind only. Now, when we get down to this Creator and His attributes, Hijāb is stuck. So its either reject all the attributes which means a rejection of the creator in external reality, or admit that the Creator is just like the created and hence you are upon the doctrine of Fir'aun and the people of Waḥdat ul-Wujūd, the unity of existence. And this is how the doctrine of the Jahmites led to the saying of the unity of existence.

Let us see what Ibn Taymiyyah said:

والذي علم بصريح العقل: أن ما كان واجب الوجود بذاته لا تكون^(١) حقيقته مفتقرة إلى حقيقة أخرى مباينة لذاته لأن ذلك يمنع أن يكون واجباً بذاته، ولذلك انحصرت قسمة الموجود إلى واجب بذاته وممكن بذاته، وكان الاعتراف بالموجود الواجب أمراً ضرورياً لا يمكن دفعه، وليس من الاعتراف به؟ إعتراف بصانع العالم، بل فرعون وأمثاله ممن ينكر الخالق تعالى لا يدفع وجود موجود واجب الوجود، وإنما الشأن في تعيينه، فقد يقربه، ويزعم أنه العالم، كما هو^(٢) حقيقة قول هؤلاء.

“That which is known by sound intellect: That whatever is necessary in existence by itself (by its essence), its reality is not in need of another reality that is separate from its essence, because that would prevent it from being necessary by its own essence. For that reason, the division of existence is restricted to that which is necessary by itself and what, by itself, is only possible (in its existence). And the affirmation of that which is necessary in

existence is a necessary matter, it cannot be repelled.³² **And within its acknowledgement there is no acknowledgement of a Creator of the universe. Rather, Fir'aun and his likes from those who rejected the Exalted Creator do not reject the existence of what is necessary in existence. But rather, the issue is in specifying it, for he may approach it and claim that it is the universe**, as is the reality of the statement of those.”³³

And here in another statement:

وأيضاً فإن هؤلاء المتفلسفة قد يقولون: وجود الأشياء زائد على ذواتها في الخارج، ويفرقون بين الواجب والممكن بأن الوجود الواجب هو الوجود المقيد بقيد كونه غير عارض لشيء^(١) من الماهيات بخلاف الممكن^(٢) كما يذكره ابن سينا وغيره، عن مذهبهم.

وحيثئذ فيكونون^(٣) قد جمعوا في هذا أنواع الباطل من الممكن وجعلوا الواجب هو الوجود المطلق الذي لا يتحقق إلا في الأذهان لا في الأعيان وهو في الحقيقة تعطيل لوجود الواجب.

So in this statement above Ibn Taymiyyah is explaining that to the pseudophilosophers like Ibn Sīnā the “**existence**” of things in external reality is a matter **additional to their essences** and they distinguish between the necessary and possible in that the necessary being is conditioned with not being subject to any realities, which means, any discussions of what it is. In other words, the result is that this existence is in the mind only, because all you are affirming is an idea, stripped of all qualifications, details, particulars and so on. Ibn Taymiyyah says: “In that case... they have made the necessary

³² That is why all atheists accept that there is a necessary existence. So Hijāb boasting about “converting atheists” is the statement of a deluded, vainglorious clown who is laughed at for his stupidity and shallowness in intellect.

³³ Bughyat al-Murtād (p. 427).

[being] to be a wujūd muṭlaq (abstract, non-specific) which cannot exist except in the mind, not as an actual external entity. And in reality this is a negation of the necessary existence.”³⁴

So what is happening here is that when the orange cap guy and the Christian guy are bringing the Mu‘tazili doctrines and arguments to Hijāb, Hijāb is stuck, because the moment he affirms a single attribute or a single chosen action which requires Allāh’s will and power, or when the argument is made that Allāh’s knowledge and power are conditioned upon His attribute of life as is said by the Ṣifātiyyah from Ahl al-Kalām, that this means Allāh is no different to that which is possible in existence, and hence the argument fails. Or you must agree with Ibn Sīnā and affirm an existence in the mind only, which is atheism. So either way, it is atheism.

