

Muḥammad Hijāb, the Falāsifah, Mutafalsifah
and Jahmiyyah: Laying the Foundations for the Dīn of the
Philosophers and Jahmites

Part 13: Muḥammad Hijāb and Cronies in the View of the Salaf: A Disease of **Scabies** to be Avoided at All Costs

AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO HOW MUSLIMS
FOLLOWED THE WAY OF PAST NATIONS

بَيِّنَاتُ
تَلْبِيسِ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ
فِي تَأْسِيسِ بَدْعِهِمُ الْكَلَامِيَّةِ

Abu 'Iyaad

salaf.com

asharis.com ♦ maturidis.com



INTRODUCTION

Over the past few weeks—through this series of articles—we have raised awareness about an **ignorant** and **arrogant academic conman** and **calculated liar** called **Muḥammad Hijāb** through indisputable and undeniable evidences from his own words and behavioural activity. Hijāb is one of many people who have found a way to acquire captive audiences on the tube and social media. Finding Muslims empty, hollow and lacking sound knowledge—and thus easily captured and led through emotions—these personalities have taken the opportunity to build audiences through the use of **entertainment**. This comprises a mix of debate culture, pranks, social experiments, provocations (with non-Muslims such as the EDL and other Islām-haters), buffoonery in the park, scandalmongering and using whatever gets views and subscribers and gives dopamine releases to themselves and to their captive audiences.

As we have stated previously—and as Hijāb himself knows through his personal experience—this leads to **addiction** wherein the followed personality **becomes a slave to the expectations of the followers**. Especially when a person also has self-amazement and arrogance. Thereafter, in order to maintain their status, they will go to extreme lengths—even if it means indulging in what is ḥarām—in order to feed the addiction and keep this status-quo.

Further, to keep their grip, they collect money in order to create an infrastructure which allows them to continue these activities, all under the guise of wanting to educate Muslims—or entertain them rather—

and teach them poisonous, toxic kalām and falsafah arguments for refuting atheists, as well as other forms of ignorance they possess. Even if they speak some truths, they are ignorant in the religion in areas of uṣūl (foundations) and the only reason they appear as scholars is because their audiences are ignorant and do not know what true knowledge is and nor what true scholars are.

As for the people of the Sunnah, upon the way of the Salaf, they follow the way of the Prophets in establishing masājid and marākiz for actualising Tawḥīd—the Tawḥīd of the Messengers, not the Tawḥīd of the Mutafalsifah and Mutakallimīn—reviving and enacting the Sunnah and teaching people beneficial knowledge from the Qurʾān and the Sunnah upon the understanding and way of the Salaf. From this way is to clarify the path of rectification, to remove harmful things such as debris, weeds and the likes and to block diversionary roads that lead off from it, on which innovators like Hijāb are stood to misguide people in the name of “daʿwah” and “defending Islām”, to siphon them off and draw them into their web of entertainment.

For this reason, Hijāb detests those who are upon the way of the Salaf and who have criticised him for his blatant, clear, serious errors and also his **vile, obnoxious, vengeful, vindictive personality** which he has exposed in broad daylight through his actions over the past few weeks, uncovering his mask and his facade. Further, he revealed his vileness (khubth), his shamelessness¹ and his

¹ An example of this is when Hijāb took the opportunity to play the great hero in the scandal of the online ruqya couple who were playing double lives or showing two faces. Hijāb saw—as did many other lowly, vile, fame-hungry characters—an opportunity to boost his views, followers and popularity through this scandal. To the degree that he went to the house of one of the women involved and got access to her mobile phone. He then made a video of her private, personal whatsapp chats with her husband in which there is very intimate and explicit language and then posted it on social media, broadcasting it to the world. This reveals the filth in

disobedience to Allāh and His Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) during his attempts to increase his popularity and imaginary hero status by riding on the wave of scandals, or manufacturing scandals himself, or interviewing diseased corrupt individuals like himself in order to perpetuate past manufactured scandals.

Coming to the core issue, Hijāb uses **trojan horse arguments** of the Mutafalsifah and the Mutakallimīn, the people of falsafah and kalām, those whom the Salaf condemned in the 2nd and 3rd centuries hijrah. As many people have found previous articles educational and informative we will provide some wider, background context for further benefit.

KALĀM, FALSAFAH AND THEIR EVIL OUTCOME

This kalām and falsafah—which is speculative speech in matters of creed through the long-windedness of philosophy and its dubious, innovated terms—was imported into the ummah at the start of the **2nd century hijrah**, the same time that the last of the Companions passed away, upon the heels of the innovations of **Irjā'** and **Qadar**, which followed **Khārijism** and **Shīsm**. These philosophical methods of acquiring creed, premised upon the false notion that reason ('aql) is given precedence over revelation (naql), were the products of idol-worshipping nations, such as the Greeks, the Hellenized Sabeans and had already poisoned the People of the Book, the Jews and Christians, prior to Islām, leading them to innovation, misguidance and taḥrīf (distortion) of their revelations.

this man's heart and shows the degree to which he has become a slave to his audience, aiming to please and entertain them like a court jester does in the king's court, save that Hijāb's king and master is his audience of mostly ignorant fools who cannot see through him and who do not judge his actions by way of the Book and Wisdom.

The creed so produced was given the title “**Classical Theism**” and refers to a Jahmī, Mu‘tazilī creed with respect to Allāh, His names, attributes and actions. This is what Hijāb’s arguments lead to by logical necessity. They demand negation of at least **something** from what Allāh described Himself with and what His Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) described Him with. Then, that **negated something** itself, due to logical necessity, demands rejection of everything else, in order to maintain full internal coherence.

Classical theism, whether under the influence of Plato as was that of the Church Fathers, or under that of Aristotle as was that of the Scholastics, presented God as *actus purus*. Of the latter, Aquinas became the chief spokesman. Beginning with the idea of God as Pure Abstract Being, Aquinas maintained that all other attributes could be deduced with logical consistence from this single actuality or subsistence. In the *Summa Theologica* this monopolar idea is given its most rigorous form. The whole section from Q.3. Art.I to Q.II. Art.4. is designed to prove that as Self-subsistent Being, God is without body, without imperfection, without limit, without mutability, without temporality, without parts.

Monopolar Theism and the Ontological Argument
Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge University Press
Refer to <http://www.asharis.com/creed/?kagzi>

Thus, **al-Ja‘d bin Dirham** (d. 118H) and **al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān** (d. 128) came with the same thing that was being written and spoken of by the Hellenized Jews, Christians and Sabeans such as the Jewish scholar **Philo Judaeus** (d. 50CE), the Christian scholar **Augustine** (d. 430CE) and others both before and after Islām. Christians after Islām were influenced by the Mutakallimīn’s treatment of these issues and took from their arguments and writings.

