EXCERPTS FROM

DESTROYING THE FALSEHOODS OF ʿABD AL-LAṬĪF BĀSHMĪL

by Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī رحمه الله

Providing Insights into the Origins, Methods and Goals of the Ḥaddādī Methodology

COMPILATION & ANNOTATION BY
Abū ʿIyaaḍ Amjad Rafīq

EXCERPTS FROM

DESTROYING THE FALSEHOODS OF 'ABD AL-LAṬĪF BĀSHMĪL



by Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī رحمه الله

FREE EBOOK: NOT FOR SALE

Title: Excerpts from ʿDestroying the Falshoods of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl' by Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī

Compilation & Notes: Abū ʿIyaaḍ Amjad Rafīq

Version 1.1: Muḥarram 1448 • July 2026

1st Ebook Edition: 1448H • 2026 CE

© 2026 TheNobleQuran.com

@AbuIyaadSP • AbuIyaad.com

All rights reserved worldwide. No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced or utilised in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, without prior permission from the copyright holder.

Visit:

Salaf.com • Aqidah.com • Manhaj.com
TheNobleQuran.com • AlHajuri.com
Takfiri.com • Bidah.com • Madeenah.org
SalafiBookstore.com • SalafiSounds.com

for Authentic Islāmic Information

Transliteration of Arabic Terms

In transliterated words, Arabic letters correspond to their English equivalents with the exception of the consonants below:

Consonants

ء	ʾ	ص	ṣ
ث	th	ض	ḍ
ح	ḥ	ط	ṭ
خ	kh	ظ	ḍh
ذ	dh	ع	ʿ
ش	sh	غ	gh

Vowels

Short: ـَ a ـِ i ـُ u

Long: ـا ā ـي ī ـو ū

Diphthongs: ـَو aw ـَي ay

Adulations and Salutations

عَزَّوَجَلَّ The Mighty and Majestic (Allāh).
سُبْحَانَهُوَتَعَالَى The Sublime and Exalted (Allāh).
تَبَارَكَوَتَعَالَى The Blessed and Exalted (Allāh).
صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ May blessings and peace be upon him (the Prophet).
عَلَيْهِٱلسَّلَامُ / عَلَيْهَاٱلسَّلَامُ / عَلَيْهِمٱلسَّلَامُ Peace be upon him / her / them.
رَحِمَهُٱللَّهُ / رَحِمَهُمُٱللَّهُ May Allāh have mercy upon him / them.

Note: It is impossible to translate the Qur'ān into any other language whilst retaining its full range and depth of meaning. Hence, all texts from the Qur'ān cited in this work, whilst providing an accurate enough rendition of the basic meaning, remain limited due to the limitations of the English language and are unable to convey what is in the Qur'ān of limitless meanings through its grammatical constructions in the pure and eloquent Arabic Language.

Contents

Foreword

7

1. The Scholars of Madīnah Emphasise That They Do Not Accept the Error of Any Scholar

10

2. Judgements Regarding Oppositions to the Sunnah Are Only For the Upright, Trustworthy Scholars

12

3. The Ḥaddādī Manhaj Does Not Observe Benefits and Harms In Making Tabdīʿ of People

15

4. Secrecy and Obscurity are From the Ways of the Ḥaddādiyyah and Openness, Clarity and Supporting the Truth is the Way of the Salafīs

18

5. We Wage War Against Partisanship and Amassing Followers Around an Idea or a Person

22

6. Provide the Evidence that We Have a Secret Political Call That Uses Machiavellian and Freemasonic Tactics

26

7. Oppression, Treachery and Clipping Speech to Instigate Tribulations Is from the Ways of the Ḥaddādiyyah

31

8. Four Foundations of the Ḥaddādī Methodology

36

9. The Fitnah of the Ḥaddādiyyah Requires Deep Reflection as it Relies on Deception and Cunning

41

10. Another Illustration of Ḥaddādī Treachery in Quotation and Ascription: Al-Albānī, Reviling Allāh and Irjā'

47

11. From the Traits of the Ḥaddadīs is Feigning Respect for the Scholars

58

12. Taḥākum (Arbitration) Is to the Book and the Sunnah, Not Ferkous

63

13. Our Da'wah Is Clear and Open, We Have No Need for Lying, Tricks, Camouflage, Ambiguity and Coercion

67

14. A Summary and Conclusion of the Study on 'Abd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl

75

Foreword



Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād seeded the Ḥaddādī ideology which is based on **exaggerating excusable and unintended errors and slips to facilitate *tabdīʿ*** as a destructive weapon to use against Ahl al-Sunnah, and to infuse divisions and enmities among them, all out of sympathy and support for the political *aḥzāb* and their goals. His speech began with attacking al-Nawawī, Ibn Ḥajar (رَحِمَهُمَا ٱللَّهُ) and their likes, whose oceans of goodness and service to Islām drown the errors they fell into, which they had inherited from their shaykhs and teachers. However, this was just a prelude to generalising this approach to contemporary scholars of the Sunnah. The first of those they targeted was Shaykh al-Albānī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) due to his role in standing up to and exposing the *jamāʿāt* and *aḥzāb* of *ḥizbiyyah* (partisanship) and *siyāsah* (politics). Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād is the origin of the approach, but he disappeared into obscurity after being expelled from Saudi.