Then from here, the only way to escape is to ascribe attributes to Allāh upon the way of the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah, to make them synonymous with His essence or to say that they are other than His essence, and hence His attributes are simply created entities. So His power is really the wind and the ocean that manifest power, and His speech is what is spoken by the creation and so on. Effectively, Allāh’s attributes are established not with His essence, but in the essences of His creation. And this then leads to the saying of **the unity of existence**, in that the creation is an expression, a physical one, of Allāh’s attributes, that His attributes gave rise and became embodied in the creation, and it is this way that He reveals Himself and makes Himself known to His creatures. When this confusion and controversy about the attributes bewildered factions of people, they were led to this saying of the unity of existence. That everything we see is a manifestation of Allāh Himself.

³⁴ Bughyat al-Murtād (p. 417).

So, well done Hijāb! Laying the foundations of the religion of Fir'aun, pure atheists and the unity of existence through the dung and puss filled trojan horse of Ibn Sinā, and leading Muslims down this evil path, building your social media and tube personality on the back of such misguidance! How I wish 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) and the Imāms of the Salaf had set eyes on you to discipline you, you evil, ignorant, misguided innovator and corrupter of the creed of the Muslims. I say this because the proof has already been established upon you, and you have chosen to wage war against the truth, knowingly and wilfully, and you are exposed as a 3rd Wave Jahmite Mutakallim, poisoned with the philosophy of Ibn Sīnā.

So coming back to our discussion, we are at 2h:19m:29s and Hijāb now responds to the Mu'tazilī understanding that the Christian presented: "That's mereological studies, that's a fallacy in fact." And mereology is the study of the relation between parts and wholes and the properties of that relation. The Christian tells him "Its not a fallacy, its a traditional position in theistic..." then there is a bit of wrangling, Hijāb is protesting that he is trying to discuss with the atheist (guy in orange cap) and why is he, the Christian interfering. Hijab is getting uncomfortable. In reality, what is happening is that the Christian is popping Hijāb's inflated balloon and demonstrating the truth of what I have been telling him in clear, unambiguous words.

Hijāb then asks the Christian: "Do you believe God has parts". He answers, "No". Hijāb says, "I don't believe God has parts"—so now he says "God does not have parts" and earlier he said "speech is a **part** of God", so this speech is not precise, it is contradictory, so here Hijāb is going to struggle, as he is all over the place.

The Christian correctly says to Hijāb: "**But you have a problem because you are contradicting yourself.**"

Now Hijāb cannot reply except with the statement of the star-worshipping idolator, Aristotle, and that of al-Jahm and Ibn Sīnā and the Muʿtazilah, of innovated negatory language: “Let me explain, We believe God is **immaterial** and **incorporeal** and He is also **partless**, right.” The Christian acknowledges saying: “Yes, divine simplicity, He is not composed of parts....but then you have a problem because if he lacks parts, His speech has to be a part, because if it is not then identical... the only reason He does not have parts because everything within Him is identical to Him, so He is not composed...”

Keep in mind that two minutes earlier, at 2h:18m:47s, Hijāb explicitly said about Allāh’s speech: “**No, no, we say that’s part of Allāh**” in order to oppose the claim that it is other than Allāh. So the Christian has now used the argument against him, the very one I was trying to tell Hijāb, that your argument is going to lead to atheism, because you will not be able to distinguish between the creator and the created through this dubious, innovated language. So this is binding upon Hijāb, if He wants to believe in the Lord and Deity of the Prophets and Messengers, as revealed in the Qur’ān, the Lord who has attributes and chosen actions, then he will not be able to. He has to reject this Lord. And this is what is happening here.

Now here comes the killer blow. After a little wrangling and Hijab appearing confused and asking for clarification and saying “**Maybe we agree...**”³⁵ : The Christian explains to Hijāb: “Because if they are not identical to God, then things within God, God is dependent on,

³⁵ Hijāb is now clearly confused to the point that he says that he may be in agreement with Josh the Christian, and this means he would be agreeing to the negation of the attributes upon the consideration of the Mutafalsifah, Ibn Sīnā and the Muʿtazilah. So this is the reality, I described the argument being used by Hijāb as **a trojan horse**, and this is exactly what has happened here.

He depends on His omnipotence, he is dependent on His omniscience...”

