



Is Mohammed Hijab upon the manhaj of Aristotle, Averroes and Avicenna? A refutation of the vacuous, fraudulent quack “doctor”

Introduction

Within the past few decades, there has appeared among Western Muslims a coterie who bear the defining marks of tahazzub (partisanship) & ta’assub (uncritical, fanatical allegiance) despite their claims to the contrary. They’re primarily known for “refuting” other Muslims in the da’wah scene; employing the harshest of diction, slanderous and malignant in their approach - all under the spurious guise of naseeha (advice). Their methodology in refutation (which they’re not qualified to do to begin with) is a sign of their cynicism and insanity. Who from among the victims of their decades-long abuse, slander and personal attacks has taken their “advice” on board and willingly made a public retraction? Was character assassination & public humiliation the methodology of the Salaf when giving naseeha? Rather their objective is not to advice, but to belittle others with the intent of raising their own standing among the Muslims – an expected corollary of a group who have very little to offer of value (i.e. due to their deficient levels of intelligence & knowledge) with which they can retain & grow their fanbase. One of their more celebrated & prolific authors of pseudo-refutations goes by the name “Abu Iyaad” who has recently authored a series of poorly-written articles in refutation of Mohammed Hijab. The refutation mainly consisted of faulty reasoning, sensationalist rhetoric & paraphrasing of scholars in the wrong contexts as will be demonstrated within the scope of this article. To proceed.

Point 1: We will demonstrate Abu Iyaad’s error in suggesting that the principles of necessary and possible existence lead to heretical views when followed through to their *intended* logical conclusion. What the Amjad Rafiq means by ““intended” logical conclusion” here can be one of the following:

Either: the principles “necessary and possible existence” are more apt to serve the function of a precursor to sacrilegious viewpoints. Meaning, Avicenna introduced them to facilitate introduction of more insidious principles after their reception. However, this is false since the principles necessary and possible existence have no peculiar link with the arguments made using tarkib and takhsis, any more than the argument that every every ḥādith/originated requires a muhdith/originator. For the sake of argument, it could be stated that every originated phenomenon requires an originator, but we observe among originated phenomena a commonality, namely that they’re composites – thus The Creator cannot be a composite; just as it could be stated that the possible existences bear commonalities like composition. Could even apply to Abu Iyaad’s “Ayni-proving” arguments, with the same level of synchrony.

Or: that the arguments from imkan and wujub (possible & necessary existence) may only function as proof for The Creator if combined with the argument from tarkib and takhsis. This is evidently flawed, as we will provide an alternative argument building on imkan and wujub that point to a “Ayni” existence (note, we will demonstrate the whole “Ayni” and “Mutlaq” dichotomy to be false within the course of this article, with the differences, at best, being a matter of extent and not kind). The demonstration is as follows: possible existences inevitably require a necessary existence for their inception and perpetuation. This necessary existence must possess the attributes of knowledge, power and will to create and perpetuate possible existences since the latter demonstrate signs of a Designer, Creator and Sustainer that is extremely wise, knowledgeable and capable. Here, we’ve “qualified” the necessary existent without recourse to tarkib and takhsis. In contradistinction, Amjad Rafiq has suggested that to qualify a Creator after proving necessary existence, one must augment the argument using the concepts of tarkib and ikhtisaas¹.

Point 2: Abu Iyaad, in numerous instances has charged Mohammed Hijab with advancing an argument that does not differentiate between the Tawhid of the Messengers from the necessary existence of atheists. We’ll provide one example in where he proposed this contention for the sake of brevity:

“Hence, the Khārijites, the Rāfiḍites, the Ḥulūlīs, the Ittihādīs, and those who cannot distinguish between the Tawḥīd of the Messengers from the Tawḥīd of the Philosophers and Bātīnī Kāfirs, from the “necessary existence” of Fir’aun, Aron Ra, Alex and Julie the physicist, such as Muḥammad Hijāb and his likes, they are the ones who will be prone to the fitnah of Dajjāl, the greatest deceiver after Satan.”²

The argument in question is the one in which the concepts of necessary and possible existence are deployed (cogently so). To suggest that this argument fails to demarcate The Creator from other forms of existences is to demonstrate a complete, embarrassing misunderstanding of the argument. Part of the argument is to demonstrate that other forms of existences are possible, dependent, could have had an alternative configuration (i.e. they were subject to temporal inception at one point) and so forth. In discussing and elucidating the properties of possible existences (which include the forms of existences that Abu Iyaad falsely claimed to be viable candidates for necessary existence), there’s a

¹ According to Amjad “the argument must be completed through the arguments of tarkīb and ikhtisās using dubious, toxic philosophical considerations whose outcome is denial of a creator in external reality.” Page 30/31, part 8.