Al-Ja'd and al-Jahm had been debating with different factions—Jewish scholars, Christian theologians, Sumaniiyah philosophers and Sabeian philosophers—and they picked up these **trojan-horse** goods. You can see identical theological language in the writings of Philo Judaeus, Augustine, and later, Aquinas (d. 1274CE), as well as misguided, ignorant, deluded innovators like Muḥammad Hijāb, when they describe what they consider to be “God”, such as **“without body, parts and passions”, “immutable”, “without limit, without mutability, without temporality, without parts”** and so on. All of this came from the notion of divine perfection outlined by star-worshipping idolators such as Plato and Aristotle. And this is what entered into Islām. It laid the foundations for the gradual erosion of Allāh’s names, attributes and actions and by necessity to atheism.

This is because through the use of these philosophical, kalām methods, by their very nature and structure, one can only prove a **wujūd muṭlaq** (abstract, general, non-specific, in the mind only). Then, because of **dubious terminologies** used in the proof, when it comes to distinguishing the creator from the created in external reality—and every existing thing must have a **qadr** (existent reality) and a **ṣifah** (all of its attributes) through which it is distinguished and separated from all other things—it cannot be done except by denying what has come in the Book and the Sunnah of names, attributes and chosen actions for Allāh. This is due to the dubious terminologies used on top of premises which are false.

The Jahmites innovated this into Islām and following its logical necessities, they began to deny the major symbols of Islāmic creed.

—They denied Allāh’s ‘uluww, His being above His Throne, above His creation because to them aboveness is an ‘araḍ, an accident, an incidental attribute, which is only said of ajsām, bodies.

—They denied Allāh being seen on the Day of Judgement, because seeing requires **jihah**, (direction), which means **makān**, (location), which in turn means **taḥayyuz**, (occupying space), which

in turn means **jismiyyah**, (embodiment) and this would invalidate their proof for the existence of a creator.

—They denied His attributes, because having attributes means multiplicity in his essence, which means composition.

—They denied His chosen actions because they are “ḥawādith”, events and “He cannot be subject to events”, otherwise He would be a body like all other bodies.

—They denied that His speech is uncreated and hence, claimed the Qurʾān is created.

When these people appeared, the Salaf knew that this was a call to **pure atheism**, and through their foresight, they knew that in the future this will lead an erosion of Islām and the removal of veneration of Allāh in the hearts of people. At the beginning these Jahmites were only making **insinuations** and were not coming out explicitly with their rejection of Allāh’s ‘uluww for example, which was demanded by their toxic, loaded, ambiguous philosophical speech. They were hinting at it, but were scared of saying it openly, because they knew it was firmly rooted in the people’s fiṭrah and was clearly stated in the Qurʾān and Sunnah. So the Salaf warned against them in the severest of ways, because they knew what this meant for the people of Islām of future generations. Take a look at these narrations:

Sulaymān bin Ḥarb said: I heard Ḥammād bin Zayd (b. 98H, d. 179H) (saying): I heard **Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī** (d. 131H), and the Muʿtazilah were mentioned, so he said: “The central axis of the Muʿtazilah is that they want to say there is nothing above the heaven.”²

² See Mukhtasar al-‘Uluww (p. 132-133). Abū al-Qāsim Sulaymān bin Ahmad at-Tabarānī brings it in Kitāb us-Sunnah, and al-Dhahabī brought it from the route of al-‘Abbās bin Fudayl al-Asfātī. And al-Dhahabī commented on this: “This isnād is

Yahyā bin al-Mughīrah said: I heard **Jarīr bin ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Dabbī** (d. 188H) saying: "The speech of the Jahmiyyah, its beginning is honey and its end is poison. They are attempting to say, ‘There is no deity above the heaven.’"³

And **‘Abbād bin al-‘Awwām** (d. 185H) said: “I spoke to Bishr al-Marīsī and his associates, and I saw that the final (part) of their speech ends up with them saying there is nothing above the heaven, and I hold that they are not to be married into, and nor should inheritance (be given to them or taken from them).”⁴

And **Wahb bin Jarīr** (d. 206H) said: “Beware of the opinion of Jahm, for they are trying (to say) that there is nothing above the Heaven, and this is nothing but the inspiration of Iblīs, it is nothing but kufr (disbelief).”⁵

The reason for the negation of these major symbols of the Islāmic creed was that affirming them contradicted the philosophical proof which—because of the dubious terminology used in establishing the originated nature of things— demanded that Allāh be described through negations, **“Allāh is not a body, not parts, not composed, not limited...”** and so on. In turn, it demanded distortion of those texts which appeared to clash with this philosophical idea of divine perfection, which ultimately returns back to the ramblings of star and idol-worshipping philosophers.

As such Muḥammad Hijāb is sat upon a junction in the road where the road splits off into this same direction. He has a tent on this junction in which he operates his circus. He invites people into that road and then into his circus, and all we have done—after a period

like the sun in its clarity and like a pillar in its affirmation from the head and scholar of the people of Baṣrah (Hammād bin Zayd).”

³ Mukhtasar al-‘Uluww (al-Maktab al-Islāmī, Beirut, 1991), p. 151.

⁴ Ibid, p. 154.

⁵ Ibid, p. 170.

of gentle advice and admonition and establishing the proof which much patience towards his abuse—is to stamp on his **scorpion tail** and send him on his way in order to protect hearts and minds and ward off the descent of wrath in the future. For this, he became more angry, more personal, vindictive and vengeful, indicating that this man is lacking in amānah, wara’ and khashyah which are substrates for knowledge, and which, in their absence, knowledge, even if it is sound, becomes a tool through which games are played and personal agendas are pursued.

And we note that Hijāb is simply a **showman, a performance artist, an actor**. He is simply using the toolset of kalām and falsafah in order to put on a show for his audience, and these traits of Hijāb are alluded to in the ḥadīth of the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), under the threat: “Whoever sought knowledge in order to compete with the scholars or to stupefy the foolish or to turn people’s faces towards him, Allāh will enter him into Hellfire.”⁶ May Allāh protect us from this.

We have already established in an indisputable manner that Hijāb is not sincere in what he is doing and this is known to any sane person just through his own speech and behaviour in dealing with us. It is not the case that what is in the hidden in the heart remains forever hidden and is never accessible to anyone. This is incorrect. Rather, what is in the heart is poured out through a person’s speech and action, without fail, by necessity because of **al-talāzūm bayn al-ẓāhir wal-bāṭin**, the necessary link between the outer and the inner. And no person concealed anything inwardly except that it is revealed in the slips of his tongue and expressions on his face as is related from ‘Alī (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ). Hence, Muḥammad Hijāb is a **kadhḥāb** (liar), a **caller to innovation and misguidance**, a **ḥāqid** (hateful, envious person) who seeks **shuhrah** (fame, recognition), an **arrogant fool** who will never reach the greatness he seeks. And all of these are

⁶ Related by Ibn Mājah and declared **ṣaḥīḥ** by Imām al-Albānī.

simply descriptions of what he has made manifest about himself and which any person with knowledge and intellect can verify by analysing his speech and action in this affair and others.