So here, this was the very argument that was refuted by Ibn Taymiyyah in the speech I brought at the beginning of this article in order to refute Hijāb’s vile slander upon me when he accused me of saying Allāh is “dependent”. This was the “Mu‘tazilī Falsafiyy” argument as Ibn Taymiyyah described it, that if Allāh has attributes, His existence must depend on them. So Ibn Taymiyyah refuted it, as we cited earlier:

“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].”³⁶

Hijāb is clearly stuck and he has no answers, and this is because when it comes to speaking with specifics about the so-called “necessary existence” he has established, he only has two choices, to avoid all descriptions completely, keeping consistent with what Ibn Sīnā said: **“wujūd muṭlaq bi sharṭ al-iṭlāq”**, an abstract, non-specific general existence in the mind only, with the condition of keeping this completely unqualified. Meaning you cannot add any other description or attribute or any particulars, except to say that He is necessary in existence. Because the moment you do, you will

³⁶ 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.

make Allāh dependent on what you ascribe to Him, according to the argument. So Ibn Taymiyyah refuted that. And likewise, it would be refuted by Ash‘arīs and Mātūrīdīs who would say that Allāh’s attributes require or depend on the attribute of life, but that would not make Him dependent on anything besides Himself. So the point being, the argument Hijab brought against me, this cannot even be used by Ash‘arīs and Mātūrīdis against me, and yet Hijāb ascribed tajsīm and kufr to me through it, and that is because it is a **“falsaffiyy mu‘taziliyy”** argument, used by Ibn Sīnā and the heads of the Mu‘tazilah against the generality of the Şifātiyyah (, the affirmers of the attributes which Ahl al-Sunnah, and then innovators such as the Kullābiyyah, Ash‘ariyyah and others). **And now, he is stuck with his dung and puss.** This very same argument was being used against him, weeks before this misguided innovator used it to slander me. So this is the extent of Hijāb’s ignorance and misguidance.

He is a **misguided innovator** who misguides others and he slanders the people of Tawḥīd and Sunnāh, whilst he himself is upon the Tawḥīd taken from the language of Aristotle, Ibn Sīnā, al-Jahm and the Mu‘tazilah, and now when the “Mu‘tazilī Falsafiyy” argument is being used against him, he is destroyed. This is **the trojan horse** which I was speaking about. Hijāb used the trojan horse of Ibn Sīnā and the Mu‘tazilah, of imkān, wujūb, completed by tarkīb and takhṣīṣ, and now, when speaking about the attributes and Allāh’s chosen actions, he has to remain true to the doctrines of Ibn Sīnā and the Mu‘tazilah and adopt their theology, and He can’t even go to Ash‘arism either, because that is also tajsīm and kufr, according to the argument and its logical requirements.

Through this discussion, Hijāb keeps plugging his recent book on cosmological arguments until even those discussing with him get sick of it and start mocking him for it.

Do not listen to this misguided innovator. Do not read his books. Put your fingers in your ears and flee with your religion. Do not believe a word he says that he is “Atharī”, “Ḥanbalī”, I call Allāh and the Angels to witness that this is a lie. He can never ever be Atharī, Ḥanbalī, **ever**, while he remains upon this falsehood and does not openly free himself from it.

Next at 2h:21m:05s the man in the orange cap comes back and wants to make a point on the same issue, he says: “No, no, its the same thing... so is the Qur’ān able to exist eternally without Allāh?” Hijāb says: “No.... because it is **the expression of Allāh.**” So this is why we suspect Hijāb to be **a covert, concealed Ash’arī Jahmite, masquerading as a Ḥanbalī** in order misguide and mislead people away from the Salafī creed and there are other evidences that support this too, such as his praising of the Ikhwānī innovator and mufsid (corrupter), **Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī** and him studying under individuals that consider Ash’arism to be a valid school of thought within the body of Ahl al-Sunnah. We have come across academic and intellectual fraudsters like this previously, and so we suspect that this is what he is and inshā’Allah the truth will be made apparent, and with Allāh lies knowledge of the hidden and the unseen.

So the Ash’arites are the ones who say the Qur’ān is an ibārah, an expression, because they deny Allāh speaks through His will and power and with a voice that is unlike the voice of His creation, which is the creed of the Salaf. The Ash’arites followed the Kullābiyyah in this innovation.