The associate of Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād, **ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl**, claimed that the Shaykhs of Madīnah, such as Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) were calling to a deviant political methodology in complete secrecy built upon the errors of Shaykh al-Albānī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ). He accused them of being infiltrators, working on the inside for political objectives. He also claimed that they were following the ways of the Ikhwānīs by not making *tabdīʿ* of certain callers in Saudi Arabia. These Ḥaddādis had exaggeration in matters of *tabdīʿ* and *tajrīḥ*, aiming to incite discord and chaos within the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah.

To support their claims, they attached themselves to well-known scholars in Saudi because they opposed Shaykh al-Albānī in various issues, and they leveraged this attachment to attack Shaykh Rabīʿ and others. Bāshmīl became the main promulgator, spokesman and caller to the ideology in the late 1990s. After them, came the second wave Ḥaddādīs in the 2000s such as Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī, then Fawzī al-Baḥraynī and they carried on the methodology with their own infusions.

In this compilation, I present excerpts from the refutation of Shaykh Rabīʿ against ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bashmīl from 1418H (1998 CE) in which Ḥaddādī traits, behaviours and methods are exposed, those by which division and chaos is seeded in the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah. Sadly, these affairs have been forgotten or their importance is no longer valued, and as a result, in recent years, much confusion and splitting has occurred through such neglect and absence of diligence.

To help the reader keep everything in context, there are four groups:

The first are the Ḥaddādīs who bring exaggeration in matters of *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl*. The second are the Mumayyiʿah who bring laxity and softness in order to shield the people of misguidance and the *aḥzāb* (factions) engaged in blameworthy politics. Though these two groups appear to be opposites, they are merely approaches against Ahl al-Sunnah, and they actually have similar loyalties, sentiments and ambitions.

The third are Ahl al-Sunnah who are upon the Salafī methodology in speech and action, and especially in the arena of rulership, the position towards Ahl al-Bidaʿ and how to treat Ahl al-Sunnah and their errors. They proceed on the just methodology comprised of truthfulness, sincerity and upholding truth and adherence to principles and foundations.

The fourth group are those who try to treat the confusion resulting from the Ḥaddādīs (and the Mumayyiʿah) in the name of observing the benefits and harms (*al-maṣāliḥ wal-mafāsid*) and wisdom (*ḥikmah*) but end up corrupting the scales or use corrupt scales. And this occurs either due to their ignorance, or lack of insight in the affairs due to lack of grounding. Or, they have underlying, undeclared worldly interests, financial, or otherwise, that are in play and influence their actions. When such people enter the field in the name of rectification, the oppressor becomes the oppressed and vice versa, the aggressor becomes the victim and vice versa, he who has truth is silenced, vilified, pushed aside, and hindered, while he who is upon error and falsehood is left unhindered upon his path. Hence, the realities are overturned.

In a way, this fourth group does more harm to Ahl al-Sunnah than the Ḥaddādiyyah and Mumayyiʿah themselves because they allow the line between truth and falsehood to be blurred, hence, indiscoverable, and hence, wasted, leaving Ahl al-Sunnah confused and bewildered in such affairs.

Abū Iyaaḍ Amjad Rafīq
Muḥarram 1448 (June 2026)

CHAPTER ONE

The Scholars of Madīnah Emphasise That They Do Not Accept the Error of Any Scholar



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[11]

> "I emphasise that we — and praise is for Allāh — do not accept the error of any scholar, not Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, nor Ibn Taymiyyah, nor Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. Whoever gives preference to the saying of any one of them over the saying of Allāh and His Messenger (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), we say to him what Ibn ʿAbbās said: "I fear that stones will fall upon you from the sky! I say: 'Allāh and His Messenger said', and you say: 'Abū Bakr and 'Umar said?!'
>
> We take the position of the Salaf towards their errors, however lofty their statuses may be. We are not parrots, and nor have we been raised — and all praise is for Allāh — to be parrots, or upon blind-following, and reckless bigotry, which those who have not smelled the fragrance of knowledge from your likes wish to impose upon us.
>
> And you are not, if Allāh wills, except: Like (the mountain goat which) butted its horn against a rock one day to weaken it, but it did not harm the rock, and only weakened its own horn."

NOTES

Infallibility is only for Allāh's Messenger (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) in affairs of religion, and as for those besides them, no matter their status, their sayings in religious matters can be taken or rejected. Further, as

11 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/482).

they are not infallible, they are prone to error, and they can err even in the foundations (creed and methodology) alongside the branches. However, one must distinguish between:

a. The scholar or shaykh from Ahl al-Sunnah who errs, is criticised and returns back to the truth,
b. The scholar or shaykh who persists upon his error, and
c. The people of innovation whose errors arise from their deviation.

The first one has his honour maintained and is increased in rank for returning from error. The second, is treated with respect and gentleness, and after advice and correction if he persists upon error and falsehood, he loses his honour and diminishes his rank, regardless of his prior status and following. The third are warned against from the outset, as they are already upon deviation and misguidance.

This was the way of the scholars of Madīnah, among them Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī, Shaykh Muḥammad Amān al-Jāmī, Shaykh ʿUbayd al-Jābirī (رَحِمَهُمُ ٱللَّهُ) and others, and they did not consider even Ahmad, Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (رَحِمَهُمُ ٱللَّهُ) to be above knowledge-based criticism, let alone those besides them. They were not nurtured to be parrots and they did not nurture Salafīs to be parrots either, repeating the sayings of their shaykhs without knowing the evidences for what they say and judge.

However, today, after the passing of these scholars and those before them and greater than them, this way has become obscure, is harder to find and has been replaced by *ghuluww*, authoritarianism, sanctifying of figureheads and calls to blind-following, wherein unjust rulings of *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl* cannot be openly challenged on the one hand because of statuses, and critiques of violations of foundations backed by evidences are dismissed on the other, merely because of statuses.