TRANSMISSION OF THE BID'AH

So this bid'ah of the **Jahmites** was carried to the **Mu'tazilah**, then the **Kullābiyyah**, and then to the **Ash'arīs** and the **Mātūrīdīs**. And their methods are summarised as follows:

—That of the **Jahmites**, the proof of **ḥudūth al-a'rāḍ fī al-ajsām** (origination of bodies) by demonstrating the emergence of attributes in things. In other words, things are originated because they possess temporal or incidental attributes (a'rāḍ). This reasoning is false. This proof led them to negate all names, attributes and actions.

—That of the **Mu'tazilah**, the proof of **ḥudūth al-ajsām** through the route of **tarkīb**, composition of created bodies, which to them, indicates that they are made, recent, emergent. They had dubiousity in the use of the word composition. This led them to negate attributes and actions, and they affirmed names in name only. Meaning, they are just labels that do not represent actual, real attributes.

—That of the **Kullābiyyah, Ash'ariyyah and Mātūrīdiyyah**, the proof of **ḥudūth al-ajsām** by demonstrating **ḥudūth al-ḥawādith**, the recency or emergent nature of bodies, through the events or occurrences that take place in them. This led them to deny Allāh's chosen actions, those that are tied to and depend on His will.

In all of these arguments, they tried to demonstrate something which is already plain and obvious to the physical senses (**ḥiss**), through basic observation (**mushāhadah**) and by rational necessity (**ḍurūrah 'aqliyyah**)—that the entities we see are originated—they tried to demonstrate this obvious matter with philosophy, in a long-winded way, beyond the reach of the common people. All it did was to entangle them in a mess for centuries which they could not escape

from except by falling into misguidance and committing crimes upon the Islāmic creed, which is what they did.

THE PSEUDOPHILOSOPHERS

While this madness of bid‘ah and ḍalālāh was going on in the 3rd and 4th centuries hijrah, a group of people appeared who were disbelievers, heretics, atheists. They were upon the ideas of the Greek philosophers and observed that Islām has some positive, outward effects on morals and manners. So they tried to merge the foundation of atheism with aspects of Islām. They argued for the eternity of the universe, that prophethood can be acquired, and that there is no such thing as bodily resurrection. These were the likes of **Ikhwān al-Şafā** and after them, **Ibn Şīnā**, the Bāṭinī Ismā‘īlī Shī‘ite. To call to what they were upon, they chose the face of Shī‘ism, claiming attachment to Ahl al-Bayt, and under that cover, they began to promote their ideas. These are what we call the Mutafalsifah, the pseudophilosophers, and they were upon the ideas of the Falāsifah, the original philosophers, the Greeks, like Aristotle and Plato.

They were smart enough to see that the Mutakallimūn—who are the Jahmiites and their offshoots—in particular the Ash‘arites who denied Allāh’s chosen actions, were using flawed arguments. They identified the flaw⁷ and used it to their advantage to construct intellectual arguments for the eternity of the universe. This affair was hinged upon the issue of Allāh’s chosen actions. If you deny them, you will never be able to refute the Mutafalsifah and their claim of an eternal universe, and this is because once you deny that Allāh’s speech and action which He wills, chooses, and desires, such that

⁷ The flaw lies in the negation of chosen actions for Allāh (**af‘āl ikhtiāriyyah, şifāt fi‘liyyah**). Without affirming them, then atheism cannot be refuted, ever. All of the people of kalām reject Allāh’s chosen actions and this is why they struggled for centuries to refute atheists, the naturalist philosophers. Eventually, they gave up after becoming confused, as happened with al-Rāzī and others.

His actions depend on His will⁸, with the meaning, **determined** by His will, **decided** by His will, **result** from His will, **based** on His will—and all of these are dictionary meanings of “depend on”—then you will never be able to resolve this problem. In fact, this position makes it impossible to affirm that an actual act of creation took place that is ascribed to Allāh, as His actual act.

So Ibn Sīnā constructed an argument, and this was an innovation on his behalf, an innovation with its linguistic meaning here, even though it is also an innovation in a legislative sense. This is because no one before him brought this rendition, not the Greek Philosophers and not the Mutakallimīn. He replaced the words of the Mutakallimīn **qadīm** (eternal), **ḥādith** (emergent) with **wājib** (necessary) and **mumkin** (possible). Thus, instead of arguing for something being eternal in its existence, you argue instead for something being necessary in its existence. And, instead of showing the emergent, or recent, or temporal nature of things, you demonstrate that they are only possible in their existence. This is achieved by Ibn Sīnā through his poison which is to incorporate the argument of **tarkīb** taken from the Mu‘tazilah (whatever is composed is in need, muftaqir) and also added something new: **ikhtiṣāṣ** (particularisation, specification). What he meant by this was that anything that is given particulars, any

⁸ This is the statement for which **Hijāb and his Ash‘arite supporters** are desperately trying to use against me, and this is because they are coming from the direction of Ibn Sīnā and his **imkān, wujūb plus tarkīb and iftiqār** argument which I have explained in previous articles in this series and also refuted their doubts in this regard. Refer to Parts 7 and 11. Hijāb tried to impute me with the iftiqār being alluded to in the argument of the Mutafalsifah, whereas I was speaking of something else and which scholars refer to with the phrases such as “manūṭah bi”, “mutawaqqifah ‘alā”. And this means that Allāh’s ṣifāt fi‘liyyah depend upon, are conditional upon, are determined by return back to His will and power, which is a correct meaning. Hijāb tried his hardest to throw that same filth upon me, as the Mutafalsifah and Mu‘tazilah tried to throw upon all of the Ṣifātiyyah, which is the accusation of tajsīm and kufr.

specifics, must have a specifier, a particulariser. Thus, if you affirm attributes for Allāh, you have specified Him, and made Him the same as creation, needing a specifier. In reality, this means that this “necessary existence” he was trying to establish can only exist in one’s imagination only, in one’s mind, not in external reality.