Then the man in the orange cap makes his point: “**So the Qur’ān is contingent on Allāh?**” So here this is the foundation upon which Ibn Kullāb denied Allāh’s actions that are tied to Allāh’s will and choice, he denied the **ṣifāt fi’liyyah ikhtiyāriyyah**, because he could not answer the argument of the Mu’tazilah that this means

there are contingencies in Allāh’s essence, and Allāh would depend on them and that Allāh speaking the Qur’ān would mean there are ḥawādith (events, occurrences) in Allāh’s essences. So he rejected that Allāh speaks or acts according to His will, and said the Qur’ān is eternally with Allāh as a meaning in the self. And as for the Arabic Qur’ān that is with us then it is a citation (ḥikāyah) of that Qur’ān which is a meaning in the self of Allāh which is with Him eternally. The Ash’arīs followed him in this and used a different word, that the recited, heard Qur’ān is an ‘ibārah (expression) of that Qur’ān which is a meaning in the self of Allāh. And this led to the doctrine of the two Qur’āns, and ultimately to the saying that the Qur’ān we have with us, recited and heard in Arabic is created. And from here is born the doubt that Christians bring with respect to the word of Allāh, in that an attribute of Allāh can manifest into something that is created, and they use this innovation of the Kullābiyyah and Ash’ariyyah to argue in favour of their doctrine about Jesus (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام), the “word” that was God, becoming “flesh”. So in his answers, Hijāb has laid down the foundations for the dīn of the Christians. Hijāb is on a roll, bid’ah after bid’ah, ḍalālāh after ḍalālāh, opening numerous pathways to kufr and zandaqah and for the validation of the dīn of the mushrikīn. And this is the end result of this evil debate culture based upon logic, and philosophy by ignoramuses put to trial by their inflated egos.

The correct answer to this is to say that Allāh speaks through His will and power, and that his speech is not except by His will and power—and when I explained this in Part 7 of this series, in the course of the flow of argument, and said that Allāh’s ṣifāt fi’liyyah depend upon His will (mashī’ah) and desire (irādah) which is a true statement and there is no caution in it, then it answers this doubt. Allāh is self-sufficient with all of His attributes, He does not depend upon other than Himself. And the Qur’ān is from His speech, it is not

eternal (as the Kullābiyyah and Ash‘ariyyah were forced to say and as Hijāb said), but it is something Allāh spoke when He willed to speak, just as He spoke the Torah and Injīl. However, Hijab attacked this explanation through the toxic poison of the Mu‘tazilah and Mutafalsifah and declared this to be tajsīm and kufr, and now the very thing Hijāb used against me is being used against him and he is stuck for answers, and uttering statements of bid‘ah and kufr, because He is not a firm, stable Sunnī Muthabbit but a **Falsafiyy Mutakhabbit**, a philosophical erratic, blind, wandering stumbler.

The man in the orange says: “I think that’s a fair argument” and now Hijāb, clearly stuck and lost, begins his tricks of evasion and misdirection. After being unable to answer these valid arguments, he simply resorts to saying whatever arguments are used then they are irrelevant to the deity which is God because He is “metaphysical”. Basically, Hijāb is fleeing on his heels. The Christian disagrees and says: “You can have metaphysical parts”, and He is correct and this is the argument of the Philosophers and Mu‘tazilah, because you can have physical parts in the physical world, but you can also have conceptual parts, and this is how they treat the attributes, and they consider this to be tarkīb (composition) which violates their proofs of imkān and wujūb coupled with tarkīb and ikhtiṣāṣ, which Hijāb is using, or of ḥudūth al-ajsām, which is what the Mu‘tazilah use.

Hijāb tries to dismiss the argument by saying: “All of those things are irrelevant to God” and the Christian says: “No, they are not irrelevant to God”, and he is actually correct, sad to say, and Hijāb is in fact the mubṭil (falsifier), the liar in this scenario. **This is because Hijāb is now contradicting himself and his entire argument and it shows his hypocrisy in argument.** Because in his debates, he relies on saying that possible things are “composed”, “particular”, “specified” and so on from this dubious philosophical language that is

part and parcel of his proof, and that God is the complete opposite of that. However, since you committed to that language, then you have to be consistent, and deal with the issue of attributes and chosen actions, otherwise, everything you said God isn't in connection to created things, He actually is, as soon as you start affirming the attributes—in the context of this innovated kalām and falsafah.

The Christian continues to reject Hijāb's claims and then makes a remark to show that he is much more informed than Hijāb, by far. He says: **“They are not irrelevant... because some people had the debate: Is God's essence identical to His existence.”** Now this statement here, is the very one that Ibn Taymiyyah used as a counter argument against the Philosophers and Jahmites who brought the doubt about the attributes, about Allāh depending on His attributes if they are affirmed for him. Ibn Taymiyyah said that the same thing is binding upon you because if we apply your reasoning, we can also say that Allāh's “existence”, which you affirm, requires His “essence” and thus He is in need (muftaqir, muḥtāj) of His essence for His existence and hence, He is composed of parts and thus is mumkin (possible) or ḥādith (originated). So what has happened here is that this Christian has brought to Muḥammad Hijāb the very doubt Hijāb used against me and Muḥammad Hijāb cannot respond except by making raw, blatant lies and effectively admitting defeat in an indirect way and renouncing his argument.

