

“And the Mulberry Leaves Fell...”

Part 2: Second Evidence of the Lies and Fabrications of ‘Arafāt Al-Muhammadi Against Sheikh Abū ‘Iyād – Who is Free from Them

All praise is due to Allāh, the Lord of all that exists, and may Allāh raise the rank and grant peace upon our Prophet Muhammad, upon his family and all of his companions.

To proceed: Indeed, from the most dangerous paths of transgression and the most hideous ways of tyranny is to lie against scholars, shaykhs, and students of knowledge, fabricate and falsely attribute statements to them, and then pass judgments, hold stances, and slander based upon those very same fabricated lies. For this approach combines lying, oppression, deception, corruption of hearts, and division of ranks. This is the practice of the people of desires, both past and present.

From this category, rather one of its clearest examples, is what the one named ‘Arafāt Al-Muhammadi has fallen into, by way of: blatant lies, outright fabrications, and utter slander against Sheikh Abu ‘Iyād Amjad Rafīq—may Allāh preserve him. He attributed to him a series of statements and credal beliefs that he never said, never believed, and never even implied its meaning, neither explicitly nor implicitly. He is completely free and innocent of them like the wolf is innocent of the blood of Yūsuf, peace be upon him.

Firstly: Presenting the Lies

Among the lies he fabricated against him are as follows:

1. That major scholars are desert Bedouins who are incompetent.
2. That they blindly and submissively follow their rulers.
3. That he (i.e. Abu 'Iyād) wants to topple the scholars in order to support a false ideology.
4. That the scholars are unable to oppose the policies of their rulers, and hence why they issued verdicts & legal rulings on matters related to vaccinations in favour of what was required of them (by their rulers).
5. That he (i.e. Abu 'Iyād) discredits the statements of the scholars who issued verdicts permitting vaccination.
6. That their verdicts on vaccinations are merely an echo of what the rulers want.
7. That scholars fundamentally lack the courage to oppose policy.
8. That they never, under any circumstance, dissent from the policy of the rulers.
9. That he (i.e., Abu 'Iyād) describes some scholars — falsely — as fools, confused ones, and ignoramuses of medicine, and generalises this to include others.
10. That he (i.e., Abu 'Iyād) stipulates that a scholar should not issue a verdict and legal ruling on anything until he specialises in it.
11. That he (i.e., Abu 'Iyād) repeats this condition and makes it a fundamental principle.
12. That he (i.e., Abu 'Iyād) portrays scholars as naive dervishes.

13. That he sees no benefit in referring to scholars in emerging calamities (nawāzil) because they are incompetent.
14. That his speech (i.e. Abu 'Iyād's) does not differ from the speech of the Surūriyyah and Qutubiyyah: "Major scholars do not comprehend the reality."
15. That he (i.e. Abu 'Iyād) made the vaccine a matter of allegiance and disavowal.
16. That he (i.e. Abu 'Iyād) preoccupied the youth, day and night, with this issue.

So here we take a stance of fairness and justice:

What 'knowledge' is this that justifies a man to craft this onslaught of defamation and false accusations against a shaykh who is known for (adherence to) the Sunnah and for his da'wah?!

What 'religion' permits him to accuse him of statements he never even uttered, nor did his wording indicate such, nor did the people of knowledge understand that (from his speech)?! Then to build upon those false accusations: defamation, revilement, and discrediting?

What type of 'piety' convinces its possessor to dare to attack the honor of shaykhs?! Gathering lies, compiling them, and then presenting them to people under the guise of advice, while in reality they are slander and transgression?!

By Allāh, this is rather audaciousness against the truth, embarking upon desires, and a departure from the methodology of Ahlus-Sunnah in justice and fairness. For Ahlus-Sunnah do not affirm a statement except with evidence, nor attribute an opinion except with transmission, nor judge except after verification.

Then, what mind accepts that these grave accusations be attributed to a single Shaykh, all at once, in one go, without hearing his clarification, or a statement being transmitted from him, or inquiring about his intent?!

This approach — if it is not blattent, intentional lying — is then false deception, clear transgression, and corruption in the scale of justice. It only emanates from one who belittles the truth or prioritises his disputation over his religiosity.

Secondly: Who is this Abu ‘Iyād Who Was Lied Against?

“Sheikh Abu ‘Iyād Amjad Rafiq is one of the callers to Salafiyyah, known for his da‘wah and lessons in Britain and the Western world for thirty years. He was known to Shaykh ‘Ubayd al-Jābrī, who praised him and included him among his students. He has translated a great number of works and treatises of scholars and published thousands of articles in defense of the Salafi methodology and in protecting knowledge and the scholars.