CHAPTER TWO

Judgements Regarding Oppositions to the Sunnah Are Only For the Upright, Trustworthy Scholars



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[12]

> **"Clarification That Judging in These Matters is for Upright, Trustworthy Scholars, Not the Lying, Hateful Reckless Ignoramuses**
>
> Thirdly: who is the one to judge against us that we have opposed the true Salafī *daʿwah*? Is it the hateful, lying, ignoramuses such as your likes? Or is it the scholars of the true Salafī methodology, the people of fairness and justice!
>
> You are not the judge whose rule is pleasing, nor the noble one, nor the one with (sound) opinion and argument.
>
> Are you going to demolish the lofty edifices of truth which are based upon the Book, the Sunnah and the Salafī methodology with your lies, (displays of) ignorance and deceptions which fool only the wretched and the riff-raff? Far removed are the people of the true Salafiyyah that they should pollute their minds and their pure creed with the filthiness of the lies that they (the wretched and the riff-raff) have swallowed. For in every matter and in countering any falsehood, the Salafi methodology is based upon the likes of Allāh's saying:
>
> قُلْ هَاتُوا۟ بُرْهَـٰنَكُمْ إِن كُنتُمْ صَـٰدِقِينَ ﴿١١١﴾

12 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasāʾīl* (9/489).

"Say: 'Bring forth your evidence, if indeed you are truthful.'" [2:111]."

NOTES

Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) established that making judgements regarding violations and oppositions to the Sunnah is only for the upright, trustworthy scholars who are people of fairness and justice. They are people of sound opinion and argument and their rulings and judgements are received with pleasure and satisfaction because they are built upon evidence, careful consideration and justice — and may involve the avenues of engagement, dialogue and removal of misunderstandings where appropriate — so that their rulings are solid, and do not become the source of confusion and division among Ahl al-Sunnah.

In every matter, in every issue and in the countering of every falsehood, the way of the Salafī is: bring your proof if you are truthful. Further, they distinguish between oppositions for which a person can be expelled from the Sunnah and those for which he is not expelled.

As for the Ḥaddādīs and those who follow in their footsteps or resemble their conduct, their way is to build their rulings and make their judgements upon lies, fabrications, uncertainties, plausibilities, genuine slips and so on and sometimes they may make their attacks on the basis of intolerance to legitimate and permitted views that go against their own, or it may be on the basis of mere statuses and appeals to authority. They are believed by those partisan towards them and the riff-raff, not those who are grounded in and respect the Salafī methodology, and they are unable to survive scrutiny and subjection to principles. Thereafter, they play games of evasion and distraction when requested to provide actual evidence.

Some of them respond that their chosen scholar has already spoken and because he is Allāh's witness on earth who gives testimony for Allāh, portraying as if his judgement (in this case, of *tabdīʿ*) has divine sanction and cannot be interfered with. This sounds a bit like the way of Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī, that if you do not accept his rulings of *tabdīʿ* of known Salafīs but ask for proof, you have invalidated the messengerships and invalidated Islām and so on, as if his unjustified *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl* was synonymous with Allāh's judgement.

When they are approached and asked directly: "You made tabdīʿ of so-and-so, you accused so-and-so of being a plant, what is the evidence?", they have no response except total silence and evasion. Then they close the doors shut and block and boycott everyone who simply requests evidence upon the divinely revealed principle: bring your proof if you are truthful.

This behaviour involving exaggeration (*ghuluww*) and oppression (*ḍhulm*) has no connection to the methodology of Ahl al-Sunnah whatsoever and is not the way of the upright trustworthy scholars and those who follow them in the path of truth, justice and moderation. Rather, it is more in line with the way of the Ḥaddādīs of unjustified *tabdīʿ* (heresification), testing of people (*imtihān*) and boycotting them (*hajar*), all of which have been witnessed in the open, in full view.[13]

13 Refer also to:

- https://abuiyaad.com/q/rabee-jarh-tadeel-manhaj
- https://abuiyaad.com/q/rabee-follow-evidence
- https://abuiyaad.com/q/accept-truth-scholar

CHAPTER THREE

The Ḥaddādī Manhaj Does Not Observe Benefits and Harms In Making Tabdīʿ of People



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[14]

> "Are you and Farīd [al-Mālikī] not the very close, intimate associates of al-Ḥaddād? Rather, you were the one throwing him into difficulties which he did not want out of cowardice and fear of their outcomes.
>
> Did you (ʿAbd al-Laṭīf) not come to me with him (al-Ḥaddād) to debate with me about *tabdīʿ* of (certain) people in this country whom I refused to make *tabdīʿ* of, and you were insisting on their *tabdīʿ* and arguing zealously with me about it, and about the way of al-Ḥaddād himself, and I rejected that? And I said to you: "This is for the scholars, this is not for me. The only thing upon me is to discuss the errors of those (people), then after that, the ruling upon them is to be given by the scholars." I explained to you the risk that this adventure (of *tabdīʿ*) would cause to the *daʿwah*.
>
> I cited evidences for you from the positions taken by the Prophet (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and from the Sharīʿah principles. However, due to your intense enthusiasm for the Ḥaddādī methodology in tabdīʿ you would reject the evidences and the principles, especially regarding the benefits (*maṣāliḥ*) and the harms (*mafāsid*), and you would say: 'This is the way of al-Ikhwān al-Muslimīn',

14 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/510).