² Part 11, page 38

perspicuous demarcation between The Creator (the necessarily existent that all of creation depend upon) and creation.

Amjad Rafiq's writings on atheism are rife with the notion of the universe exhibiting signs of a Creator who possesses the attributes of will and intent. What if an atheist was to retort that this entity with will and intent is Saturn, does that mean that the atheist's argument is valid solely because he put forward a contrary stance? No, since Saturn does not possess the attributes of will and intent, neither do the existents alluded to by Amjad Rafiq qualify for necessary existence, due to their manifesting properties denoting possible existence.

Amjad must recant his idiotic slander of Mohammed Hijab concerning this issue – accusing him of advancing arguments that do not differentiate between atheism and theism.

We will now forcefully re-enter Amjad's jurisdiction, interpret the law that he abides by and convict him accordingly, seizing him by the neck. In a recent article: Amjad has made a case for The Creator using observations made in cell biology. His central argument in a nutshell was that this observable phenomenon points to an exceedingly Wise, Knowledgeable, Capable designer. How would Amjad respond if one was to dismiss Amjad's arguments as "generic, unspecific and unqualified"? That the exceedingly Wise, Knowledgeable, Capable designer Amjad speaks of could very well apply to extra-terrestrial, highly advanced Alien species within this context and that he can't differentiate between the two? It is not permissible for him to use the concept of "fitrah" as an escape, for the fitrah **agrees** with the idea of a Creator who's necessarily existent. This is an example of how dangerous, unscrupulous use of Reductio Ad Absurdum could backfire, rendering one crippled. We do not say that ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah have mercy on him) was unscrupulous for he made such statements solely out of regard for truth. While our incompetent opponent is toiling endlessly solely to find blemishes in Mohammed Hijab's statements.

The difference between Amjad's indictment and ours, is that ours is based on logically valid argumentation, while not every existence possesses the properties to qualify as a necessary existent.

Point 3: Amjad Rafiq has, on several occasions, peddled the fanciful (almost Hollywood-esque) narrative that Avicenna has shrewdly introduced the concepts of necessary and possible existence "to corrupt the proofs of the Mutakalimuun"³ and deceive them into rejecting the attributes of The Creator. Bear in mind that we've already demonstrated that there is no special link of any kind between the sets of arguments alluded to and that the arguments from necessary and possible existence are sound in of themselves (which ibn Taymiyyah concurs with).

He has erroneously extrapolated this from ibn Taymiyyah's statements, we think it has its roots in the idea that "Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah explains that Ibn Sīnā simply altered the wordings of the proof to devise a proof for the purposes and designs of the Philosophers." However, what ibn Taymiyyah was referring to here, is a proof for a creator that is consistent/compatible with the position of the philosophers - viz. that the world is pre-eternal and the impossibility of the world being created ex-nihilo as exposted by Imam Ghazali in his tahaafut al filaasifah⁴.

Using the principles of necessary and possible existent, one can make a case for The Almighty being The Sustainer of the world (thereby affirming a deity), without necessarily supposing the idea of the world being created ex-nihilo (which the philosophers rejected), hence its appeal to the philosophers. Using the principles of ḥādith/originated and muhdith/originator, inception of the cosmos ex-nihilo

³ Sourced from part one of his diatribe

⁴ Tahaafut al filaasifah, part one, discussion one "on refuting their doctrine of the world's past eternity"

will be an inevitable corollary, hence the philosophers rejected this. It is for this reason that ibn Taymiyyah has stated that Avicenna simply altered the wordings to devise a proof for the purposes and designs of the philosophers. With the absence of mutual exclusivity between the aggregation of arguments initially used by the Mutakalimun and those posited by ibn Sina, it is patently clear that there was no grand scheme to hoodwink the Mutakalimoon into accepting false principles.

This is the result of an unrestrained imagination combined with incomprehension, while being an embarrassing case of utilising pseudo-psychoanalysis (i.e. assuming Avicenna's intentions & motives) in one's pseudo-polemical writings.