Many Salafis in Britain, as well as a large number of English speakers worldwide who did not understand Arabic at the beginning of learning Salafiyyah—including many students of knowledge today, teachers, and graduates of Islamic universities—came to know the Salafi methodology and learned who the scholars of the Sunnah are and their legitimate status through the efforts of Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād and his brothers among the callers to the Sunnah in these Western lands.

Among his most prominent, firmly-established, beneficial stances and writings are his numerous treatises in defense of the Mujaddid, Imām Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhāb (may Allāh have mercy on him), defending him from the fabrications of the

people of innovation and the orientalist, and his refutations against the Surūriyyah and Qutubiyyah who infiltrated Britain and deceived many Muslims, alongside his refutations against the Ash‘aris in the West who tried to disguise their innovation by claiming to be Hanbalis and Ahl al-Athar, and also his refutations against the divisive Musa‘fiqah (supporters of Muhammad ibn Hādī).

He is a man who is loved by Ahlus-Sunnah due to that which he has put forth by way of efforts that are appreciated, and he hated by the people of innovation for what he has written in refutation of them. We do not attribute infallibility to him, just as we do not attribute it to other than him. However, the likes of Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād are the most deserving of people to be mentioned with good. And if there is a need to advise them or correct an error of theirs, our scholars have taught us that a Salafi, with a long-standing, good history of adherence to the Sunnah and defending it and its people, deserves that his honor be protected and his station preserved whilst simultaneously advising him and correcting his error if he errs. And Allāh knows best.” — *Written by our brother: Abu Abdillāh Zubair ibn Ibrāhīm As-Somālī (may Allāh preserve him), 23 Rajab 1447 AH - corresponding to January 13, 2026 CE.*

I say: Is it conceivable—after this—that this Shaykh be accused of such horrendous revilements?! Or is the affair one of desire, seeking revenge, and deliberate, intentional distortion?!

Thirdly: The Origin and Reality of the Fabrication

All these lies & fabrications did not emanate from Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād, neither in wording nor meaning. Rather, they are compounded fabrications, crafted with cunningness and cleverness by this plotting fox.

A similar incident occurred many years ago, I believe nearly twenty years ago. At that time, Shaykh Al-Bukhari and Shaykh Khālīd Ar-Raddādī (may Allāh have mercy on him and forgive him) listened to some ill-natured individuals¹ who carried revilements and fabrications against their brothers in Maktabah Salafiyyah (Salafi Publications) in Britain. They leaned towards them, believing them and began supporting them at the expense of Maktabah Salafiyyah (Salafi Publications) and its people.

So when the brothers came for Umrah, Shaykh Khālīd Ar-Raddādī (may Allāh have mercy on him) invited them to his house to honor them. They sat with him and had a friendly conversation, until he said to them: **“What do you think about repeating this gathering tomorrow?”** The brothers were delighted and under the impression that things were improving, especially after the expressed gentleness and friendliness.

Yet they were surprised to find, the very next day, that the meeting was not as they had previously thought. They approached Shaykh Khālīd Ar-Raddādī’s building, only to find Shaykh ‘Abdullāh Al-Bukhārī had gathered with them those very same ill-natured individuals who were striving to topple them and revile them, without prior knowledge or preparation.

1 Translator’s Note: These people were Tahir Wyatt and associates from Madinah-dot-com.

Then, an attack was launched against them, without giving them the opportunity to clarify or defend (themselves). They were compelled to write retractions regarding what had been falsely and slanderously attributed to them.

By the bounty of Allāh Almighty, our Shaykh, the Imām Rabī' bin Hādi al-Madkhalī (may Allāh have mercy on him), was present in Madinah that night. When what had occurred reached him, he became severely angry, denounced this action, and ordered the brothers at Maktabah Salafiyyah (Salafi Publications) to respond to Shaykh Al-Bukhārī and Shaykh Khālid Ar-Raddādī with a clear, knowledge-based response.

Similarly, our Sheikh, the 'Allāmah 'Ubayd bin Abdullāh Al-Jābirī (may Allāh have mercy on him), became angry when he learned what happened and denounced what had transpired by way of oppression, hastiness, and poor conduct.

Since that time, Shaykh Khālid Ar-Raddādī (may Allāh have mercy on him) cut off from them (i.e., Salafi Publications). As for Shaykh Al-Bukhārī (may Allāh pardon him), he was not pleased with their referral to Shaykh Rabī', arguing that "gatherings are a trust," although what transpired was not a gathering of advice and trust, but rather a surprise ambush wherein opponents were gathered together to compel the innocent to affirm what they never said.

