

“And the Fig Leaves Fell”¹



The First Installment

The Tribulation that Displaced the Masks

Shaykh Abū al-‘Abbās Bilāl al-Sālīmī

All praise is due to Allah, Lord of the Worlds, and may blessings and peace be upon our Prophet Muḥammad, and upon his family and all of his companions. To proceed:

It is from the established laws of Allāh with His servants that [the realities of] men are known during tribulations, that [mens’] claims are tested during trials and that the truthful and the [untruthful] deceiver are not equal when the scales are uneven. Allāh the Exalted said:

¹ (سقطت أوراق التوت)—This is an expression that is used when something concealed or a scandal becomes exposed, and (التوت), refers to berries, or in this case, figs.

أَحْسِبِ النَّاسَ أَنْ يُتْرَكُوا أَنْ يَقُولُوا آمَنَّا وَهُمْ لَا يُفْتَنُونَ

“Do people think they will be left alone to to say: ‘We believe’ and that they will not be tested?” (29:2).

The Salafi arena (of da‘wah) in Yemen has been tested with a great tribulation whose legal scale (in the Shari‘ah) was clear, without ambiguity, [and it is]: hearing and obeying [the ruler] in goodness, remaining behind the legitimate authority, and the prohibition of rebellion, obstinacy and splitting the ranks of obedience.

These are decisive foundations with Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā‘ah, which the Book and the Sunnah have indicated and the Salaf and leading Imāms of the ummāh are united upon them.

First: The Position of the Senior Scholars and the Clarity of Manhaj.

The position of the deeply-rooted people of knowledge was very clear and explicit, without confusion and ambiguity. They advised adherence to the legitimate authority and standing with the [Yemenī] state. They warned against challenging the rulers and explained that rebellion only brings about corruption, bloodshed and splitting the jamā‘ah.

Foremost among them was our shaykh, Imām Rabī‘ bin Hādī al-Madkhalī (رحمه الله) when he expressed his clear statement: “Be with the coalition, be with Saudi.” He expressed this statement from his deep understanding of the reality, and firm grounding in Shari‘ah foundations.

Likewise, Shaykh al-Bukhārī-Allāh grant him success—even though his words came later and with some hesitation, save that the truth is accepted from anyone who brings it.

So these (shaykhs) and others affirmed the great Salafī principle that rebellion is entirely evil, there being no good in it at all. This is in accordance with the saying of the Prophet (ﷺ): *“Whoever comes to you while you are united behind a single man, desiring to split your ranks, then kill him.”* Reported by Muslim. And his (ﷺ) saying: *“Hear and obey, even if a slave is appointed over you.”* Agreed upon.

Second: The Shaykhs of Yemen Opposing the Scholars and Siding with the Rebels.

However, what is truly painful is that some people did not halt at this statement, nor did they take the guidance of the scholars, but instead, they openly opposed them, and they began—sometimes explicitly and sometimes implicitly, whether publicly or from under the table [of command]—to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Southern Transitional Party (STC), which is a rebellious party that has rebelled against the ruler, and was established by weapons, bloodshed, and disobedience.

Shaykh ‘Alī al-Huḍhayfī (حفظه الله) was patient with them for many years, offering sincere advice with compassion, clarifying with wisdom, bearing harm, without rushing to defame or label, in adherence with the principle, and in preservation of the methodology, until blood was shed and the deviation became as clear as the midday sun, leaving no excuse for silence. At that point, clarification became a religious obligation, and silence a

knowledge-based crime, [and he, Shaykh ‘Alī embarked upon that] in compliance with the words of Allāh the Ealted:

وَإِذَا خَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ لَتُبَيِّنُنَّهُ لِلنَّاسِ وَلَا تَكْتُمُونَهُ

“And when Allāh took a covenant from those who were given the Scripture, [saying]: ‘You must make it clear to the people and not conceal it’” (3:187).