Point 4: Abu Iyaad Amjad has repeatedly misrepresented Mohammed Hijab's views concerning the issue of Tarkib & Takhsis exposing his congenital incompetence in the process. In one of the places in which his misapprehension is more conspicuous, he has stated that: "Upon what has preceded (i.e. about tarkib and takhsis), **it is possible for a Jahmite to come along, and extending Hijāb's argument** —in the manner of al-Rāzī, and say: "**Allāh has a face, eyes and hand, and they are other than each other in Allāh's essence, and this necessitates composition, or parts, and thus Allāh is composite and therefore a body. So here, either you must negate these attributes in order to affirm the validity of the argument (and remain true to its necessities) or you reject the argument as false and affirm what came in the Qur'ān.**"⁵

The error of this assertion (quoted above) will be demonstrated in the form of an analogy:

"And when he (Ibrahim) saw the sun rising, he said, "This is my lord; this is greater." **But when it set,** he said, "O my people, indeed I am free from what you associate with Allah" (6:78)

The similitude of Amjad's fallacy is like one insisting that the statement of the Prophet Ibrahim (in the Ayah), when taken to its fullest logical conclusion, leads to denial of Allah's descent, as attested to in the following Sahih hadith:

"Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) as saying: **Allah descends every night to the lowest heaven** when one-third of the first part of the night is over and says: I am the Lord; I am the Lord: who is there to supplicate Me so that I answer him? Who is there to beg of Me so that I grant him? Who is there to beg forgiveness from Me so that I forgive him? He continues like this till the day breaks." (Muslim)⁶

This is a false conclusion as there are caveats and conditions to be accounted for. The analogy provided above (concerning Ibrahim's statement) does not necessarily lead to the posited consequence due to the obvious fact that by the sun "setting", the implication(s) are not restricted to descent, but also include temporary intermission (e.g. in being a source of light and energy, etc) which is impossible for Allah, etc. Likewise, not any ostensible case of tarkib (&or takhsis for that matter) leads to the conclusion that it's a generated phenomenon. We accept Allah's attribute of face, eyes and hands – with our justifications (both scriptural and rational, e.g. the attributes not being part of the essence, nor other than it – as will be elucidated in due time) for this belief rendering this case to be in stark contradistinction when compared to generated bodies we observe in our cosmos.

f(X) - - - > Y

⁵ Found on page 7 in the 3rd part of his diatribe

⁶ Sahih Muslim, book 6, Hadith 202. USC-MSA web (English) reference: book 4, hadith 1657

In simple logic: if f = general function, x = proposition, y = logical corollary: to assert that Mohammed Hijab's position on tarkib inevitably leads to the outcome of denying the attributes is to suppose that when $f(X) \rightarrow Y$, X = (every) case that is seemingly subject to the principle tarkib, Y = the origination of X - which we've demonstrated to be false. As it's false for the one who asserts that Ibrahim's statement results in the rejection of Allah's descent: which is to suppose that when $f(X) \rightarrow Y$, X = (every) case of descent, Y = the none divine origins of X .

We hold the position of Ibn Taymiyyah: pertaining to the interconnection between Allah's attributes and his essence, namely that they are neither part of his essence, nor other than it⁷. We think that Ibn Taymiyyah's position concerning this issue is corroborated by the logical consequence(s) of assuming both the positive (viz. the attributes being the essence - which will result in tajseem) or negative (which will result in ta'til), in the former case affirming a kind of tajseem that the *Atharis* outright rejected, among the characteristics of which, are **composition (tarkib) in a manner that's similar to those found in creation**. This is alluded to by Ibn Taymiyyah⁸ in his demarcation of the differences between the essence & attributes of the creation and that of The Creator. Who sees the irony here? If Amjad still insists and protests that "Mohammed Hijab's views on tarkib lead to denial of the attributes" or "as opposed to the Mohammed Hijab, the Salaf did not utilise tarkib in the absolute sense", then he would further expose his incomprehension and failure to understand what we've clearly elucidated. Thus, to assert that the rational corollaries of our position include denial of the attributes (as Amjad did with Mohammed Hijab's position) is *plainly false*.