So at 2h:22m:52s Hijab says: **“All I am saying Josh, is that when we are analysing parts and wholes, in the world that we live in, that study gets us nowhere in understanding the metaphysical reality of God.”** And here Hijāb has established himself to be a **raw liar**. Because this is **exactly** what he uses in debates. This is the very foundation of his entire argument and the arguments of kalām and falsafah in general. He basically speaks of

the physical world, that it is limited in its variable, composed, specified, particularised and through that He comes to the “metaphysical reality” of God which he returns back to Sūrah Ikhlāṣ—upon the way of the Philosophers and Jahmites that is, not the way of the People of Sunnah. So here Hijāb, being unable to answer, tells blatant lies, and has destroyed his own imkān and wujūb argument that is completed with tarkīb and takhṣīṣ.

The Christian then says: “Yes, it does”, and he is correct within the context of philosophical and kalām arguments, and he says next: “Because philosophers always try to negate those things of God.” And this is what Hijāb does and knows this is true. So Hijāb is fleeing on his heels, he needs to run faster, perhaps that dung and puss of Ibn Sīnā he has been sniffing and consuming is taking its toll and he needs to drop its load. So as a cop out, in order to escape from this he says to the Christian: “Josh, me and you both believe, in our respective theologies, that we can never be acquainted with the true esse... we can never know the exactly what the true essence of God is. So if we both agree with that, that the true essence of God... if we don’t know what, how God is, in essence, then what I am saying is that anything you imagine, or anything you’ve observed is not relevant to this discussion of God’s essence.”

So Hijāb—the **academic weasel, the coward, the intellectual fraudster**—continues in his blatant, wicked lies and the Christian says: “Yes it is [relevant].” So notice the blatant lie of Hijāb. His whole argument depends on looking at what is observed, arguing that it is “variable, limited, specified, particularised, composed” and so on, and then moving from that to the essence of God, what it must be, by negating from it what it can’t be. And this is what Hijāb does in his debates, like he did with Alex at Oxford and like he did earlier with Aron Ra and likewise with the young lady, the physics student. In all

of those discussions, that is exactly what Hijab was doing, all along. So now, when trapped with this toxic, poisonous bid‘ah that he is upon, he resorted to blatant lies in order to escape, and effectively renounce his toxic, poisonous dung and puss he took from Ibn Šīnā, that shrewd Bāṭinī Kāfir. Hijab has been “**philosophy-raped**” by a Christian theologian who used Mu‘tazilī arguments to expose his blatant contradiction and also by the shrewd orange cap atheist, and he requires mental, psychological help.

This is why the people of kalām, as was said by Ibn Taymiyyah, they neither aided Islām nor did they refute the Philosophers. However, Hijāb is not even there, he is worse than that because the people of kalām, the Ash‘arites, they tried to refute the Mutafalsifah, like Ibn Sīnā, and they were unable, because they were also upon faulty goods. However, Hijāb is not even here, he is beyond this, he is actually on the way of the Mutafalsifah themselves, of Ibn Sīnā, and using this argument, he is neither aiding Islām nor refuting the atheists. Rather, the atheist are in agreement with him that there is a necessary existence, and its just the universe as a whole, it is independent in its existence as a whole, or as individual fundamental particles—and then Hijāb considers the affirmation of any necessary existence to be immediate conversion to Islām!

So Hijāb has done nothing to separate his own statement of “necessary existence” from the statement of Fir‘aun and the atheists he is debating with, because he is unable to, because the argument won’t allow him to. We can end our analysis here as it is sufficient to make the truth clear, even though there is more. We finish with a quote from Ibn Taymiyyah and after that we will make some closing notes, observations and comments.