Then Shaykh ‘Alī (حفظه الله) did not suffice with advising them privately, but also went with them to Shaykh al-Bukhārī—Allāh grant him success—and presented to him [the details of] what these people had fallen into of clear opposition to a foundation from the foundations of Salafiyyah, hoping for rectification and ending the argument. However, regretfully, he returned empty-handed, or even worse, without any shoes, as the foundation [of creed, which had been violated] was not given justice, and the scale [of justice itself] had not been set as it should have been.²

Despite that, Shaykh ‘Alī remained firm upon the truth and was patient upon harm. He did not swerve from this foundation by even a hair’s breadth. When these people were unable to keep

² In a recent statement from some days ago (9 January 2026), Shaykh ‘Alī al-Ḥuḍhayfī said: “I complained to Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī on three separate occasions: once more than three years ago, once less than two years ago, and the last time while I was in Egypt, when they openly declared warnings against me. I informed him that ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī and those with him were openly warning against me, yet he did not reply to us with even a single word. ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī even declared warnings against me in Egypt shortly after the death of Shaykh Rabi‘. After nearly six years of showing patience, I openly responded to ‘Arafāt and his gang. Today, many Salafi youth in Aden are speaking against Saudi Arabia due to poor upbringing, and some of them ask me to delete my praise of Saudi Arabia from my status posts.” <https://t.me/AliAlHuthaifi55/3021>.

up with him in terms of proof, they all rejected him together, with one bow, and unleashed ignorant boys against him, the likes of the lying Ḥaddādī Bādukhn, through messages of insinuation and belittlement that were circulated from beneath the table [of central command] and plots that were formulated at night, an art which that cunning fox [ʿArafāt] excels in.

And from the rare curiosities of Allāh’s decree is that from what the cunning fox leaked out and which his boys spread was the statement [from Shaykh al-Bukhārī]: “His writing—meaning, of ʿAlī al-Hudhayfī—would not be written by boys.”³ But then the arrow turned against its archer, as its owner [Shaykh al-Bukhārī] ended up issuing a fatwā based on what Shaykh ʿAlī had affirmed [six years earlier], even though that was with hesitant shyness.⁴ Glorified be He, who manifests the truth, even though the chameleons may detest it.

Third: Admissions and Sermons that Revealed the Hidden.

Then events came which removed the masks and exposed the paths, from them:

1. The admission of Ṣalāḥ Kuntūsh of what cannot be denied, that which is established, documented and photographed—look at

³ Meaning, it is childish writing or less. This is a reference to what Shaykh ʿAlī wrote in outlining his position and in defence of himself.

⁴ When the Saudi coalition attacked and expelled the separatist STC forces recently, Shaykh al-Bukhārī issued a statement advising with obedience to the legitimate ruler, which had been the view of Shaykh ʿAlī al-Ḥudhayfī from the beginning, the very same position for which he had been attacked by Dr. ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadī and the Aden shaykhs and surrounding which he sought redress but was unable to receive justice.

the attachments—and it is still on his page, and in the presence of which stubbornness will not benefit, when he said, and how evil is what he said, in response to the honourable Shaykh Fawwāz al-Madkhālī, may Allāh protect him and keep him aright:

“Secondly: I have no objection to your screaming in order to silence your lying mouth, not for your satisfaction, but so that some people are not shaken, so I say: As for ‘Aidrūs al-Zubaydī, then he is from our senior leaders in the country, alongside all of the members of the Presidential Leadership Council. He, like others, has a right to our obedience as was agreed upon by the Arab coalition. May Allāh grant him success and reward him.” End of the quote.

2. The sermon of Munīr al-Sa‘dī in which supported the Transitional Council led by al-Zubaydī, after a long period of silence he revealed his support for it. This sermon came out and it exposed him and those with him to be steeped in deception and treachery towards the Muslims, and here is its link.

The honourable Shaykh Fawwāz (حفظه الله) was correct in his insightful article: *The Mask Has Fallen...A Blatant Lie, an Exposed Methodology and Exploitation of the Houses of Allāh*, when he said:

“The revolutionary Munīr al-Sa‘dī considered me a liar, but the matter did not require much time before he himself declared himself to be a liar. He denied visiting Socotra Island to polish the image of the Transitional Council, but then facts and recordings emerged as witnesses—which could not be subjected to patching nor interpretation—revealing the glorification of its leaders [by Munīr al-Sa‘dī], and commendation of its forces at the height of its war against the legitimate authority in Ḥaḍramaut, from the

pulpits which are supposed to be places of trust, not stages for partisan propaganda.”