Point 5: Amjad insinuates in several articles that there's a dichotomy between the language of the Prophets and the language of the philosophers, suggesting mutual exclusivity in this aspect. This falls into the category of logical fallacies called "false dilemma". Every language evolves with the passage of time, by means of international interactions, or endogenous formation. Word(s) that signify novel concepts, principles and expressions have their origins in observations made about the universe. To dismiss them as false for merely having their roots in particular parts of the world is irrational. We've previously mentioned that there were innumerable scholars who made a case for The Creator using the language that Amjad denounces. Indeed, Abu Iyaad himself makes use of language that the Salaf were not familiar with - making extensive use of modern science (the cogency or lack thereof of his theses does not concern us in this matter). If the opponent suggests that the arguments he's put forward using modern science are mere extensions of those that are found in the Qur'an and Sunnah **in contrast** to the arguments of Muslim kalam theologians, then this is erroneous. The arguments used by the Sunni Mutakalimun can most assuredly be demonstrated to be extensions of Qur'anic arguments, an undeniable fact that we will promptly demonstrate. The "Ayni" arguments alluded to by Amjad (and more specifically, his propositions using modern science) are primarily arguments from design. While the arguments of the Mutakalimun are based on observations of elements that factor into creation's createdness. One of the ayat that serves as a precedent to the approach of the Mutakalimun is the following:

"Or were they created by nothing, or were they the creators [of themselves]?" (52:35)

From this ayah, among the wisdoms we acknowledge, is that it is appealing to a fact that all humans are cognisant of, viz. their mortality and temporal inception - they're familiar with the factors that point to this undeniable fact. The Mutakalimun (for instance in their arguments from possible and necessary existence) venture to explore and identify elements of createdness in other perceivable entities and the cosmos at large, positing arguments and proofs for The Creator using these observations.

⁷ Ibn Taymiyyah's position on this matter can be found in his Majmu' al Fatawa

⁸ Sourced from Ibn Taymiyyah's al-fatawa al-hamawiya al-kubra

If this ayah was not in the Qur'an, Amjad would have dismissed this as a variant of the arguments the Mutakalimun use (e.g. hadith and muhdith), establishing an unqualified, generic, abstract creator (a false assertion we will refute in due course). And refuge is sought with Allah.

If he protests that as opposed to the arguments put forward by philosophers, the arguments derived from observations in the natural sciences point to a "‘Ayni existence" while those that have been made us of by the philosophers point to an existence that is "Mutlaq" (theoretical) then we will expose this dichotomy to be false in our next point (6).

The hypocrisy of Abu Iyaad is illustrated by the fact that on the one hand, he denounces philosophy and the approach of the philosophers when it comes to discussing the attributes of The Creator, and on the other hand, he holds views pertaining to the sifaat that are philosophical in nature. Case in point: when he mentions that the view of the Salaf was to negate that Allah has an interior – with the proof for this being that Allah is al-Samad and that he is one from whom there is no tawallud (*generation, production*)⁹. The apparent meanings of the words al-Samad and Walad/Tawallud are independent/self-sufficient and the act of begetting respectively. What's the difference between the one who interprets the attribute of al-Samad and the negation of Tawallud to mean that he has no interior and the one who interprets the attribute of al-Samad (independent/self-sufficient) to mean that he has no parts upon which he depends? If Amjad puts forward a rebuttal insisting that there is no use for an interior besides generation and production, then he has made the very tashbih that he accuses the Mutakalimun of. Abu Iyaad says:

*"They erred here because they were operating upon the principle of **analogising the unseen with the seen**, and thus they imagined that the reality (kaifiyyah, haqiqah) of the attributes that Allāh affirmed for Himself, which are from the affairs of the unseen, are like the reality of the attributes of the creation which are perceived and observed. Then they fled from this tashbīh to ta‘tīl."*¹⁰

Point 6: In this section, we will demonstrate that the arguments used to establish ‘Ayni existence, and Mutlaq existence are identical in their method, as well as results (with the only variation being in extent, not kind). We will begin with method:

Both "‘Ayni" and "Mutlaq" arguments require observable premises (or previously arrived at rational conclusions used as premises) and a rational conclusion derived from the premises.

Qur'anic example of an "‘Ayni" argument:

"...Abraham said, "Indeed, Allah brings up the sun from the east, so bring it up from the west." (2:258).

Premise: Allah brings up the sun from the east. This is a rational, evidence-based conclusion used as a premise, not observable.

Premise: If nimrod was The Creator, he'd be able to cause the sun to rise from the West.

Resultant conclusion: nimrod is unable to do that, therefore he's not The Almighty.

Example of a "Mutlaq" argument:

Premise: Every observable natural phenomenon tends to be contingent on something else.