Despite all this, Maktabah Salafiyyah (Salafi Publications) — praise be to Allāh — continued to respect Shaykh Abdullāh Al-Bukhārī, visit him when they came for 'Umrah, and advise students of the Islamic University and their own students when they went to Madinah to benefit from him, adhering to the methodology of Ahlus-Sunnah in observing justice, correcting error while maintaining status, and remaining loyal to the people of virtue.

Therefore, ‘Arafāt implemented his usual method of cunningness and deception. He took an audio recording from the recordings of Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād, took excerpts from it, twisted its wordings, and blew it out of proportion, filling it with lies and fabrication to deceive people.

At this point, every fair reader and every impartial listener has the right to stop and ask: What led Arafat to adopt this approach? What motive led him to this amount of lying and the inventing these successive fabrications and slanders?

The answer, for whoever desires the truth, is not based upon conjecture or assumption, rather, it is an explicit answer on the tongue of Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād himself. One of the brothers asked him this exact question, and he (may Allāh preserve him) responded with an answer that exposes the hidden cause, places the hand on the exact place of the ailment, and clarifies the reason for this deviation, without increase or decrease...

Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād (may Allāh preserve him) said:

“I believe the real reason for the attack was a defence of Shaykh Al-Bukhārī, because he is the origin of all this talk:

In 2021, when the vaccines came out and people started dying, and most European countries suspended the AstraZeneca vaccine in March 2021, I advised people not to take it. If they were in Muslim countries where it was required for work, I advised them not to take the mRNA vaccine and to take others like Sinovac (the Chinese vaccine).

They claimed that this was a revilement of the scholars and an accusation against them, that they do not know *fiqh al-wāqi‘* (the rulings pertaining to current affairs), and that I must stop speaking and return back to the scholars I think they meant

(only) Shaykh Al-Bukhārī. This was the issue I was discussing in the audio clip (i.e. the one ‘Arafāt used), when some of them were presenting these objections to me, saying: **‘Why do you speak about vaccines and the like?’**

Then later in the same year, they raised the matter to Shaykh Al-Bukhārī and he issued a verdict stating that whoever advises against taking the vaccine is sinful, and said: **‘What is the difference between you and ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd (al-Mu‘tazili)?’** He said we were doing it (i.e. speaking out against the vaccine) for money and fame. His response was ambiguous and contradictory; because he also said he was obliged to follow what the authorities where he resides, and cannot dissent from their opinion, and that medical matters are speculative and subject to disagreement.

At that time, I knew that this judgment of his, meaning the judgment of declaring a person sinful and what is on the verge of tabdī‘ (declaring a person to be an innovator), was incorrect and oppressive. But I chose to concede, considering the overwhelming benefit of the da‘wah and to prevent division. Then matters subsided during 2022 and early 2023.

Thereafter, when the pandemic officially ended in 2023, I began to publish on my website information about the harms caused by vaccinations and how to remedy them, after many people suffered illnesses and complications. I said in several places that the doctors and specialists who advised caution had fulfilled their duty religiously, professionally, and in accordance with the legal system in their countries. I mentioned more than once that they are not taking the path of the Mu‘tazilah, and that accusing them of that is not just.

In August 2023, ‘Arafāt, whilst in Indonesia, claimed that saying people died because of the vaccine is a lie, and said: **‘This is a lie.’** Consequently, what I was explaining made ‘Arafāt look bad in front of his followers. I also cited studies from Muslim countries, from Saudi Arabia and Jordan, to prove the harms of mRNA vaccines.

So ‘Arafāt’s followers began conveying this to him, and he and they felt offended because they did not want to admit they were wrong, and that Shaykh Al-Bukhārī’s verdict issued in 2021 was erroneous and harsh, and was not based on true facts.

Then in 2024, I published a link to an article based on a statement by Shaykh ‘Ali Al-Hudhayfī about ‘population control’ (i.e. that one of the goals of the vaccines — by their manufacturers own admission — is to control the Earth population). That was, I believe, on September 17th. Just a few days later, on September 19th, ‘Arafāt began his attack and began publishing a long list of accusations, all of them were based upon the same audio clip, and his approach was one which indicated anger and distress.

A conclusive summary of the real reasons:

1. Defending the status of Shaykh Al-Bukhārī and his harsh verdict which he issued and it is not the verdict of the senior scholars in Riyadh.
2. Defending ‘Arafāt himself; because he was denying an established fact, which is that the vaccines had indeed been the cause of harms, and due to the severe stance he took that made him look bad in front of his followers.