So the argument is first made that all things whose existence is possible—which means that it can both exist and not exist, it can admit to existence and non-existence—must require something whose existence is necessary. Meaning, whose existence is by itself, and which has always been in existence. Now at this point in the argument, though the reasoning is fine, you have not established a creator, nor any act of creation that led to this universe. So at this point, Fir‘aun would not disagree with you, and those whom Hijāb has been debating with, like **Aron Ra**, **Alex the Cosmic Skeptic**, **Julie the Physicist**, and the **Man in the Orange Cap**, they would not disagree either, they all accept that something has to have a necessary existence and to them it is just the universe. It is self-existing, self-sustaining, independent in and of itself, through the laws that govern it and that’s all that exists and has ever existed. There was no creation and no resurrection, and all that happens is the passage of time. And this was the saying of the Dahriyyah mentioned in the Qur‘ān in Sūrah al-Jāthiyah:

وَقَالُوا مَا هِيَ إِلَّا حَيَاتُنَا الدُّنْيَا نَمُوتُ وَنَحْيَا وَمَا يُهْلِكُنَا إِلَّا الدَّهْرُ وَمَا لَهُم بِذَلِكَ مِنْ
عِلْمٍ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَظُنُّونَ

“And they say: ‘There is nothing but our worldly life; we die and live, and nothing destroys us except time.’ And regarding that, they do not have any knowledge, they are only assuming.” (45:24).

So Hijāb considers that as soon as a person accepts a “necessary existence”, then that is “God”, and a person enters Islām, like he did

with Julie the Physicist in his Hyde Park discussion we analysed in Part 8, and in this, he is more misguided than Jahm bin Ṣafwān. This is greater kufr than the kufr of Jahm bin Ṣafwān and in saying this we are not making takfīr of Hijāb, because a person can say something and not realise the reality of what he is saying. Jahm bin Ṣafwān said that īmān is maʿrifah, which is merely to know Allāh. Jahm accepted that Allāh is al-Khāliq and al-Qādir. However, he limited faith to simply knowledge of Allāh in the heart, and this would mean Iblīs is a believer, Firʿaun is a believer and so on. Whereas īmān is to have certainty that none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh alone. However, Hijāb’s “necessary existence” is not even a creator. It is a wujūd muṭlaq (existence only in the mind) of something that is said to be “necessary in existence” and that could be the universe for the pure atheists like Firʿaun, or it could be the unity of existence of the extreme Ṣūfīs. Hijāb affirmed Islām for Julie the Physicist just on account of this alone, indicating the severity of his ignorance and the sad state of his intellectual spasticity.

Ibn Taymiyyah explained this, we cited a number of statements from him in this regard in Part 7 of this series, he (رحمته الله) said:

“All that this [argument] comprises is that within existence, there is an existence that is obligatory. And this is accepted by those who deny a Maker, such as Firʿaun, 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.’”⁹ And he also said: **“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**

⁹ Sharḥ al-Aṣbahāniyyah (1430H) pp. 49-50.

speech that Fir'aun proclaimed... a rejection of the Lord of the Worlds... 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. **And all it achieves is that about which there is no dispute between intelligent people, of the affirmation of the existence of that whose existence is necessary by itself. As for affirmation of the Maker of the universe, then this method does not achieve that, except upon the foundation of rejecting the attributes upon which they based their [version of] Tawḥīd. And this is a corrupt proof.**"¹⁰

To distinguish between these two: a) an eternal universe that is self-sustaining and requires nothing outside of itself being the “necessary existence” and b) a creator that is distinct from what He created being the “necessary existence”—you are tied to the same language you used to prove the “necessary existence” in the first place. So what argument did you use to prove that something is only “possible” in its existence. You used the Mu‘tazilī arguments of **tarkīb** (composition) and **ikhtiṣāṣ** (specification) and the dubious language of “**not a body, not parts, not composed, not specified...**” and so on which is the way of past nations, and of the star and idol-worshippers.

As for **tarkīb**, Ibn al-Qayyim (رحمة الله) explains the argument:

“As for the Philosophers, they affirmed the Maker through the way of *tarkīb* (composition) which is that [created] bodies (*ajṣām*) are composed (*murakkabah*) and anything that is composite is needy and dependent (*yaftaqir*) upon its parts (*ajzā'*), and everything that is needy (*muftaqir*) then its existence is only possible (*mumkin*, as

¹⁰ Sharḥ al-Aṣbahāniyyah (1430H) pp. 313-316.

opposed to necessary, *wājib*), and that whose existence is only possible (*mumkin*) must have an agent whose existence is necessary (*wājib*). And numerousness (*kathrah*) in the essence (*dhāt*) of that whose existence is necessary is impossible, since that necessitates its composition (*tarkīb*) and need (*iftiqār*), and this contradicts its necessary existence. And this is the limit of their Tawḥīd, and through it did they affirm the Creator, according to their claim. It is known that this is the greatest of evidences for the negation of the Creator, for it negates His power (*qudrah*), will (*mashī'ah*), knowledge (*ilm*) and life (*ḥayāt*). Because if these attributes were affirmed for Him, according to their claim, He would be composite (*murakkab*, composed of parts), and that which is composite is in need of other than it (*muftaqiran ilā ghayrihi*), and therefore, cannot be necessary (in existence) by itself. And in this doubt there is such deceit and fraud, and [the use of] generalized words and ambiguous meanings whose description will become very lengthy.”¹¹ So this means that if you affirm multiple attributes with different meanings, you have created “composition” and thus Allāh is created, so Allāh must be other than this.¹² This is false, and it requires negation of the attributes.

As for **ikhtiṣāṣ**, what Ibn Sīnā meant to argue was that if you give anything any particulars, any specifications, which means any names, attributes, descriptions, then if it has that specification, it is in need of a specifier. And all things that are specified, only have a

¹¹ Refer to *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawā'iq* (2/365).

¹² As for making the argument through contingency or need, *iftiqār*, (as opposed to numerousness, *kathrah*), then this still only establishes a **wujūd muṭlaq** as we have explained and does not prove a **wujūd ‘aynī** for the creator. And further, since dubious language is still employed, it leaves grounds for obfuscation and avenues for rejection of what Allāh and His Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) affirmed for Him.

possible existence. This is the argument that Hijāb has been using with atheists, using language like “**particularisation, specification, composite configuration, limited variables**” and so on which is dubious language.

Ibn Sīnā was trying to maintain the deity of the likes of Aristotle, wherein all you have is an abstract idea in the mind. This “necessary existence” which he affirmed, he said that it must be a **wujūd muṭlaq bi shart al-iṭlāq**, and this basically means that it is only an abstract existence in the mind only, completely unqualified without any additional qualifiers, specifications, which means you cannot give it any names or attributes, otherwise it becomes specified and thus no different for possible things (mumkināt).

So in reality, your argument has not proven a creator to begin with, it has only proved that something has “necessary existence” and then secondly, you cannot affirm the existence of this creator in external reality because the dubious terms and premises do not allow you to. So on the one hand you have proven an existence in the mind only, and then you negate that being an actual existence in external reality, because your method demands that from you.