> while al-Ḥaddād remained silent, and you took lead with argumentation and obstinacy."

NOTES

01. Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) discussed and debated issues that al-Ḥaddād and his associates were trying to infuse into the *daʿwah*, which is hasty *tabdīʿ* of certain known personalities in the *daʿwah* (referring to the likes of Safar and Salmān). However, Shaykh Rabīʿ replied that making *tabdīʿ* is deferred to the senior scholars, and his duty is only to make their proven errors clear with evidences. He also warned these Ḥaddādīs about the great harms that the adventure of *tabdīʿ* would bring to the *daʿwah*, and that in making *tabdīʿ*, one has to consider the benefits and harms. However, they would reject the Sharīʿah principles in this respect.

02. The errors of the Surūriyyah, Quṭbiyyah were proven and clear (*takfīr* of sinners and governments, inciting against the ruler, praise of heads of innovation, encouraging demonstrations), and they justified *tabdīʿ*; however, Shaykh Rabīʿ understood what these Ḥaddādīs wanted, so he deferred the *tabdīʿ* for the senior scholars.

03. This Ḥaddādī approach was continued by Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī, whom Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī also advised, after he launched a war of *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl* against well-known personalities who had light errors, without consultation and referral to senior scholars, and without considering the benefit and harms. He denied these affairs as a matter of principle, claiming that providing the reasons for the *tajrīḥ* and *tabdīʿ* are not required, benefits and harms do not have to be considered, and he enjoined *taqlīd* of his disparagements against others.

04. This approach continued with Muḥammad bin Ḥāḍī and currently, the flag of unwarranted, unjust *tabdīʿ* without evidence has been taken by ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadī and his group who accuse

Salafīs of being innovators and plants[15] on account of affairs that do not warrant it, without evidence and without any consultation and referral to the senior scholars and consideration of the benefits and harms. These actions have led to turmoil, chaos, confusion, division and enmity among Ahl al-Sunnah, who are the fewest among the people.

05. There is a great difference between the scholars who are qualified to criticise and disparage and do so upon justice and fairness, and those following the way of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī and their likes which is to cut off a limb at the very first instance of perceiving danger, which may very likely just be imaginary, in their own minds, given that they are bereft of academic honesty and are characterised by treachery, deception and clipping speech. Indeed, those who resemble this way of al-Ḥaddād and Bāshmīl made *tabdīʿ* on account of lies, distortions and fabrications and affairs that do not warrant criticism in the first place, let alone outright *tabdīʿ*.[16]

---

15 Some *mashāyikh* have described ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadī as a plant based on his suspect activities, complicity in sedition, conspiring to deceive senior scholars in matters of war and bloodshed, praising innovators, and splitting Salafī communities, just as the *mashāyikh* of Egypt suspected Hishām al-Beily of being a plant, based on his history, affiliations with innovators, and his activities which include insulting the senior Salafī scholars of his land and stirring up the issues of *Īmān* and *Irjāʾ*. As for accusing Salafīs of being plants for cautioning against the harmful medications of Ahl al-Kitāb and discussing their fabrications and exaggerations in affairs of medicine for the benefit and the well-being of the Muslims, as scholars have done in the distant and recent past, these are not grounds for accusing people of being plants. Rather, it is slander and oppression.

16 Refer to:

- https://abuiyaad.com/q/rabee-haddadi-trick
- https://abuiyaad.com/w/rabee-advice-falih

CHAPTER FOUR

Secrecy and Obscurity are From the Ways of the Ḥaddādiyyah and Openness, Clarity and Supporting the Truth is the Way of the Salafīs



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[17]

> "Severe secrecy and obscurity surround you and surround your suspect activities and deception is your emblem and your cloak. But we — and praise is for Allāh — do not have a speck of deception, and we do not have except clarity (*wuḍūḥ*) and sincerity of purpose to Allāh, His Book, His Messenger (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and to the generality of the Muslims, regardless of whether they are loyal to us or oppose us.
>
> Whoever speaks the truth, we support him, and whoever speaks with falsehood and error, we refute his error with proof and evidences within the limits of our ability, and our books and cassettes testify to that.
>
> And we free ourselves from the errors of men, all of them, whatever level of knowledge they may have reached and from them is al-Albānī, whose most important errors we have refuted and announced our innocence from them, and our scholars and brothers also refuted them, those whom we supported in what was correct in their refutations.
>
> And we have established — and praise is for Allāh — that we do not worship except Allāh, and we do not follow except His methodology. We are not worshippers of rabbis and monks,

17 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/495-496).

> nor (are we from) the Rawāfiḍ, and nor from the extreme Ṣūfīs who sanctify personalities and believe in their infallibility."

NOTES

01. Shaykh Rabīʿ clarified that deception, secrecy and obscurity are the very opposite of the way of Ahl al-Sunnah who follow the methodology Allāh revealed, which is one of clarity (*wuḍūḥ*), openness and sincerity of purpose, with nothing to hide. Ahl al-Sunnah do not operate in the shadows, behind the curtains or under the tables.

Over the past years, some people have tried to belittle this issue of clarity, calling those who value it "*Aṣḥāb al-Wuḍūḥ*" (the People of Clarity) as a form of mockery. However, they do so in order to keep Ahl al-Sunnah, their students and common-folk, ignorant and deprived of a criterion so that their own erroneous ways are not exposed and so they can continue to keep a grip on their followers' minds and hearts and direct them where they wish. This is because they praise or sit with disparaged people or have ties to factions (*aḥzāb*) engaged in politics, behind closed doors, while showing another face to the public. Further, they undermine the role of reports, and threaten people against narrating things from them that would implicate and expose them. Hence, the war against clarity (*wuḍūḥ*) because they thrive in ambiguity, obscurity and evasion.