3. Likewise, the well-known lies of the Dr., ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī, which have become a symbol of deception, fraud and knowledge-based treachery, not of [genuine] investigation, nor trustworthiness. And I will address them, one lie after the other in this series, if Allāh the Exalted wills, in support of the religion and defence of the upright methodology.

[Through the above] it became clear to people that the issue was not one of a permitted ijtihād, nor a scholar’s slip, nor an accidental mistake, but rather, a deviant approach based on deception and trickery, colouring the discourse, and prioritizing partisanship and [personal and private] interests over decisive Salafi principles.

When the condition of these people was exposed and they had nothing left in their hands to defend themselves, they did not return to the truth, and they did not apologise or repent. Rather, they followed a well-known path among the people of innovations and desires which is attacking the advisors instead of discussing the evidence.

They began to attack the honourable Shaykh Nizār bin Hāshim, the honourable Shaykh Fawwāz al-Madkhalī and others among the noble shaykhs and distinguished students of knowledge. And prior to that, they used to abuse and attack Shaykh ‘Alī al-Ḥudhayfī, and would warn against him without evidence or proof, opposing the statement of Allāh the Exalted:

قُلْ هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

“Say: Bring your proof if you are truthful.” (2:111).

When the truth of what these and other Shaykhs were upon became clear, and the secret of [these] people was uncovered, and the fig leaves fell from them, and they had nothing left in their hands to defend themselves with except slander and mischief, and that was a clear sign of knowledge-based and methodological bankruptcy, it then became necessary to embark upon the duty of clarification, removing the ambiguity, and showing what these people are upon with legal (shar‘iyy) evidence, while adhering to the manners to be observed, as advice to the ummah and exoneration from blame.

Everybody should know that we will all stand in front of Allāh (جَلَّوَعَلَا) and be held accountable for every large and small, important and insignificant matter. Nothing will be of benefit on that Day except truthfulness and just dealing.

Therefore, I say, and with Allāh lies success:

Indeed, lying is a fatal disease and a destructive affliction. No religion can be established alongside it, and no call (to Allāh) can be established through it. It is among the signs of hypocrisy, and among the most repugnant of traits in the sight of Allāh and His servants. The Exalted said:

إِنَّمَا يَفْتَرِي الْكَذِبَ الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَاذِبُونَ

“Only those invent falsehood who do not believe in Allāh’s signs, and it is those who are the liars.” (16:105).

And He the Sublime, said:

لَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِينَ

“Allāh’s curse is upon the liars.” (3:61).

And the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said: “Beware of lying, for lying leads to sinfulness and sinfulness leads to the Hellfire. A servant does not cease

to lie and be given to lying until he is written with Allāh as a liar.”
Agreed upon.

Ahl al-Sunnah have never ceased to consider lying to be the root of all calamity and the key to all deviation. Through it, truths are erased, methodologies are distorted, and deception [takes place] through falsehood disguised as truth.

And given that when lying is coupled with plotting, deception and transgression against the people of truth, and its danger becomes multiplied and its evil more widespread, it becomes obligatory to clarify, silence becomes forbidden and exposing it becomes part of obligatory advice, defence of the Salafi methodology, and protection of the religion from distortion.

So when the affair of Dr. ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī became more serious and his boldness in lying became severe, and his methods of deceit and evasion continued unabated, and he transgressed too far in attacking the people of truth and reviling those firm upon the methodology, I saw that it was binding upon me—in fulfilment of the trust, as advice to the ummah, and to cut off the argument—to expose some of his lies and the lies of his group from the people of ignorance and slander. An exposition supported with evidences and documents, in compliance with His saying, the Exalted:

قُلْ هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

“Say: Bring your proof if you are truthful.” (2:111).

The First Lie of the Cunning Fox

‘Arafāt al-‘Adanī al-Yamanī—may Allāh deal with him with His justice and show him the evil of his doing—(His lie in denying his commendation for the Ḥaddādī Hishām al-Beily al-Miṣrī).

First: Spread of the commendation:

1. “Dr. ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī was asked about the condition of Shaykh Hishām al-Beily. Dr. ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī said: ‘He is a Salafī on the right path.’ It was said to him that he speaks about al-Banna! He said: ‘Leave all of this aside, Shaykh Hishām is one of our Salafī brothers.’ End of his statement.