Premise: The universe is a natural phenomenon.

Conclusion: Therefore, the universe is contingent upon something.

⁹ This can be found on page 3 in the sixth part of his diatribe

¹⁰ This can be found on page 22 in the first part of his diatribe

We can switch the second premise and the conclusion to:

Premise 2: an infinite series of contingencies is impossible. This is a rational conclusion used as a premise, not observable.

Conclusion: Therefore, the series of contingencies must cease at that which is not contingent.

This is not to say that everything the philosophers say or (by extension) that every argument for a Creator is accurate. Our reason for clarifying the methods was due to Abu Iyaad's irresponsible claim that **"As for the method of the Philosophers and the Mutakallimīn, it is through the use of analogies and logic that do not establish an existence which is 'aynī but only muṭlaq (absolute, non-specific, in the mind only)."**¹¹

As for the results: If Amjad suggests that the "Ayni" arguments point to a specific entity while the "Mutlaq" arguments do not, then this is false¹². He clearly grounds this judgement on the notion that the "Ayni" arguments point to a specific deity with knowledge, power, and so on; while the "Mutlaq" arguments can point to anything. It's not always the case that an "Ayni" argument always points to a specific deity, while "Mutlaq" arguments allude to unspecific existence. It all depends on *how* the information is interpreted. For instance, it could be easily stated that the entity that all phenomena are dependent upon or is necessary must have the attributes of power, knowledge and so on for it to be the originator and perpetuator of creation. If the only possible explanation of empirical phenomena that exude design and mastery was a deity that had the enumerated attributes, there wouldn't have been counterarguments from philosophical naturalists in this aspect. Rather, it becomes a case of adopting the more likely and rational interpretation/conclusion.

It is not the case that the Mutlaq arguments lead to denial of a Creator in external reality, for attributes can be affirmed for a Creator using these arguments. Nor is it ever the case that the arguments for a 'Ayni existence Amjad speaks of is thoroughly qualified or specific, for anything that can be conceived of with the enumerated attributes can be posited to be the alluded-to entity(ies), we've previously given the example of highly-advanced alien species – Indicating imperfection in qualification and thus abstraction. We do not find this type of speech to be agreeable by any measures, but we were forced to utilise these types of words in refutation of an unscrupulous pseudo-scholar. When we refer to 'Ayni & Mutlaq arguments as two separate types of arguments, it is only for the sake of elucidating a point. Mohammed Hijab has made a wide-variety of arguments for a Creator, we advise the readers to not content themselves with Amjad's misrepresentations in his failed, vacuous attempts at nit-picking and blemish-finding.

Point 7: Mohammed Hijab made statements concerning the Qur'an to which Abu Iyaad responded the following:

"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

¹¹ Part 1, Page 9.

¹²According to Amjad (concerning his rendition of the arguments from possible and necessary existence): "In reality, it only proves something called "obligatory existence", which could then be interpreted or explained as anything, including the universe itself." Can be found in the footnotes section on page 1, part 4 of Amjad's diatribe.

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, the "word" that was God, becoming "flesh".¹³

Firstly, this is not an accurate representation of Mohammed Hijab's views in this subject-matter. Secondly, we will carry out a thorough analysis to determine which of the two positions is more apt to give credence to the beliefs of Christians:

The view espoused by Abu Iyaad entails that an act of speech on the part of The Creator can have a temporal beginning (speech by way of will) while simultaneously being of a divine nature. The idea of the word of God becoming flesh (with the corporeal form having a temporal beginning) in addition to being of a divine nature is more correlative with the view that Abu Iyaad is a proponent of in this affair.

By contrast, the position that Amjad Rafiq charges with lending credence to the triune doctrine does not admit any phenomenon with temporal beginning to be of a divine nature. This is corroborated by the fact that this position entails that there are two Qur'ans (as pointed out by Amjad, which we've quoted above), with the one that is recited and is subject to temporal succession belonging to the "created" category.

This is another example of Amjad Rafiq shooting himself in the foot.