This is contradiction, it is the nature of these arguments which comprise dubiousity and loaded terminology. However, this particular one is **the more corrupt of the various proofs**, as Ibn Taymiyyah described it. It is more corrupt than that of the Mutakallimīn who used the argument of ḥudūth al-ajsām (showing bodies are originated) through ḥudūth al-a'rāḍ (incidental attributes) or tarkīb (composition) or ḥudūth al-ḥawādith (occurrence of events) as we mentioned, which demanded rejection of Allāh’s names, attributes and chosen actions, to maintain coherence and to save the proof.

Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمة الله) said: “The Mutafalsifah are more severe in opposing reason and revelation than them [the Mutakallimīn].

However, they knew the corruption of this intellectual way of [the Mutakallimīn in proving an originated universe], so they attacked them through that [corruption in argument]. But they traversed [a way] that was more corrupt than that [of the Mutakallimīn] such as the way of *imkān* and *wujūb* (possible and necessary existence).¹³

The reason is that Ibn Sīnā was aiming to corrupt the proof of the Mutakallimīn. He sought to undermine it, to force rejection of all names, attributes and actions, and to lay down the foundations for arguing that the universe is eternal which could be easily achieved through the route of *imkān* and *wujūb*, by taking advantage of the fact that the Mutakallimīn were all agreed in rejecting Allāh’s chosen actions. This would allow the likes of Ibn Sīnā to say that Allāh acts through His *dhāt*, essence (and not through His *mashī’ah*, *irādah*, and *ikhtiyār*, His will, wish and choice). As such Allāh, by way of His essence, is “eternally acting” and as such, the universe is eternally present along with His essence, it is **mūjab bil-dhāt** (necessitated by the essence).

As for **ignorant mental cripples** and **intellectual spastics** like Hijāb—who come on the scene, their bellies filled with philosophy, who set up shop on a junction on the straight path, and invite people to their circus of entertainment, to debate culture, drawing Muslims into these types of arenas with the intent of flexing their alleged intellectual muscles which they claim to possess and the intent of winning debates—they are ignorant of the way of the Salaf, they never studied it and they came from backgrounds of innovation. Their first nurturing was upon innovation, they were suckled upon it in their initial, developmental stage. And for them, religion appears to be a game, a pastime. And this is evident from their own behaviour

¹³ Kitāb al-Nubuwwāt (1/296).

as has preceded. For us, it is rectification of the earth, it is a matter of people's lives, their īmān, their Paradise and Hellfire.

This is why the Salaf's rejection of misguided innovators like Hijāb was very severe. They were harsh against the Jahmites and the Mu'tazilah. Yet despite their harshness, in accordance with Allāh's wisdom, the bid'ah of the Jahmiyyah survived and is present in abundance today, with millions affected by the Jahmite doctrines of Ash'arīs and Mātūrīdīs. Then we have the likes of Hījāb, deceptively trying to merge the "the Atharī, Ḥanbalī" way, whatever that means to him, with the way of the Mutafalsifah, Ash'ariyyah and Mātūrīdiyyah. One, misguided, ignorant, deluded **ninnyhammer** if there ever was one.

Coming back to the flow of the discussion: To Aristotle and their likes, the creation and the "first cause" or "prime mover" as they called it, which they identified as the cause of the universe, are both like a **contemporaneous cause and effect** (illah and ma'lūl) and the nature of the relationship between the two is that if one is present the other one must be as well. This then means that the universe must exist by necessity of the existence of the "first cause" or "prime mover". This makes the universe eternal with this entity which they refer to as "first cause" or "prime mover", and which is really only an abstract idea in the mind in any case. So Ibn Sīnā rephrased this same idea and he said that the existence of the universe is **possible in itself** (mumkin bi nafsihī) but **necessary through other than it** (wājib bi ghayrihī). In other words, this thing that he first arrived at called the "necessary existence" (wājib al-wujūd), is eternal, and the universe's existence, even though it is only possible in its existence through its own self, it is necessary in existence by other than itself, through the wājib al-wujūd which the argument first establishes. So long as the "necessary in existence" exists, then the universe will

exist alongside it because it is **mūjab bil-dhāt**. Thus, **the universe is eternal and no act of creation ever took place**, because the universe exists by virtue of the existence of the essence of the necessary existence, not due to any wilfully chosen act performed by the necessary existence. All of this is pure atheism of course.

Now Ibn Sīnā was a shrewd Bāṭinī Kāfir in what he did and some of the Ash‘arites fell for the bait and some of them began to rely on this proof, or aspects of it, as happened with al-Rāzī and others and this led to the hybridisation between kalām and falsafah. Al-Rāzī was spoken ill of by some Ash‘arites and he was warned against for this, for being affected by the poison of the philosophers.

On these issues, intellectual battles took place between the people of kalām and the people of falsafah for a few centuries, and in the end because the Mutakallimīn used **trojan-horse arguments** and allowed the likes of Ibn Sīnā to poison them even further, they could not resolve the issues to satisfaction and some of them got utterly confused. They were confused because the arguments for the eternity of the universe were as strong if not stronger than those for the origination of the universe and they began to speak of **takāfu’ al-adillah** which means the equivalence of evidences.¹⁴ The reason for this misguidance is that all of these kalām factions rejected Allāh’s chosen actions. And this was because their proof of ḥudūth al-ajsām demanded it from them. As a result, they made it impossible for themselves to refute the atheists. And this continues till this day.

Pay attention:

No Ash‘arī, Māturīdī or Jahmī, Mu‘tazilī can ever refute an atheist through the types of arguments upon which their theology was built, in which they refer to Allāh’s chosen actions as “ḥawādith” (events,

¹⁴ This happened to al-Rāzī in his book al-Maṭālib al-‘Aliyyah.

occurrences), except by negating Allāh’s existence in external reality. This is why Ibn Taymiyyah said that this way leads to atheism, and this binding upon all of these factions of kalām and falsafah and of anyone who denied **anything** from Allāh’s attributes and chosen actions. He said: “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.”¹⁵ In other words, they first affirm His existence, through their argument, then they deny His existence in external reality. Also, no one from the Mutakallimīn and Mutafalsifah can ever establish that **an actual act of creation took place which lead to this universe**, an act that is attributed to Allāh as His actual action. Hence, these are trojan-horse arguments which help to lay down the foundations for pure atheism.

HOW ATHEISTS BENEFIT FROM THESE ARGUMENTS

As for the atheists, those who claim the eternity of the universe, and which is the “necessary existence” of Fir‘aun and his likes, then they do not have any **independent proof** for this claim. By its very nature, it can only be pure speculation and that is what the Qur’ān states about them, that they only make assumptions:

وَمَا لَهُمْ بِذَلِكَ مِنْ عِلْمٍ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَظُنُّونَ

“And regarding that, they do not have any knowledge, they are only assuming.” (45:24).