سئل الشيخ: عرفات المحمدي عن حال الشيخ:
هشام البيلي ؟ فقال الشيخ عرفات المحمدي:
سلفي على الجادة ؛ فقليل له إنه يتكلم في البنا!
فقال: دعوكم من هذا كله الشيخ هشام من
إخواننا السلفيين

وكان ذلك بشهادة جمع من المشايخ والطلاب
وقد نقل ذلك ؛ الشيخ عباس الجونة اليمني
الشيخ صلاح كنتوش اليمني

المصدر دورة العلامة عبيد الجابري الثانية
في اليمن في يوم ٢٦ /جمادى الآخرة ١٤٤٦هـ
٢٦ /سبتمبر/ ٢٠٢٤م

This was witnessed by a group of shaykhs and students, and it was reported by Shaykh Abbas al-Jawnah al-Yamani and Shaykh Ṣalāḥ Kuntūsh al-Yamani.

Source: The second dawrah of the ‘Allāmah ‘Ubayd al-Jābirī, may Allāh have mercy on him, in Yemen, on the 26th of Jumādā al-Ākhirah 1446 AH, 26th of September 2024 AD.”

2. I and others have heard an audio clip of that wild horse, al-‘Adanī bin Ṭāhir, ascribing the commendation to ‘Arafāt, he said: “‘Arafāt commends him with a restricted commendation, not an absolute one.” However, because of his cunning—the wild horse—he deleted the clip!

3. In the attachments is an audio in the German language of brother Mūsā Khalaf who is from Switzerland and now resides in

Egypt [wheren he says] that he heard ‘Arafāt praise Hishām al-Beily a lot.

4. More than one trusted student of knowledge heard him praise al-Beily and explicitly recommend him. This is a well-known and witnessed matter that is not specific to just one or two people. Those who read this clarification and have heard it with their own ears will testify to it and give their testimony in the comments. The testimony of one just person is sufficient to refute this contrived denial, in addition to the succession of testimonies and the multiplicity of listeners.

Second: Denial of the Commendation.

Our rejection of that commendation—myself and a group of just mashāyikh of Egypt—was nothing but a religious obligation, preservation of the methodology and protecting Salafiyyah from tampering required it. Hence, I refuted it in the first installment titled: *A Response to Those Who Cite the Commendation of Dr. ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī and Shaykh ‘Abbās al-Jawnab—may Allāh pardon them—For the One Called Hishām bin Fu’ād al-Beily, Allāh Return Him to the Truth.*

But then it reached us that the one called ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī denied his commendation of al-Beyli in a disguised manner, from which neither an explicit denial nor a truthful confirmation can be understood. Rather, it is a cunning and deceitful method which keeps the door open slightly, to satisfy every party. This is a method that people of truth do not know, and nor [one] that trustworthy people follow.

When Shaykh Shihab al-Din (حفظه الله) the son of our Shaykh, ‘Allāmah Hasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā (رحمهُ اللهُ), went to perform ‘umrah, he met ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī in the mosque of

‘Abd al Ilāh al-Rifā‘ī and confronted him with this issue directly. He evaded the matter like a fox, denied commending al-Beyli, and added to that a clear lie, saying: “I did not commend him, and do not attribute anything to me except what I have written with my own hand on my page, or what you have heard recorded in my voice.”

This statement—to people of insight and just dealing—conflicts with the methodology of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā‘ah with a clear contradiction. It is not from the principles of the Salaf and nor from the methods of Ahl al-Ḥadīth to limit the veracity of transmission to these two indicators only, nor to dismiss the transmission of trustworthy and upright people, and reject their testimony altogether. For in that there is a destruction of a great principle from the principles of knowledge, which is the acceptance of the report of the trustworthy person, upon which the Shari‘ah was established, and by which the religion was preserved.

Allāh the Exalted said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِنِ جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَأٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَنْ تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ
فَتُصِيبُوا عَلَى مَا فَعَلْتُمْ تَادِمِينَ

“O you who believe, if a sinful person comes to you with information, then investigate (and verify his report), lest you harm people in ignorance and thereafter become regretful over what you have done.” (49:6).