02. Shaykh Rabīʿ clarified that whoever speaks the truth is supported and whoever speaks with falsehood is refuted with proofs and evidences, no matter what his status. Ahl al-Sunnah support the truth, wherever it lies, and with whomever it lies, especially when that support strengthens, protects and fortifies Ahl al-Sunnah.

03. As for the errors of Shaykh al-Albānī, this was related to the issue of the Gulf War and issues pertaining to ḥadīth and

jurisprudence in which there were criticisms and refutations from various scholars such as Shaykh Ḥamūd al-Tuwayjirī, Shaykh Ḥammād al-Anṣārī, Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh al-Dawaish, Shaykh Muḥammad Amān al-Jāmī (رَحِمَهُمُ ٱللَّهُ) and others. When a scholar or a group of scholars criticise another, whatever is correct from their refutations is to be accepted and supported, regardless of the status of the one being refuted.

04. Those who follow the way of the Salaf love clarity (*wuḍūḥ*) because truth leads to clarity, and unity is built around truth, not confusion and error. For this reason, whenever you see a people mocking and belittling the issue of clarity (*wuḍūḥ*), and ridiculing Salafīs for calling to clarity and supporting any scholar(s) who bring clarity in an issue or in the religion in general, whether in affairs of creed, methodology, *daʿwah* and jurisprudence, then this may be an indication that they desire departure from the foundations, and this may become evident in their actions.

The Qur'ān and the Sunnah came with clarity, and the Salafī creed and methodology has clarity, its night is like the day (in distinctness), and the speech of the Salaf has nothing but clarity, and likewise, the speech of every truthful follower of their way, ought to have clarity, just as they are upon clarity when truth becomes known from error, and they take from those who are clear (*al-wāḍiḥīn*) during tribulations, as stated by Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) during past tribulations.

05. Finally, the Shaykh explained that Ahl al-Sunnah only follow Allāh's methodology which He revealed, that they do not worship rabbis and monks, and nor do they sanctify personalities and statuses which is the way of the Rawāfiḍ and Ṣūfiyyah, treating them as if they are immune from error. And these affairs can and have entered the ranks of the Salafīs, as the Shaykh himself observed: "But now exaggeration has spread in the arena of Salafiyyah, exaggerations, embellishments (in praise) are spread until some of

them have reached the level of the Rāfiḍah and the Sūfiyyah and Ḥulūl, and we free ourselves from this exaggeration."[18]

06. Ahl al-Sunnah do not venerate and sanctify the scholars as did the Jews and Christians with their rabbis and monks, and when they say "return to the scholars", they understand that it means the scholar who has proof and evidence for what he says, since they venerate the truth, not statuses, and they know men by the truth, and they judge to the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, not the statements of men, all of which can be accepted or rejected, save that which comes from Allāh's Messenger (ﷺ).

Hence, unlike the Jews and Christians, they respect the scholars and give them the lofty standing and status that Allāh gave them, without going beyond these bounds by sanctifying them, exaggerating in them, and making their words, statements and judgements to be the final authority.

And though they permit *taqlīd* of a scholar for the one who is incapable of knowing and understanding the affairs of his religion, unless it becomes clear that the verdicts and rulings in question are contrary to the Book and the Sunnah, they also do not discard the saying of the scholar that is backed by evidence just because of the accusation of "*taqlīd*".

18 Refer to: *Shaykh ʿAllāmah Rabīʿ bin Hādī's Advice to the Callers* (2025 CE, pp. 47-49).

CHAPTER FIVE

We Wage War Against Partisanship and Amassing Followers Around an Idea or a Person



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[19]

> "For we call to Tawḥīd and wage war against shirk. We call to Sunnah and wage war against innovation. We call to adherence to the Book and the Sunnah and uniting upon them and we wage war against partisanship and warn against it, drawing our understanding from the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Messenger (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and following the Righteous Salaf from the Companions, the Successors, and the Imāms of Sunnah and guidance. Not out of blind-following…
>
> Explain (with evidence) that our affair is (one of) partisanship (*taḥazzub*), and amassing a following (*takattul*) upon a particular ideology which opposes the Book of Allāh, the Sunnah of His Messenger (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and the methodology of the Righteous Salaf, in creed and legislation. And explain (with evidence) that we are gathering people around a specific person.
>
> If you were truthful in waging war against partisanship and amassing of followers (around an idea or a person), you would have known with certainty that we are the ones who truthfully wage war against partisanship and amassing of followers. And perhaps you know that and have certainty about it, but you are

19 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/497).

> from the type of people who know the truth and conceal it, rather, who give false witness for its opposite.
>
> And I say: Rather, you are the biased partisan calling to the amassing of people and you run here and there in the darkness to gather the people upon your extremist, exaggerating, Ḥaddādī methodology, and enlisting those who respond to you as soldiers for fighting against the people of truth, who are in truth, the ones who fight against the people of falsehood, and the people of partisanship and amassing of people (around them)."

NOTES

01. Ahl al-Sunnah call to unity around the Book, the Sunnah and the way of the Salaf, without attaching themselves to a shaykh or a personality and they do not call to blind-following. This is the way of the people of *taḥazzub* whose love and loyalty revolve around personalities, ideas, political calls or goals of the *ahzab* (factions).