As such, it is impossible for them to prove the eternity of the universe through independent means, through their alleged scientific

¹⁵ Sharḥ ‘Aqīdat al-Aṣfahāniyyah (Maktabah al-Rushd, 1422H), pp. 101-102.

method. It is not possible. Hence, they rely upon two ways to argue for their atheism:

a) The first is to attack the weak, flawed, trojan-horse arguments innovated into Islām which have their origins with star-worshippers and Hellenized Jews, Christians and Sabeans. These types of philosophical arguments only prove a **wujūd muṭlaq** (an abstract existence in the mind only) and not a specific existence in external reality. By refuting and pointing out the flaws in these arguments, and in philosophical arguments in general, atheists wrongly think that this is evidence for the eternity of the universe and the non-existence of a creator. However, this is not true. Some atheists deceive people into thinking or leaving them to assume that this is the case. Some of them will acknowledge that this is not necessarily the case, and will remain in doubt.

b) The second is to make use of **inventive theories** to validate their imaginary claims and this is what came on to the scene in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.¹⁶

¹⁶ One must distinguish between **inductive theory** which has an actual basis in reality as it involves generalisations based on actual experience and **inventive theory** which is pure invention of the mind, it is nothing but abstraction validated by maths. The first—though imperfect—leads to a good approximation of reality over time and will tend to be correct **conceptually, physically** (in the real world) and **mathematically**, there will be coherence in all of these areas, hence giving a good approximation of reality. However, it remains prone to error and constant revision and nothing can really be final. The second leads to fiction and make-believe and will be correct mathematically only. That is, it will be correct only on the paper it is written but not in physical reality. As a result, a person can be led further and further away from actual reality, whilst thinking he is arriving at reality. And this is the nature of what the disbelieving atheists and scientists are upon today in many of their claims regarding the universe, which are built upon assumptions for which they have no evidence and likewise, in interpreting observations, they also make use of assumptions for which they have no empirical evidence.

What we are focusing upon here are the flawed arguments which are attacked by atheists which are also at the same time, trojan-horse arguments as it relates to Islāmic creed.

They are the evidences of:

- ḥudūth al-a'rād** of the Jahmiyyah
- tarkīb** of the Mu'tazilah
- ḥudūth al-ḥawādith** of the Kullābiyyah, Ash'ariyyah
- tarkīb and ikhtiṣāṣ** of Ibn Sīnā (upon imkān and wujūb).

And they cannot be completed except with negation of Allāh's names, attributes or actions. In these arguments, the Mutakallimīn were refuting each other while also trying to refute the Mutafalsifah, and all of them were using the same flawed goods.

This background provides the reader with the necessary details to appreciate why we are writing these articles.

GIVING ATHEISTS WEAPONS TO ATTACK ISLĀM

From the above history, our purpose in writing these articles and explaining these affairs in detail can be understood:

Firstly: in light of the statements we cited in Part 3:

It is related from Ibn Surayj al-Shāfi'ī (d. 306H) (رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ): "The Tawhīd of the people of knowledge and the Jamā'ah of the Muslims is 'I testify none is worthy of worship except Allāh (alone) and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh'. And the Tawhīd of the people of falsehood is disputing about *al-a'rād* (incidental attributes) and *al-ajsām* (bodies) and the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) was sent with the rejection of that."¹⁷ Abu Bakr al-Marwazī reported: I heard Abū 'Abd

¹⁷ Abū Ismā'īl al-Harawī with his isnād in *Dhamm ul-Kalām* (4/385-386) and Ibn Taymiyyah in *Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyyah*. And he means that the speech of the people of disbelief from the Philosophers and other than them regarding the creator was based upon the likes of these philosophical terms and discussions,

Allāh [Imām Aḥmad] (d. 241H) (ﷺ) saying: “Whoever takes to kalām will never prosper and whoever takes to kalām will not escape from tajahhum (adopting the views of the Jahmites).”¹⁸ Ibn Abī Ḥātim said: “My father (Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī) and Abū Zur‘ah (al-Rāzī) used to say, “Whoever sought religion with kalām, will go astray.”¹⁹

Recall that these warnings were made by the Salaf in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, and this is precisely what happened centuries after them in that **taṭīl** (negation of attributes) and **ilhād** (deviation, atheism) emerged and spread, despite it being subdued initially by the Salaf in their refutations against the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah. This bid‘ah was carried by the Kullābiyyah, then Ash‘arites and then transmitted to the ummah after that. This led to confusion and bewilderment after the Mutafalsifah got involved, leading eventually to the appearance of doctrines of outright disbelief, atheism and paganism, such as **ittihād**, **ḥulūl**, **waḥdat al-wujūd**. Here, the wrath of Allāh descended upon this nation through the Mongols and the Crusaders, as mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah.

Hence, these trojan-horse philosophical arguments—which **Hijāb the Ninnyhammer** is involved in—are an erosion of the Tawḥīd of the Messengers, they lay the foundation and open up the avenue for that, and for the eventual destruction of the servant and the land.

Secondly: Over the past few decades there have been numerous approaches taken by Muslim apologists which have had the effect of giving atheists opportunity to attack the foundations of Islām. These include:

and the Prophet (ﷺ) came to guide people with the light of revelation and to reject false and ignorant speech regarding belief in Allāh and the unseen based upon such philosophies.

¹⁸ Ibn Baṭṭāh in *Kitāb al-Ibānah*, *Kitāb al-Īmān* (2/537).

¹⁹ Ibid, (4/383).

—1. Exaggerating in the “scientific” miracle of the Qur’ān. This is done by misinterpreting verses in light of speculative, inventive theories in cosmology for example, or by reading into verses an intricate or technical meaning that is not there, and then clothing it with scientific, technical language to make it appear that the Qur’ān gives scientific foreknowledge way ahead of its time. We do not deny that there are aspects of foreknowledge in the Qur’ān, because it is Allāh’s knowledge, whether that is in relation to future events and occurrences or details of creation. However, there has been some takalluf—pretentious, overambitious behaviour—and exaggeration in this area done by people who are ignorant of the way of the Salaf. From them is Zākir Naik by way of example. These people build people’s īmān upon shaky foundations and set them up for apostasy at some point further down the line.