IBN TAYMIYYAH ON THE REALITY OF WHAT ḤIJĀB IS CALLING TO THROUGH HIS POISONOUS PHILOSOPHY: PURE ATHEISM AND THE UNITY OF EXISTENCE

Ibn Taymiyyah said:

“This discourse which they mentioned in affirmation of the necessary in existence (wājib al-wujūd) is true, apparent and clear,³⁷ however, alongside that, they claimed that it is an unqualified existence with the condition of keeping it unqualified. It cannot be specified or particularised with a reality through which it is distinguished from all [other] existing things. Rather, that the reality of His existence is just a pure [abstract] unqualified existence with the condition of negating all other restrictions, specificities and particulars.³⁸ And they know that in logic, and every intelligent person who conceives of [the meaning] of this speech, that this has no reality, and it does not have existence except in the mind, not in external reality. Thus, the ‘necessary in existence’ which is testified to by what exists in external reality [i.e., the heavens and earth and all that we see], does not exist except in the mind. And this is the most clear contradiction and confusion and it is combining between two opposites, in that they made Him to have an external existence on the basis of a true evidence and then to be non-existent in external reality on the basis of stripping Him of attributes in their imaginary Tawḥīd. Hence, their saying necessitates both His existence and non-existence. And thus, is the saying of the one who

³⁷ In other words, there is truth in that basic reasoning and it is no different to saying that which is created needs a creator, that which is in needs that which is free of need, that which is originated needs what is not originated and so on. However, all of this establishes a wujūd muṭlaq (abstract, general, non-specific) existence in the mind only.

³⁸ This is why it necessitates a rejection of every name, attribute, description and action for Allāh.

traversed their way such as the Bāṭinī Qarāmites, such as the associates of the writings of Ikhwān al-Ṣafā and their likes from the Ittihādites³⁹, the people of the unity of existence⁴⁰ such as Ibn Sabʿīn, Ibn ʿArabī and their likes. Rather, it is the way of the negators of the attributes of the people of kalām such as the Muʿtazilah and others. Rather, it is the way of all of those who negate anything from the attributes, for the binding necessity of their speech is negating and denying His [existence] whilst affirming His existence, hence, they combine between two opposites, and this is explained in detail elsewhere.”⁴¹ End of the quote.

In other words, this proof demands the negation of all names, descriptions, attributes and actions for it to remain valid, and this is what we see in the discussion of Ḥijāb that was analysed above.

So from this, the misguidance of Ḥijāb is clear and he is leading people down a path which only splits into two other paths: The path leading to Firʿaun and the pure atheists. The path leading to people of divine union and the unity of existence, which is also atheism.

As such it is established that Ḥijāb is **a misguided innovator** who misguides others, a devil among the men, a type of caller that was specifically mentioned in the ḥadīth of Ḥudhaifah (رضي الله عنه) wherein the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) described, “Callers at the gate of Hellfire, whoever responds to them, they will throw him into it.” One must beware of him and flee from his misguidance. This is because he has not paid any heed to repeat advices given to him, but has instead shown arrogant opposition, rejection of truth, as well as oppression and cowardly slander to deny and cover his misguidance.

³⁹ Those who believe Allāh merges with His creation.

⁴⁰ Those who believe all existence is one, without separation between creator and created.

⁴¹ Sharḥ ʿAqīdat al-Aṣfahāniyyah (Maktabah al-Rushd, 1422H), pp. 101-102.

CLOSING COMMENTS, NOTES, OBSERVATIONS

1. Muḥammad Hijāb is a misguided innovator who misguides others. He is a calculated liar and deceiver in his debates with atheists, contradicting himself, playing games, tricks, using diversion, evasion and so on.⁴²

2. Muḥammad Hijāb is a wicked slanderer, liar and oppressor. He slanders other Muslims, from the people of Tawḥīd and Sunnah, in order to shield himself and deceive his followers.

3. Muḥammad Hijāb is skilled in “turning the tables” upon his adversaries—for the sake of defending himself and his reputation—all upon falsehood of course. And he uses such devices in debates and uses them against people who criticise him.

4. Muḥammad Hijāb is a shameless scandalmonger, who when refuted for his errors in creed and methodology, scours the internet to find what people of ḥizbiyyah, innovation and misguidance, and people of personal interests have spread against Salafīs of lies, fabrications, distortions and untruths. Then he presents this to his audience to attack the personal character of his adversaries. He is a sore loser, with a despicable, vindictive, arrogant personality.