They also used to say: **‘Why doesn’t he listen to Shaykh Al-Bukhārī? Why doesn’t he take his advice? Why doesn’t he stop writing?’** and so on.

So, all this revolved around: not submitting to their authority, and publishing worldly information that made people see that they were wrong and harsh in their judgment on this issue.

In actuality, I was supporting the same position that was held by Shaykh Al-Luhaydān (may Allāh have mercy on him) during the swine flu in 2009, when he said the hype around it was nothing more than fear-mongering to sell vaccines, and his statement proved true, even though they mocked him and dubbed him ‘the “virologist” scholar’ (mockingly and sarcastically). Shaykh (Al-Luhaydān) also expressed skepticism about the Covid issue. In the same manner, they accused me, and accused all the Muslim doctors in the world who took a similar stance, that we are no different from ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd al-Mu‘tazili, and that we seek fame and money. Their followers in Europe repeated this accusation last year, and Allāh knows we are innocent and free from that.

This is the breif summary of my case.

As for a more general overview, then ‘Arafāt’s followers in Europe were saying things like: **‘Why don’t you refer your matters to Shaykh Al-Bukhārī ?’** and **‘Why have you left him?’** and the like. They also cited some speech from Sheikh ‘Ubayd during one of the conferences, wherein he gave us a tele-Link in 2021. In it, he mentioned his nomination of Shaykh Al-Bukhārī and ‘Arafāt to participate in the conference, and said verbatim: **‘I nominate for you after me,’** — meaning **I nominate them for you to participate (in the conferences) after me.** However, the translator inaccurately translated it as: **‘I leave as a bequest after me...’**

So, ‘Arafat’s followers began using this speech, and it became one of their main arguments: ‘Look, Shaykh ‘Ubayd told them

that they must follow Shaykh Al-Bukhārī and ‘Arafāt and refer affairs back to them, however they are not doing so.’

So in summary: This is the speech of ‘Arafāt’s followers, and it is not far-fetched that ‘Arafāt himself was the one indirectly conveying that to them, and Allāh knows best.” — *End quote of the speech of Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād (may Allāh preserve him).*

I say: And I do not deem it to be far-fetched either; rather, trustworthy testimonies & events affirm this. For the noble Shaikh; ‘Alī Al-Huthayfī (may Allāh preserve him) once narrated to me, saying: **“‘Arafāt and those with him have employed a large number of pseudo-students of knowledge to fight against the virtuous and the Shaykhs. He has networks and followers in India, Australia, and Qatar, whom he delegates to write articles that warn against students of knowledge, repel people from them, and distort their image.”**

Then he (may Allāh preserve him) mentioned a revealing example, saying:

“We have a French brother of Arab origin who wrote an article and sent it in a WhatsApp group. When the brothers reviewed it, they found that the entire article comprised of an attack on ‘Alī Al-Hudhayfī. They were astonished by the strength of its composition and the quality of its style. They said to him: **‘Whose article is this? You couldn’t be its author!’** He said: **“‘Arafāt is the one who put it together for me,’** or said: **“‘Arafāt assisted me with it!’** The French brothers in that group were shocked by this explicit confession...” End quote.

O servants of Allāh! What is mentioned in this article of attributing statements and positions to Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād Amjad Rafīq (may Allāh preserve him), while he is free from them, does not fall under the category of an accidental error, nor can it be attributed to a

possible misunderstanding. Rather, it is from outright lying, taking speech out of context, and evident slander, slander that borders on the level of *tabdīʿ* (declaring one to be an innovator) oppressively and unjustly, due to what results from it:

Toppling the status of the scholars, distortion of the Salafi methodology, incitement of the hearts of the common people and students of knowledge, and the invention of imaginary disputes taken as a pretext for revilement and causing discord.

Fourthly: The Knowledge-based Verification That Debunked the Lies

When the dispute was stirred, the turmoil increased, and accusations ensued in rapid succession, regarding an audio recording of Shaykh Abu ʿIyād Amjad Rafīq (may Allah preserve him), and statements were alleged against him that were not found present among its content, it was incumbent by scholarly integrity, legislative justice, and following the methodology of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamāʿah in verification and fairness, that the matter be investigated with a precise, knowledge-based verification, far from exaggeration and desires. Thus, this issue was examined as follows:

Firstly: The audio recording was referred to one of the trusted scholars known for piety and knowledge, one who is referred to in such matters, to examine its content and judge it with an objective, scholarly judgment.