—2. Reviving the kalām arguments by blindly-following Christian apologists such as **William Lane Craig**. And this is what the likes of Ḥamza Tzortsis fell into, and after him there appeared many clones, apologist clones of Ḥamza Tzortsis. They blindly-followed him and mimicked his polemics and proliferated on the tube and social media, all parroting the same bid’ah and ḍalālāh. Craig simply went to the books of the Mu’tazilah and Ash’ariyyah, and reformulated their kalām arguments. After proving a “cause” for the universe, he went uses the same language in describing his deity as we find with Aristotle, Plato, the Sabean Philosophers, Philo, Augustine, Ja’d, Jahm, the Jahmiyyah, Mu’tazilah, Ash’ariyyah and others. “Allāh is not a body, not mutable, not composed, is without parts...” and so on. So we wrote a series of articles criticising Tzortsis and others for entering into this dangerous territory.²⁰

²⁰ These articles were written in 2013 and can be found on Aqidah.Com. Thereafter, Tzortsis entered the field of **scientific miracles**, and he got attacked

—3. The emergence of self-amazed **intellectual spastics** like Muḥammad Hijāb who are grounded in European philosophy with next to no insightful knowledge of Islāmic creed and who use the most corrupt of proofs of the Mutafalsifah, which even the Ash‘arites must refute him for because in history, the likes of al-Rāzī fell into this, and he was refuted and warned against by the Ash‘arites who came afterwards, because he fell prey to the doubts of the Mutafalsifah in relation to the attributes. In particular, the doubt of tarkīb (composition) and also iftiqār (need), which is the direction Hijāb is coming at me in order to lay the same charge against me as the Mutafalsifah laid against all of the Şifātiyyah (Ahl al-Sunnah, and then Ash‘arīs, Māturīdīs).

Hijāb is a performance artist who is out to win debates through any means necessary, including all the tactics and tricks of debates used by philosophers and rhetoricians. And this debate culture is alien to Islām and it is the foundation of misguidance. Abū Ismā‘īl al-Ḥarawī (d. 481H) explained that this is how deviation entered into Islām in his excellent work, Dhamm al-Kalām. This is apparent from the Qur’ān itself, which speaks of the ways in which the People of the Book went astray, they fell into controversies.

for that by atheists, much of it in falsehood, but some of it having a basis in areas. Then he entered the field of the **linguistic miracle** of the Qur’ān and used that for a while, though this would be hard for non-Muslims to grasp and is not the primary evidence one would use with such people. Then finally, he moved towards the fitrah argument. Had it not been for Salafis refuting these people, they would be lost, wandering in every direction, having to bear large burdens on their shoulders on the Day of Judgement for misguiding others by speaking without knowledge, upon ignorance, opinion and rhetoric, not revealed knowledge. Thus, they have a lot to be thankful for to Salafis, who are more merciful to them, than their own fathers, mothers and near relatives.

However, Hijāb brought an additional element. Whereas the likes of Tzortsis appear to be genuine on the face of things and display an openness to advice and change, even though they remain within the domain of confusion and innovated ways in da‘wah²¹, Hijāb is a trickster, an academic con-man who is about image, appearance. We have proved that he is **a calculated liar, a deceiver**. A man who is all about views, likes and subscribes who thinks he has “won” just because his videos got a half-million views, as he stated in one of his audios or videos, something along the lines, **“We got from three to five-hundred thousand views... so we won, you lost.”** Look at this deluded idiot-child, living in the world of fantasy. This is a fake individual whose mind and soul the shayāṭīn have hijacked and used to misguide others. And those who have rallied around him are the Khārijites, Ash‘arites, Māturīdīs, Sūfīs and others.

Hijāb learned arguments taken from Philosophers and Jahmites, become proficient in debating, and how to intimidate and overwhelm opponents through various devices and mechanisms, whether

²¹ And this is because they have gone too far down the path to humbly turn around and put their foundations in order. It means that the personalities, infrastructure and connections with third-parties they have built, do not allow them to take the path of genuine humility and turning to truth wholeheartedly. So what they do is to make it appear that they are turning to the correct way, by making token references to Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim for example and altering their speech slightly. But they do not return wholeheartedly and instead try to engineer a situation whereby they can remain in the position they are and do enough just to ward off legitimate criticism from themselves. The Salaf said that anyone who loves kalām, and who acquires his religion through kalām, then it will not leave him. This is why it is a poison, and people have too much to lose when they build their da‘wah upon foundations of ignorance and misguidance. This is why little trust is to be placed in individuals like Hijāb, because their disease has become apparent and it is deeply-rooted, being extremely difficult to cure and remove completely. Their disease of innovation and misguidance has been compounded with the diseases of pride, arrogance, self-amazement and the likes. This makes it even worse.

linguistic or psychological, and then employs them to win the debate. But as soon as you take him out of this arena, and into meaningful discussions, the man is lost. He is like a circus clown who has mastered the art of juggling with skittles, through which he entertains his audience. However, outside of these little gimmicks and tricks, the clown does not have much to show, except to reveal the filth that was lurking in his heart, the filth of arrogance and disdain.

The point being that these factors among others have contributed to the emergence of atheism and ex-Muslims as a movement. And people like Hijāb perpetuate and feed into these movements through their activities, because their arguments do not go any further than establish what atheists already accept, that there is something which has a necessary existence. Then, Hijāb and his likes would never be able to reconcile between the reality of this “necessary existence” as demanded by his argument, and what is in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of names, attributes, descriptions and actions for Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ). Thus, what Salafis are engaged in, when they write these types of articles, clarifying these affairs, is nothing more than a continuation of what the Prophets and Messengers came with and what the Salaf stood to perform in order to protect this religion from going the same way as the way of the Islām of Moses (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام) and Jesus (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام) which underwent tabdīl and taḥrīf through the same routes. Likewise, what Salafī scholars have been doing throughout history till this day of ours. We are followers, not innovators. And authentic revelation never clashes with sound reason, and this proves that those people oppose revelation and also sound reason at the same time, despite them claiming intellectual superiority for themselves.

In the era of the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) these affairs were present. This kalām and falsafah was present. **Labīd bin al-A’ṣam al-Yahūdī**, the sorcerer who poisoned the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), he

was a pre-Islāmic era Jahmite. He held the Torah was created, upon the very same considerations that the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah considered the Qur‘ān to be created, having taken this saying from the Jews of Yemen. And from him did al-Ja‘d bin Dirham take this doctrine and he passed it onto al-Jahm. The Christians were upon this philosophy as were the Sabean Harranian philosophers, and they were all using “negative theology” to describe the Creator, the same one used by the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah, Ash‘ariyyah and today, Hijāb. So when Islām came, when the Qur‘ān was revealed, it abolished all of that false, vain speech and the methods that led to it. And this is the meaning of the statement of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) at the end of Sūrah al-Ṣāffāt, as indicated by Ibn Taymiyyah:

سُبْحَانَ رَبِّكَ رَبِّ الْعِزَّةِ عَمَّا يَصِفُونَ. وَسَلَامٌ عَلَى الْمُرْسَلِينَ. وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ

“Glorified be your Lord, the Lord of Might, from what they attribute [to Him]. And peace, (safety) is upon the Messengers. And all praise is for Allāh, Lord of the Worlds.” (37:180-182).