5. Muḥammad Hijāb is a concealed Ash‘arī masquerading as a Ḥanbalī and under that guise he brings the poison of Bāṭinī Kāfirs like Ibn Sīnā which corrupts the fiṭrah and ‘aql of Muslims and leads them into a path that ends in kufr and zandaqah. However, even within this Ash‘arite base, if we grant that to him, he is a chameleon and a charlatan because he is a person who is given to debating and is simply out to win debates. Hence, he will graze in every field and eat

⁴² That is not to deny that he, as a Muslim, by virtue of his Islām, is upon truth and atheists and others are upon falsehood and disbelief, and that he has truth against them in areas. However, there was never any misguided innovator, ever, that did not have truth with him in many different fields.

from every table to find arguments. Thus, he fills himself with the books of philosophy of the pseudophilosophers, the heretics and the disbelievers. As such, he ends up being an ignorant, confused, bewildered, contradictory individual. And this was the reality of the likes of al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān and other heretics in history.

6. Muḥammad Hijāb must repent and apologise for his slanders, acknowledge the truth, humble himself and come and sit in the Salafi Mosque in Birmingham in the basic elementary lessons with seven-year old kids and learn the correct meaning of the kalimah, “Lā ilāhah illallāh”, how it establishes the Tawḥīd of the Prophets of Messengers in a way different to the Tawḥīd of the Bāṭinī Qarāmiṭī Jahmite Kāfirs in which Fir‘aun, Aron Ra, Alex and Julie the physicist are all Muslims because they affirm a “necessary existence.”

7. Muḥammad Hijāb—by saying the Qur‘ān or Allāh’s speech is “a part of Allāh”. by making the Qur‘ān eternal (qadīm),⁴³ and by saying the Qur‘ān is an expression (‘ibārah) followign the Kullābiyyah, Ash‘ariyyah—has laid the foundations for the doctrine of the Christians that Jesus, the Word of God, is God, and that this Word, that was God, or part of God, became manifest in flesh, thereby asserting both the divine and human nature of Jesus at one and the same time. And the Jahmites used this same issue to argue that the Qur‘ān is created, and Imām Aḥmad refuted them in al-Radd ‘ala al-Zanādiqah wal-Jahmiyyah. So Hijāb, in his misguidance, brings innovations that help justify the religion of the Christians. This is the end result of combining ignorance, arrogance, and an inflated ego.

⁴³ It is Allāh’s attribute of speech which is eternal, and His speech returns to His will and power, through which Allāh speaks as and when He wills. And from that speech is the Qur‘ān, the Torah, the Injīl and all other speech that Allāh speaks whenever He wills. So no specific speech is eternal while the attribute is eternal.

8. Muḥammad Hijāb slandered me with three things⁴⁴ that I am free an innocent of and it is from the justice of Allāh and His aid of the people of the Sunnah that Hijāb has been exposed for falling into the very same things in actuality, explicitly, without any ambiguity.

9. Muḥammad Hijāb is an actor, an artist, a performer and he uses this debate culture as well as scandalmongering in order to gain a social media following and in the process he misguides Muslims in their religion, sows intellectual seeds of doubt in their minds through faulty intellectual merchandise and instils hatred in their hearts towards the people of Tawḥīd and Sunnah.

10. Muḥammad Hijāb is the embodiment of the combined hatred and enmity of the Jahmites, Şūfīs and Khārijites against Ahl al-Sunnah and it is no surprise that these types of orientations are the ones supporting him in his social media posts.

And much more can be said.

⁴⁴ He accused me of saying Allāh has parts which is outright falsehood, he accused me of tajsīm, and he accused me of kufr.

THE REALITY OF MUḤAMMAD ḤIJĀB EXPLAINED AROUND A THOUSAND YEARS AGO BY ḤANBALĪ SCHOLARS

Ibn al-Bannā al-Ḥanbalī (d. 471H) mentioned how when Ahl al-Sunnah exposed the people of falsafah and kalām and showed that they were in opposition to the Book and the Sunnah and they were unable to respond, they threw the charge of tajsīm and tashbīh upon them, from the angle of their philosophy and kalām, trying to liken Ahl al-Sunnah to the Rāfiḍī Shī'ite Mujassimah and Mushabbihah, all as a means of deceiving the common folk.