02. From the identifiable traits of those who follow the Ḥaddādī methodology is to accuse others of what they themselves are guilty of and engaged in, which is partisanship and amassing followers around an idea or a person. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl accused Shaykh Rabīʿ and others of having partisanship (*taḥazzub*) for Shaykh al-Albānī and of being engaged in secretive call around the mistakes of al-Albānī.

03. When they are unable to provide evidence for their claims and their approach which in the case of Bāshmīl were centred around unjustified or premature *tabdīʿ*, or false claims such as accusing others of working secretly against the rulers and scholars, or severe attacks against Shaykh al-Albānī, they make it appear as if their opponents have bigotry towards an idea or a person (in this case, towards Shaykh al-Albānī), when in reality, they are the ones whose call is centred around an idea, a person, or a particular call with certain objectives.

04. One of the clear signs of this path is that they will wage a more severe and intense war against those who reject their *taḥazzub* and *takattul* (around a particular shaykh or an idea) than they do against the outright innovators and deviants, such as the heads of the Khārijites, or the Ashāʿirah, or the Muʿtazilah, and if you look at their history, you will hardly find an instance, if at all, where they have engaged in such an intense war. Rather, their most severe and intense war is against those from Ahl al-Sunnah who oppose their partisan ways.

05. The followers they amass in the process are turned into soldiers to fight against those who reject their *taḥazzub* and *takattul* and stand between them and their goals, which are often tied to partisan (*ḥizbī*) and political agendas.

06. In contrast, Ahl al-Sunnah, the people of *wuḍūḥ* (clarity), wage a truthful war — with Allāh's permission — against all forms of *taḥazzub* and *takattul*, around creeds and methodologies and figureheads and personalities. Hence, when you look at their speech, their writings, lectures and so on, they have speech against the Khārijites, Rāfiḍah, Muriʿah, Qadariyyah, Jaḥmiyyah, Muʿtazilah, Ṣūfiyyah, Ikhwāniyyah, Quṭbiyyah, Tablīghiyyah, the Ḥaddādiyyah, the Mumayyiʿah and refutations of the foundations of all of these sects and groups, and likewise against their leading figureheads and callers.

This is what you find in the speech and writings of Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabīʿ and those who are upon this way, which proves a truthful, consistent rejection of any type of *taḥazzub* and *takattul*, rather than a narrow, particular one fuelled by motives and agendas.

07. While they are engaged in these intense wars against the people of innovation and misguidance, along come the Ḥaddādiyyah and preoccupy people with their harshness, severity, *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl*, all under the guise of zeal for the religion. They cause schisms

and divisions and wage the fiercest of wars which perhaps have never been seen from them against any other faction, sect, group or individual. No, their most fierce war is against the people of the Sunnah who fight *taḥazzub* and *takattul* in all its forms, whether among the people of Islām or other than them.

08. The reason for this likely returns back to the fact that they have undeclared goals which they work towards, and which they do not disclose to the followers whom they amass for that purpose. So when those goals are exposed or hindered, their enmity surfaces. Otherwise, there is no explainable reason why such enmity should arise from them. There has to be some partisan goal tied to some person, religious idea, or some worldly affair or another.

CHAPTER SIX

Provide the Evidence that We Have a Secret Political Call That Uses Machiavellian and Freemasonic Tactics



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[20]

> "If the errors of al-Albānī have become a methodology for us which we call to with intense secrecy, and you are very knowledgeable of these secrets, then present them and explain that we apply them and call to them, and that it is a dangerous political methodology whose danger does not diminish from the danger of the Machiavellian ideology, the Freemasonic ideology and the ideologies of the Heretical Bāṭinīs, and that we are following the way of these political factions.
>
> And I believe with certainty that you and your likes are unable to do that, because it is not found. You have nothing before you except to enter the doors of lying and plunge into [argumentation with] falsehood, as is the habit of the wagers of war against truth in every time and place.
>
> We have responded to these fabrications and lies with what is sufficient and satisfactory. Any liar who has mastered the art of deception and falsehood is capable of levelling such accusations, no matter how foolish he may be."

NOTES

01. In the early 90s when Shaykh al-Albānī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) was not fully aware of the Surūriyyah and the deviations of Sayyid Quṭb — as

20 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasāʾīl* (9/492).

was the case with other senior scholars — ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl used this, and the Shaykh's position on the 1990 Gulf War, as well as al-Albānī's differences in jurisprudence with the Shaykhs in Saudi Arabia to attack the Shaykh and to throw Shaykh Rabīʿ and others alongside him, accusing them of being agents for a secretive political call that works against the rulers and scholars of Saudi Arabia.

So Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) refuted these allegations and exposed the deception, lies and fabrications of Bāshmīl, and the Ḥaddādīs in general. Their tactic was to make a display of defending the scholars of Saudi Arabia after throwing the errors of Shaykh al-Albānī onto Shaykh Rabīʿ and thereby accuse him and others of having a secret call centred around al-Albānī's errors.

02. Because Bāshmīl and the Ḥaddādīs themselves were the ones engaged in calling to *taḥazzub* (partisanship) and *takattul* (amassing followers),[21] they tried to undermine the integrity of Shaykh Rabīʿ by throwing this accusation against him.

This is one of the hallmarks of the Ḥaddādī methodology; these people resort to **outrageous lies** because they are bankrupt in evidences against their opponents, and using the art of deception and falsehood, they level these types of accusations as a form of intellectual terrorism to keep their followers in line and prevent them from listening to evidences and clarifications of truth. All of this while the history, writings and activities of those whom they slander in this manner are replete with evidence that this claim is patently false, which is something that Shaykh Rabīʿ amply demonstrated in his response to Bāshmīl.