Point 8: Amjad has not made a single valid argument at all (by valid, I don't mean accurate), a consequence of quoting Muslim scholars without comprehension. Indeed, if one was to have understood a matter, there'd be no need to recourse to plagiarism to begin with, they'd instead be able to provide specific, original arguments addressing a matter in its context. To make matters worse, he has not even understood the material he quotes (enough) to quote the arguments in their entirety. At this point, it is patently clear that we're dealing with a fraudster who deems himself to have a high level of understanding¹⁴. **Indeed, not a single "argument" was made by Abu Iyaad Amjad, except that it fell into one (or a combination) of these three categories:**

- 1) Genetic fallacy: the idea that It is from sources that are not directly from the Qur'an, Sunnah and the narrations of the Salaf, or that the Mutakalimun and philosophers held a similar view (**albeit not identical** by any measures), therefore they're false, while it's evident that an argument can have exogenous origins (i.e. not from the Qur'an and Sunnah) while simultaneously being valid. Ibn Taymiyyah himself sees no problem with the argument from possible and necessary existence, which is an argument that ibn Sina put forward.
- 2) Slippery slope fallacy: manifests in the form of concluding that due to the sole reason that there are correlative elements between the philosophical arguments used by Mohammed Hijab and the philosophers, Mohammed Hijab must hold their view in matters that pertain to the sifaat (attributes) of Allah, etc.
- 3) Strawman fallacy: illustrated by his trenchant, pseudo-polemics against topics, principles and concepts that Mohammed Hijab has not even made mention of to begin with.

With this frame of reference, I ask you to skim read any one of his 13+ articles to see that not a single valid argument was made.

¹³ Part 8, page 66

¹⁴ Abu Iyaad states in his opening remarks in part 6 of his diatribe: "To introduce this subject, and to aid in its comprehension, we can give a quick, byte-sized, brief illustration by way of an example". Clearly assuming himself the role of a learned sage in these matters, venturing to simplify them for the less acquainted.

Amjad Rafiq continuously repeats himself in 13+ separate articles, all of them consisting of reproduced content from scholars without a single valid argument (due to his incomprehension). Do you (Amjad) think this is a game of darts, when, after taking shots in the dark, you hope one will stick? Amjad (in his indiscretion) makes use of the deranged tactic of writing very lengthy articles that could have otherwise been summarised in a few pages.

Point 9: There were repeated instances of false, libellous allegations being publicly advanced against Mohammed Hijab by the heads of SalafiPublications: Abu Khadeejah, Abu Hakeem Bilal/Paul Davis, Abu Iyaad Amjad Rafiq (including his PDFs) and so on. We ask any fair-minded individual to examine the following:

One of the allegations put forward against Mohammed Hijab was that he's a proponent of an ikhwani principle: namely that "we should unite on what we agree upon and excuse ourselves in that which we differ".

The following words of Mohammed Hijab from a video are used as "evidence" to support this libellous allegation:

"It's the *maslahah* (benefit). If this guy has the skills, we'll bring him in. If the woman has the skills we'll bring her in. If it's specialist knowledge, we don't care what sect they are, even if they're Jew, Christian. I don't give a damn! Nah, it's very important man! We gotta be straight forward about this. Our community is bleeding from within. We have to look at the bigger picture. We have no time for this sectarian thing no more man!"¹⁵

There is a context behind these statements of Mohammed Hijab. Anyone who was following the discussions taking place in Speakers Corner at the time would know that these words were in response to those who were accusing him of being an "ikhwani" for bringing personalities belonging to different sects to discuss their areas of expertise on his platform. Mohammed Hijab's point was that if there is *maslahah* in having an individual elucidate matters in their area(s) of expertise, their expertise should be used for the wider benefit. In his statement that "we have no time for this sectarian thing no more...", this is sectarianism precisely in the sense that we should not boycott Muslims from other sects when there is *maslahah* in exchanging ideas, making use of their expertise and skills. That the Muslim sects should not isolate each other from one another when mutual benefit/*maslahah* could be attained. In fact, he mentions the likes of this in that same video, which I cannot seem to find on YouTube. This interpretation is nevertheless more consistent with the context and the theme of his speech.

Mohammed Hijab's evidence for this approach is an Ayah in the Qur'an:

"...And cooperate in righteousness and piety, but do not cooperate in sin and aggression..." (5:2)

Ibn Taymiyyah in his *mujallat* has stated the following: "if you see combined in one man Iman and disbelief, Sunnah and *bid'ah*, *taa'ah* (obedience) and *ma'siyah* (sins), you treat him according to what he has of *bid'ah* (& error), while expressing love and allegiance to him for what he has of *khayr* (goodness).