He cited the statement of Imām Aḥmad which was a refutation of the people of kalām: "The Mushabbihah say, *"Seeing like my seeing, hand like my hand"* and whoever said this has resembled Allāh, the Exalted, with His creation: **'There is no likeness unto Him and He is the all-Hearing, the all-Seeing.'**" (42:11).⁴⁵ This statement is a refutation of the people of kalām because it explains the tashbīḥ that is misguidance and disbelief and which the Salaf intended. However, the people of philosophy and kalām concocted something new which they called tajsīm and tashbīh, and by which they intended rejection of Allāh's ʿuluww (aboveness with His essence), His ṣifāt (attributes) and His afʿāl (actions). So Imām Aḥmad explained that affirming the attributes that have come in the revealed texts is not tashbīh, but rather to liken them with those of the creation is tashbīh.

Then Ibn al-Bannā explained:

⁴⁵ Ibn al-Bannā in al-Mukhtār Fī Uṣūl al-Sunnah (taḥqīq ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-ʿAbbād, Maktabah al-ʿUlūm wal-Ḥikam, 2nd edition, 1425) p. 91. And it is also related by Ibn Taymiyyah in Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyyah (2 volume print, 1/476) and Ibn Baṭṭah in al-Ibānah.

“As for the Mushabbihah and the Mujassimah⁴⁶, they are the ones who treat the attributes of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) with the likeness of the attributes of the creatures, and they are disbelievers... and through them did the heretical innovator⁴⁷ find an avenue to attack Ahl al-Sunnah and Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth, so he ascribed tashbīh and tajsīm to them, and this is a lie and slander, fabrication and oppression for which Allāh sent down no authority. Allāh, the Sublime, has exonerated the carriers of the Qur’ān and the narrations of the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), those who are the harness for the people, the light for the cities, from the likes of this blind, defective saying, and blind ignorance. **Rather, it is clear to the intelligent and it is verified with the Scholars that [this saying] is from the falsehoods of the heretics when they were hard-pressed to find an exit.⁴⁸ When the [correct] methodology was not visible to them, and when they saw what Allāh had made manifest on their tongues of their disgraceful flaws and their heinous ignorance in what they opposed from the Book and the Sunnah and the ijma’ (consensus) of the ummah, they desired to deceive the common-folk, and confuse them with beautified speech, [such false speech] from which Allāh had exonerated every Imām who is followed in Islām, and in whose speech guidance is sought in the ḥalāl and ḥarām.**”⁴⁹

So here Ibn al-Bannā explains that people of falsafah and kalām, when the Salaf refuted their innovated theology which opposed the

⁴⁶ A reference to various factions of Rāfiqī Shīrites who gave Allāh’s attributes the realities of the attributes of the creation.

⁴⁷ This is a reference to the people of falsafah and kalām.

⁴⁸ Like Muḥammad Hijāb, when he was hard-pressed to refute the truth that was brought to him and exposed his misguidance. So he levelled the charge of tajsīm and kufr in order to shield himself and deceive his followers.

⁴⁹ Ibn al-Bannā in al-Mukhtār Fī Uṣūl al-Sunnah (pp. 91-92).

language of the Qurʾān and the Sunnah, they accused them of tashbīh and tajsīm—on the basis of their own philosophical language which they innovated into theology.

This is the very game that Muḥammad Hijāb is playing, hoping to deceive his audience by making the same charge against Salafīs, and this is while he is misguiding Muslims in the very foundations of their religion and corrupting their fiṭrah and ʿaql.

CLOSING ADVICE

Finally, dear reader, I sincerely advise you for the sake of Allāh:

The way of the Salaf in creed and methodology is the truth and it is obligatory upon you to follow it. There can never be any conflict between it and sound intellect and sound argumentation. This is unlike the variety of paths of Ahl al-Bid'ah. So do not be deceived by these personalities, these actors and these performers. All they are doing is giving you entertainment upon falsehood and collecting money from you to teach misguidance and sow the seeds of doubt and confusion in you, because they are ignoramuses of the Book and the Sunnah and the creed of the Salaf. It is not any exaggeration to say that it is better for you to commit major sins than to listen to the misguidance of these people, like Ḥijāb, even though major sins will harm you, so do not do them! But do not be deceived by the fact that they defend Islām. For this is what the Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah claimed and the Salaf were not deceived by them and whatever apparent good they had. In fact the Salaf used to say, they would prefer that their sons committed fornication or drunk alcohol, than that they ended upon on the view of the Mu'tazilah like 'Amr bin 'Ubayd, and there are narrations in that regard.

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

Abu 'Iyaad

@abuiyaadsp ♦ salaf.com

29 Shawwāl 1440 / 2 July 2019 v. 1.08