03. After quoting Bāshmīl's statement: "The emergence of a new foreign *daʿwah* after the Gulf War similar to the calls of the Islamic, political factions… its people proclaim the slogan of 'Salafiyyah',

21 Refer to the previous chapter.

and call themselves Salafīs", by which he intended the *daʿwah* of Shaykh Rabīʿ — Shaykh Rabīʿ mentioned a list of points in refutation of his absurd claim, and they include (summarised), headed by the question: "What has disturbed you about this *daʿwah* and compelled you to distort it and portray it upon other than its reality":

- Is it the defence of Ahl al-Ḥadīth, past and present, and promoting the Salafī *daʿwah* which is established upon Tawḥid and the Book and the Sunnah as occurs in the book *Ahl al-Ḥadīth Hum al-Ṭāʾifah al-Manṣūrah*?
- Is it the book, *Maṭāʿin Sayyid Quṭb fī al-Ṣaḥābah*?, which contains a defence of the Companions of Allāh's Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), especially the third *khalīfah*, ʿUthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) and Banī Umayyah, and which comprises destruction of Socialism and its principles, and destruction of the false *takfīr* which Sayyid Quṭb relied upon to make *takfīr* of the ummah?
- Or is the book *Aḍwāʾ Islāmiyyah ʿalā ʿAqīdah Sayyid Quṭb, al-ʿAwāṣim Mimmā fī Kutub Sayyid Quṭb min al-Qawāṣim* and *al-Ḥadd al-Fāṣil bayna al-Ḥaqq wal-Bāṭil* which destroyed the falsehoods of Sayyid Quṭb and his great innovations. Those books which shook the people of desires?

Note: When the first of these books came out, some hate-filled Ḥizbī went out to collect mistakes of al-Albānī from his cassettes as a means of diverting people from these books refuting Sayyid Qutb. The intent being to say that look, al-Albānī has great mistakes as well, he is like Sayyid Quṭb. This is one of the traits of the Ḥaddādīs, that when a figurehead of theirs is refuted, they rush to compile the mistakes of the refuting party or one who is upon the same way, in order to divert attention and exonerate and shield the refuted.

Shaykh Rabīʿ continued:

- "Or is it the book *Manhaj al-Naqd* and the book *al-Maḥajjah* which make clear the true Islāmic methodology in protecting Islām in terms of its creed, legislation, methodology and foundations and destroys the false methodology of *al-muwāzanah* (mentioning the good points of the refuted when refuting) which necessitates destruction of those (Islāmic) foundations?
- Or is it the book *al-Naṣr al-ʿAzīz* which truly aided the Salafī methodology and repelled the falsehoods of al-Shāyijī and his group.

Then Shaykh Rabīʿ said:

> "So he says about this tremendous production of Salafī (authorships), "It is a new, imported *daʿwah*" and about its people he says: "They carry the slogan of Salafiyyah and call themselves Salafīs". So what is Salafiyyah according to you? And who are the ones carrying counterfeit slogans? Is it these (who author such works)? Or is your chiefs from the people of desires and innovations who clothed you with this garb to enable you to destroy?
>
> And we say again:
>
> You must explain with proofs and evidences the falsity of this *daʿwah* and its opposition to the methodology of the Salaf, otherwise, let the truthful people of this methodology be certain about who is the destructive tool against the Salafī methodology and who is restless because of his rise and prominence among the people of innovation and political parties?

04. From the above, the way that Shaykh Rabīʿ refuted this vile Ḥaddādī was to list all of his works in refutation of *taḥazzub* and *takattul* and foreign imported ideologies which aimed to undermine the Salafī creed and methodology and the foundations of Islām. So how can it be said, with all of these tremendous works, that its

author is an agent for an imported foreign political call? This is a mighty fabrication!

Shaykh Rabīʿ demanded the evidence from Bāshmīl who made this claim and continued to press him, again and again, because the onus of proof is upon the claimant, and these types of claims must be evidenced. However Bāshmīl was unable to provide any evidence because he was a lying treacherous Ḥaddādī with no integrity.

So this is the reality of Bāshmīl, the Ḥaddādīs and those who resemble them in their conduct. They make absurd and outrageous accusations — due to their inability to counter the strong refutations — and they appeal to the intellects and sentiments of unscrupulous people like themselves.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Oppression, Treachery and Clipping Speech to Instigate Tribulations Is from the Ways of the Ḥaddādiyyah



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[22]

> "Indeed, the oppression of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf is grave, and it is more severe in my view than the action of the most severe wagers of war against this (Salafī) methodology and its people, due to the oppression, treachery, and clipping of our speech and the speech of al-Albānī so that he can use that as a pretext to create trouble for us and to instigate tribulations in this and other lands in the name of protective jealousy for the scholars of this land. And he is a great liar (*kadhāb*), for his methodology and his Ḥaddādī past show emphatically that he is the most lying of creation.
>
> And Allāh's Messenger (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) says: "*Aid your brother, whether he is the oppressor or the oppressed.*" There would be no good in us if we did not aid the oppressed and defend him until even if he was a disbeliever, let alone a Salafī scholar, which is more worthy.
>
> And we are certain that ʿAbd al-Laṭīf does not (merely) intend al-Albānī (himself) by this intimidation, rather, he intends us, and he oppresses (al-Albānī) so that through this oppression he can take revenge against us and spite us."