Secondly: That scholar produced ten independent translations of the audio recording, then meticulously compared them to ensure accuracy and eliminate any possibility of error (in the translation), and exercised caution in understanding, since the situation is one of dispute; negligence or mere speculation is not accepted in it.

Thirdly: For further verification, he referred to a certified specialist in translating from English to Arabic, known for proficiency in this field, to ensure the correctness of the translation and the absence of misinterpretation or imposing meanings the wordings cannot bear.

The summary of the scholarly judgment after this methodological approach is as follows:

- That there is nothing in the audio recording that proves the claims attributed to Shaykh Abu 'Iyād, nor anything that implies those statements propagated about him.
- That the utmost that can be said, even if we concede hypothetically, is that there are ambiguous wordings in the recording that carry more than one possible interpretation, and it cannot be definitively established that they were intended in a corrupt or contradictory meaning. Coupled with having good opinion of Shaykh Abu 'Iyād due to prior knowledge of his methodology, and not concluding definitively that he intended a false meaning, let alone accusing him of what he did not explicitly state and what his speech does not entail.

Given that the issue has sadly become a point of dispute among some who ascribe to Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah, and that which occurs by way of turmoil and division, Shaykh Abu 'Iyād (may Allāh preserve him) was given brotherly, religious advice as follows:

- To retract the ambiguous wordings that might lead to misunderstanding.
- To clarify that those wordings are not intended to mean what some people understood or what was falsely and slanderously propagated about him.

Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād (may Allāh reward him with good) complied with this advice and retracted what could be understood as implication, without any explicit, contradictory statement being established against him. The retraction was only from the ambiguous wordings. This is from the perfection of piety, good intention, and sound methodology.

The Shaykh affirmed, in this context, his respect for the major scholars, his appreciation for their status and he mentioned a number of them, as well as mentioning their students from the well-known Shaykhs, among them: Shaykh ‘Abdullāh Al-Bukhārī, Shaykh Mustafa Mubram, and others from the people of knowledge, may Allāh reward them with the best reward on behalf of Islām and the Muslims.

Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād has also produced, and all praise is due to Allāh, clear, unambiguous speech explaining that what was previously attributed to him was lies and fabrication, and that the claims promoted initially have no basis in the audio recording, nor do they have a correct mode of transmission or knowledge-based verification. Refer to the attachments for that.

Thus, it becomes clear to every fair-minded person, the falsehood of what was attributed to Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād by way of fabricated statements, and that the issue, in truth, is nothing more than ambiguous wordings that were retracted in order to cut off disputation.

And whatever followed thereafter, by way of campaigns and vilification is nothing but lies and slander and is not based upon knowledge or justice, nor is it free from contradicting the methodology of Ahlus-Sunnah in regard to verification and upholding fairness & justice.

To add to this; despite the clarity of the truth, the establishment of the proof, and the collapse of false allegations, we, out of religious

duty, call upon our brother Dr. ‘Arafāt Al-Muhammadi, for the hundredth time, with a sincere call to return to the truth, and to repent to Allāh, Glorified and Sublime be He, from this dangerous approach, from lying against Shaykhs, taking speech out of context, and basing judgments upon other than clear, explicit evidence.

We call upon him that the repentance be an open repentance, with a clear statement, in which wrongs are returned to their rightful owners, in which he frees himself from the statements he falsely attributed to Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād, and in which he cuts off the remnants of fitnah. For indeed returning to the truth is better than persisting upon falsehood.

Just as we call upon him, if he is truthful in his claim of caring for the methodology and disseminating knowledge, to unite the ranks after repentance and clarification, and to break the pens that ignited the fire of this fitnah, including what one of Arafat’s followers, Muhammad Aslam bin Hāshim , published on his (X platform) page just the other day, renewing his attack against our brother Shaykh Abu ‘Iyād (may Allāh preserve him), and (we call upon him) to extinguish the tongues that fanned the flames of disputation, and to devote himself to what is beneficial, by way of: disseminating correct knowledge and calling with wisdom, not by distorting the image of brothers, toppling scholars and Shaykhs, and not by inciting disputes.

This is the way of Ahlus-Sunnah: Repentance before disgrace, clarification before abandonment, uniting the ranks before dividing them. And Allāh is All-Aware of the intention, and He guides to the straight path.

Written by Abul-‘Abbās Bilāl ibn ‘Abdil-Ghaniyy As-Sālimi (may Allāh pardon him), on the night of Thursday the 6th; in the Solitary month of Rajab, 1447 H.

Translated by Abu Inayah Seif.