All prior false speech about Allāh was abolished, Allāh declared Himself free and innocent of the innovated language which the Jews, Christians, Sabeans and Pagans used for Him and of the names and attributes they fabricated for Him. And then safety was declared for the Messengers in that their speech is safe and secure from all falsehood, and their way in speaking about Him is safe and secure, protected by Allāh and containing nothing but truth, acquaintance and guidance. And then after this, all praise is declared for Allāh, which comprises an affirmation of all His names, attributes and actions, **positively**, and which occurs in the Qur‘ān and Sunnah through detailed affirmation (**ithbāt mufaṣṣal**) as opposed to the negative theology of the misguided innovators which rests upon detailed negations.

Further, the Qurʾān and the Sunnah came with rationalities to establish Allāh’s Rubūbiyyah and Ulūhiyyah in the simplest, most powerful of ways, devoid of all of the pitfalls and dubiousities found in the ways of the Philosophers. So the affair was completed and then whatever Allāh willed to occur, of Muslims following the ways of past nations, then that came to pass when al-Ja’d and al-Jahm appeared on the scene at the beginning of the second century hijrah. So this is from the wisdoms of Allāh, to enable the battle between truth and falsehood to continue as a means of allowing the muttabi’ (follower) to be distinguished from the muḥtadi’ (innovator). The innovators are those who followed the ways of past nations in distorting and altering their religion.

IN THE VIEW OF THE SALAF, CHARACTERS LIKE HĪJĀB ARE A DISEASE OF SCABIES

We saw how HĪjāb and his cronies were desperately demanding debates after their ignorance and misguidance were made clear. As if to beg: **“Please, please, I am so hurt and emotionally insecure right now, please let me debate you so I can save a bit of face and try to bring you down in the process.”** In doing so, they only made it even more clear that they are the very people spoken of by the Salaf as shown by **Imām al-Lālikā’ī** (d. 418H) and **Ibn Baṭṭāh** (d. 387H) in their monumental works, when they brought narrations from the Salaf regarding individuals just like HĪjāb and company.

So the intellectual conman and fameseeker, HĪjāb, was given the very same treatment that the Salaf gave to deviants like him in those times bygone.

Ibn Baṭṭāh brings many narrations:²²

²² Refer to volume 2 of Kitāb al-Īmān, the first part of the book.

Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110) used to say: “Do not sit with the people of desires nor argue with them.”

‘**Abd Allāh bin al-Busrī** said: “The Sunnah is not refute the people of desires [through argumentation] but the Sunnah is to not speak with any one of them.”

When a man came to **al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī** to debate him, he said: “As for me, I have insight into my religion, and if you have lost yours, then go and find it.” And he would also say: “Indeed, only one who is in doubt about his religion debates.”

Ṣafwān bin Miḥriz went to the mosque and there were some youths debating each other, so he shook his garment (to remove dust from it) and said: “**You are [the disease of] scabies.**”²³ And this is Hijāb and his cronies, this is what they are into and this is how they challenge those who expose their errors and innovations. They want to pass on their disease to others through the instrument of debating with falsehood and for falsehood.

Al-Awzāī said that he heard **Bilāl bin Saīd** saying: “When you see a man given to disputing and amazed with his opinion, then his ruin has already been completed.”

Al-Ḍahhāk bin al-Muḥāzim said: “The first of you used to learn wara’ (awe, fear) and there will come a time when the [first that] they will learn will be kalām.” Meaning, learning to debate through kalām and falsafah. This is what you see today wherein people are encouraged to learn debating in the context of the debate culture that has been entered into by people of desires and innovations.

Imām Aḥmad (d. 241H) said: “Do not sit with a person of kalām, even if he defends the Sunnah.” He also said: “And to abandon argumentation and sitting with the people of desires”, as occurs in his

²³ A contagious skin disease, passed on through contact.

treatise, Uṣūl al-Sunnah, and also, “He should not argue with or debate anyone, nor should he learn [the tools of] argumentation...”

And **Imām al-Lālikāī** (d. 418) explains what happened when this innovation of acquiring and corroborating creed through debating entered the ummah: “And they [who introduced kalām and falsafah] were responded to by those who were not grounded in the Sunnah, and who had not striven to acquire it, because of the hardship associated with it, and instead he sought relief and ease, and sufficed himself with it in name only, not in writing it down, in order to hasten leadership, love of his mention among the common-folk and being given the label of ‘Imām of the Sunnah’... Everyone who desired to be a person with a statement [which he wanted to make known], found associates and followers...” And later he says: “And there was no crime befalling the Muslims greater than the crime of debating the innovators...”²⁴ indicating that this debate culture is what led to the proliferation of misguidance.

CLOSING NOTES

We decided to write this article as an overview, a context into which previous articles can be placed.

Our intent is to educate people and to call them to the way of the Salaf and for them to understand that false or faulty arguments are instigated by Iblīs in order to bring about misguidance. Iblīs employs individuals like Hijāb who suffer from arrogance and self-amazement and other diseases of the heart, may Allāh purify our hearts and protect us. These Hijāb-types are perfect for achieving the goal and when these types acquire faulty arguments or arguments in which there is a high degree of dubiousity, ambiguity, Iblīs can just leave

²⁴ Refer to Sharḥ Usūl al-ʿItiqād (1/85-88).

them knowing that their wages will be paid by the audiences they acquire: recognition, love, fame and so on. However, and sadly, most people do not recognise callers to misguidance. They are deceived just because these callers speak Arabic, recite the Qurʾān, refute atheists, or at least appear to, when they can't even establish that this creation came to be through an actual act of creation. Misguidance does not come with an ugly, obnoxious appearance, it comes as honey, flowers, with a hidden, poisonous, very small and undiscernable, toxic element. This is why the ignorant—those who keep themselves away from beneficial Sharīʿah knowledge through its proper routes and sources—and those who are inclined to the world, these are the types who are taken in by personalities such as Hījāb. They catch the itch, **the scabies**, and it does not leave them very easily either. And when they are made to realise they have the itch, they want to spread it to others so that others can be in the same unfortunate position as them, which they are unable to escape from. The way of the astray innovators towards those upon the way of the Salaf is the same as the envious People of the Book towards Muslims in general: “We distorted our book, altered our religion, and we are stuck in our misguidance, and we are envious and jealous of what you Muslims have, and thus, we want you to follow the same disastrous path that we fell into, just to make ourselves feel better, and so that we are all on an equal footing. We had sound religion, but distorted it, and we want you to do the same, so that when we meet our Lord, we are not upon any greater misguidance than you are.”

So the people of innovation, because they follow the way of past nations in tabdīl and taḥrīf, in distortion and alteration, then they also inherit their traits and behaviours.

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

Abu 'Iyaad

@abuiyaadsp ♦ salaf.com

12 Dhū al-Qa‘dah 1440 / 15 July 2019 v. 1.08