¹⁵ This quote was taken from an article written by a notorious, unlearned individual <https://www.abukhadeejah.com/the-principle-of-ikhwani-we-excuse-and-overlook-one-another/>

al-'Uthaymeen (may Allah have mercy on him) in commenting on the principle of ikhwanis, has stated the following: "Their saying, **'Let us unite upon that which we agree' is true.** However, as for their saying, 'we excuse [and overlook] one another in that which we differ', then that requires elaboration. So, the ijtiḥad that is acceptable and reasonable, then we excuse each other when we differ, and it is not allowed for the hearts to divide due to this kind of differing. However, if the ijtiḥad not reasonable, then we do not excuse the one who opposes [the truth], and it is a must that he submits and yields to the Truth. **So the first part of the saying is correct, but the second requires elaboration.**"¹⁶

Al-Albani (may Allah have mercy upon him) stated (concerning the ikhwani principle): **"And we do not doubt that there is a portion of this passage that is correct, and that is, 'We cooperate with one another in that which we agree'.** So this first sentence is extracted from the saying of Allah: **'Cooperate with one another upon righteousness and being dutiful to Allah.'** As for the second sentence, 'we excuse [and overlook] one another in that which we differ', then it is a must that it is restricted. But when? When we are advising one another and we say to the one who erred, 'You have made a mistake and the evidence for that is such-and-such and such-and-such.' So, if we see from him that he is convinced [of the truth] and is sincere, then we leave him alone, his honor and position — and we cooperate with him in that which we agree. However, if we find him stubborn, resistant, arrogant and turning away, then in that situation, this sentence is not correct and we do not excuse when we differ."¹⁷

Ibn Baz (may Allah have mercy upon him) has stated: **"Yes, it is obligatory that we cooperate upon that which we agree in supporting the truth, calling to it and in warning against that which Allah and His Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him) prohibited.** As for excusing one another where we differ, then this cannot be taken unrestrictedly. Rather, this requires explanation. So if the differing is in matters of ijtiḥad where the evidence is obscure, then it is not allowed for us to condemn each other due to it. However, as for the one who opposes the Book and Sunnah; then it is obligatory to forbid him with wisdom, good admonition and by arguing with him in the best manner in implementation of the saying of Allah, the Most High: **"Cooperate with one another upon righteousness and being dutiful to Allah. And do not cooperate upon sin and transgression."** (Al-Ma'idah: 2) And His saying, **"The believers, men, and women, are allies of one another. They enjoin the good and they forbid the evil."** (At-Taubah: 18) And His saying, **"Invite to the Path of your Lord with wisdom, good admonition and argue with them in a manner that is best."** (An-Nahl: 125)... And his (peace and blessings be upon him) saying: **"Whoever guides to something good, then for him there is a reward similar to the one who acts upon it."** Reported by Muslim in his Sahih. And the verses and narrations of this kind are numerous."¹⁸

The Permanent Committee (fatwa 6250 & 6280) have suggested that the Shi'ah, Jama'at Tabligh, Ikhwaan al-Muslimun and other groups & sects must be co-operated with in that which they're correct in and that one should avoid those affairs in which they err while advising them. The fatwa was signed by the likes of Shaykh Abdullah ibn Qu'ud, Shaikh Abdullah Ibn Abdur-Rahman Al-Ghudayan, Shaykh Abdulrazaq 'Afifi with the head of them being Shaykh Abdulaziz ibn Baz.

The verse that enjoins mutual assistance in that which is good, as well as the concept behind it was referred to by Mohammed Hijab on **innumerable occasions.** If he is really a proponent of ikhwani principles, why did he not (at any point) conjoin the concept behind the verse (assisting one another in mutual good) with the second clause that comprises the ikhwani principle, namely to excuse one another in that which we differ?

¹⁶ As-Sahwa Al-Islamiyyah, Dawabit wa Tawjihah (1/218-219)

¹⁷ Mujallah Al-Furqan of Kuwait (no. 77, p. 22)

¹⁸ Majmū Al-Fatawa (3/58-59)



Exposing Ultra Intolerant Muslim 'Cleric'

92,934 views

2.1K 326 SHARE SAVE ...

In two separate instances in this video (2:46 & 14:09), Mohammed Hijab has explicitly stated that we should only unite upon that which serves the common good while clearly expressing his disagreement with the idea that our beliefs should be indistinguishable. That the unity should only be based on that which serves the common good: “People from all sides – Salafi, Sufi, Shi’a, they were common together for **those reasons** (i.e. the maslahah), **not to say that we’re all going to believe in the same thing now** (2:46 onwards).