This noble verse is a (legal) text regarding the obligation of verifying the report of a sinner, and through its opposite meaning (mafhūm al-mukhālafah), it indicates in a clear manner the (obligation) of the acceptance of the report of the just, trustworthy

person without the burden of verification. For if the report of the trustworthy was rejected or required additional evidence, there would have been no beneficial purpose in specifying the sinner [for investigation], and nor would there be any meaning in the command to investigate.

The people of knowledge have confirmed that the opposite meaning (mafḥūm al-mukhālafah) is a valid proof according to the majority of the legal jurists and that the verse is one of the foundations in acceptance of reports. Ahl al-Sunnah have used it as proof for the validity of the report of a single trustworthy narrator in beliefs and rulings.

In *Mudhakkarah Uṣūl al-Fiqh ‘alā Rawḍah al-Nāḍhir* (p. 132) of ‘Allāmah Muḥammad al-Amīnī al-Shinqīṭī (رحمته الله), he said: “It, the opposite meaning, is understood from the evidence of the speech of this verse, that if the one who brings information is not a sinner but is known for justice and truthfulness, then it is not necessary to investigate his report according to the reading, “then investigate”, nor to verify according to the reading “then verify”. Rather, it is necessary to act upon it immediately without investigation or verification. The verified truth is to accept [the validity of the concept of] the opposite meaning (mafḥūm al-mukhālafah) as has been established in the principles, contrary to Abḥ Hanīfah, may Allāh the Exalted have mercy upon him.”

Therefore, placing fabricated indicators as conditions (for accepting reports) or restricting the acceptance of transmission to personal recordings and writings is a clear violation of this Qur’anic principle and the established Salafi methodology. It is also an illegitimate (non-Shar‘iyy) rejection of the reports of

trustworthy individuals, and Allāh is the One from whom aid is sought.

The scholar ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mu‘allimī al-Yamani said in his book, *Al-Anwār al-Kāshifah Limā fi Kitāb Aḍwā’ ‘ala al-Sunnah* (p. 65): “Allāh, the Sublime, clarified that the report of a sinner contradicts the report of a just person. The report of a just person has the right to be believed, as the first verse explicitly states, and the report of a sinner has the right to be investigated until its affair is established.”

‘Arafāt put all of this out of reach and threw the reports of trustworthy individuals against the wall. This is nothing but an exposed trick by which he sought to escape the implications of his speech and cover up his falsehood after he was cornered and his contradictions became apparent to both the elite and the common people.

This is not how the truthful people behave, nor is this how commendations are treated among Salafis. Rather, it is blatant deception, cold [heartless] scheming, and outright lying that appeals only to those who have a weak understanding of the methodology and Allāh is the One from whom help is sought.

Finally, as advice and with concern for reconciliation, I and sincerely and openly call upon the brother Dr. ‘Arafāt to review himself [as to what he fell into], to fear Allāh in his religion, and to declare a clear, explicit repentance from lying, deception and evasion—with a repentance that is without ambiguity and nor any refuge in vague expressions.

For the door of repentance is open, returning to the truth is honourable, acknowledging error and returning to the truth is a virtue, and the truth is not harmed by he who forsakes it.

The Salafī rank [of unity] is a rank based on truthfulness, justice and returning to the truth, not on haughtiness and personal revenge.

The Exalted said:

وَهُوَ الَّذِي يَقْبَلُ التَّوْبَةَ عَنْ عِبَادِهِ وَيَعْفُو عَنِ السَّيِّئَاتِ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا تَفْعَلُونَ

“And it is He Who accepts repentance from his servants and pardons sins, and He knows what you do.” (42:25).

وَسَيَعْلَمُ الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا أَيَّ مُنْقَلَبٍ يَنْقَلِبُونَ

“And those who have done wrong will come to know what [kind of] return they will be returned to [after death].” (26:227).

And Allāh is the One from whom aid is sought, upon Him is reliance placed and may blessings and peace be upon our Prophet Muḥammad, and upon his family and all of his companions.

Written by: Abā al-‘Abbās Bilāl ibn ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Sālimī, may Allāh pardon him on Sunday night: 22 Rajab, 1447 AH [10 January 2026].⁵

Source: The Shaykh’s Facebook page:

<https://www.facebook.com/blal.bn.bdalghny.alsalmy>

⁵ Translated by Abū ‘Iyāḍ Amjad Rafiq, 12 January 2026.