It is impossible for the heads of SalafiPublications to accuse Mohammed Hijab of being an ikhwani with the available information, rather only the contrary can be concluded. This allegation confirms the envy, malice, ignorance, and coveting on the part of those who’ve advanced this charge, but the Muslims, Salafis and non-Salafis, are not falling for it and have voiced their objections. It is obligatory upon the heads of SalafiPublications (Abu Khadeejah, Bilal Davis, Amjad Rafiq) to repent from this idiotic libel & slander and make a public recantation.

Point 10: Amjad Rafiq interestingly rejects the challenge to a formal debate, while enthusiastically having a back-and-forth with a supposed muftadi' on a public platform with thousands of spectators. Juxtaposing the configuration of public debates in the time of the Salaf with our particular case, we uncover that: in both cases there's an audience present. In both cases it's possible for a muftadi' to influence the opinions of the laymen spectators on a wide-scale. In both cases there's a clear series of back-and-forths that the audience keep up with. It's not possible to seek absolution in the fact that the Salaf wrote against Ahlul Bid'ah, for in authoring works in that setting (well-before the printing press, let alone internet), it's logistically almost impossible for there to be a series of back-and-forths with a keen audience following up on every exchange. This is the example of an idiot, who in his desperate venture to increase his own standing, has contradicted his own principles. Mohammed Hijab's request to a public debate was in order to put the matter at rest, as one may be too occupied to have lengthy exchanges on a public platform. Abu Iyaad has previously publicly denounced Salafi du'aat/teachers like Abdulrahman Hassan for engaging in a public debate while assuming the mantle for himself.

Point 11: When Amjad Rafiq was pressured to divulge his Islamic qualifications, **he responded to this solicitation by claiming that he is one who is blessed with a high level of intelligence/comprehension ("fiqh")** and is one granted tawfiq by Allah, albeit being a demonstrably false self-assessment and a detestable case of the Dunning-Kruger effect. Amjad contends: **"As for the issue of credentials and tazkiyāt (commendations), then Allāh is the One who distributes fiqh (comprehension) between His servants—to whomever He intends to show goodness."**¹⁹ This is despite the fact that the only thing the miskeen has done is regurgitate arguments of previous scholars without any comprehension or context, leading him to committing innumerable logical fallacies.

Oddly enough, this clown tuned the issue of credentials around and accused Mohammed Hijab of keeping his credentials a private affair: **"I have been informed that Hījāb has used the tactic of questioning credentials, even though nobody knows his credentials."** While referring to this legitimate questioning as a diversionary tactic.²⁰ This is despite the fact that it's not Mohammed Hijab who has involved himself in disputations between scholars, has made & continues to make tabdi' on du'aat, etc.

Since Abu Iyaad has insisted on entering the intellectual boxing ring with us, it's incumbent for him to remain (though we think he will drop from this blow due to light-headedness) – otherwise forfeiting could mean irrevocable humiliation and the disillusionment of Amjad's followers. We will now see who is truly in bondage and is a slave to their audience. If Abu Iyaad attempts to digress (i.e. flee from the ring), he will be forced to toe-the-line and address these issues head-on, along with the attempt being a source of traumatising humiliation.

Note: this doesn't mean we're not sincere to our readers but is a response to the juvenile imagery (chokehold references) exerted by "Ustadh" Amjad in a serious topic like Aqeedah.

Abu Iyaad states:

"First, there are two types of chokes. The first is the air chokehold which prevents air from reaching the lungs. A person can survive this for only a couple of minutes before passing out. The second is the blood choke-hold, which prevents blood from reaching the brain. A person can only last from 8-13 seconds before passing out. Hījāb should know that Part 1 of this series put him in a blood choke-hold. Every part in the series thereafter represented one second in the duration of time. We are now in Part 11, and he has only a couple of seconds left before passing out. This is why Hījāb has been having violent spasms (i.e. vile behaviour)."²¹

We have waited patiently to allow Abu Iyaad to express himself unrestrictedly, to be enthralled and consumed by false positives. For the unequivocal separation of truth from falsehood is most apt in such configuration.

وصلى الله على نبينا محمد

Written by Abu Ziyad – 27/07/2019

¹⁹ Part 11 of the series of pseudo-refutations, page 27

²⁰ Part 11, page 26.

²¹ Part 11, page 2