22 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/501-502).

After this, Shaykh Rabīʿ provides just one notable example of many of the treachery of Bāshmīl in fabricating lies upon Imām al-Albānī. Shaykh Rabīʿ cites from a cassette recording from the *Silsilah al-Hudā wal-Nūr* series (no. 291), titled *Iqtirān al-ʿIlm bil-Sayf* (Pairing Knowledge with the Sword) in which Shaykh al-Albānī is asked about the "Wahhābīs" who do not send *ṣalāt* upon the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), do not visit his graves and about whom the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) made a prophecy, that Najd is the horn of the devil.

Shaykh Rabīʿ cites verbatim from the cassette over the next three and a half pages in which Shaykh al-Albānī describes the *daʿwah* of Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ), calling to Tawḥīd and rectifying the people, how the Turks were intent on destroying this *daʿwah*, and how he was aided by Muḥammad bin Saʿūd. He went on to praise the *daʿwah*, and how it led to people being able to do Ḥajj in security, when the affair was not like that before when people had to fear for their lives.

After citing all of this Shaykh Rabīʿ says:

> "He concealed this speech which is not concealed except by the most wicked of people, the most severe of them in treachery, and this action is the same type of action done by the Rawāfiḍ and the Jews. Then after committing the crime of this concealment, he then presents al-Albānī with a picture of a bitter enemy against the *daʿwah* of Imām Muḥammad bin ʿAbd al-Wahhāb whom al-Albānī defends often, as well as his *daʿwah* and he describes him as a *mujaddid* (reviver), and Shaykh al-Islām in numerous of his books. He also hides all of this yet extracts speech from al-Albānī, especially from cassettes, to (portray him) as a bitter enemy."

Shaykh Rabīʿ then asks: "Why all of this?" and he provides the answer which is that this Ḥaddādī Bāshmīl uses the attacks against Shaykh al-Albānī:

> "... to incite enmity, hatred and division between the people of Tawḥīd and Sunnah in the land, and for the benefit and service of whom? For the benefit and service of the enemies of this great *daʿwah*, upon their variant creeds and orientations."

NOTES

01. From the most notable and despicable traits of the Ḥaddādīs are academic dishonesty, treachery and clipping of speech, then committing oppression on the basis of this deception, as a means of inciting hatred, enmity and division among the people of the Sunnah. And Shaykh Rabīʿ saw it an obligation to aid the oppressed against these wicked actions of liars like ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl.

He stated that he would do this, **even for a disbeliever**, let alone a Salafī scholar.

In this instance, Bāshmīl deliberately concealed clear explicit speech from Shaykh al-Albānī in praise of Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and his *daʿwah*, while portraying him as the opposite. It's a very obvious example of deliberate fabrication.

02. But why do Ḥaddādīs like Bāshmīl do things like this? It's because they have affectations with the *aḥzāb*, had political agendas, and were grieved that they would be undermined by the *daʿwah* of Shaykh al-Albānī, Shaykh Rabī and others, which is based on gathering people around the Book, the Sunnah and the way of the Salaf, and shunning all forms of partisanship and bigotry, whether to creeds, ideas, methodologies, shaykhs or figureheads.

03. So what Bāshmīl intended was not the person of al-Albānī himself, but rather the Salafī *daʿwah* that Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabīʿ were united upon, despite internal differences and the errors that Shaykh Rabīʿ considered al-Albānī to have fallen into in his views regarding seeking the aid of non-Muslims in war,

issues of jurisprudence, and the issue of the one who reviles the religion or the Messenger (ﷺ).

> Whereas Shaykh Rabīʿ and the other scholars treated these affairs as unintended and excusable errors of Ahl al-Sunnah which can be criticised and refuted upon the principles of justice and fairness, this Ḥaddādī took them to declare Shaykh al-Albānī as a deviant, and this example captures the **obnoxious Ḥaddādī mentality** quite well. One can see the same behaviour with contemporary Ḥaddādīs such as Hishām al-Beily[23] of Egypt, and his attacks upon the senior scholars of his land (due to perceived or genuine errors) and prohibiting the invoking of mercy for them.

04. Ḥaddādīs like Bāshmīl were driven by jealousy and revenge and also because they are averse to the clarity and purity of the Salafī methodology which hinders their activities of creating chaos and division in the *daʿwah* among others as a means of facilitating and hastening their own goals, that serve certain interests.

05. To this end, they bring the most outrageous of slanders and fabrications, in this case, accusing Shaykh al-Albānī of being a bitter enemy of the *daʿwah* of Tawḥīd of Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, and likewise, claiming Shaykh Rabīʿ is an agent for a secretive political call centred around the opinions of Shaykh al-Albānī. These claims are not believed except by the dumbest of the dumb, may Allāh protect Ahl al-Sunnah from their likes.

06. Thus far in our series, we can summarise some of the traits and behaviours of the Ḥaddādīs:

- Hate clarity (*wuḍūḥ*) because they operate in ambiguity and evasion,
- Averse to evidence-based discussions,

23 Refer to: https://abuiyaad.com/w/arafat-beily

- Use diversionary tactics to divert from the foundational issues
- Exaggerate errors and slips of Ahl al-Sunnah and weaponise them
- Make rulings of unjust, unwarranted *tabdīʿ*,
- Boycotting of those who do not accept these rulings,
- Are lenient towards actual innovators, yet harsh and unforgiving towards Ahl al-Sunnah,
- Have ties to political *aḥzāb* and sympathy, defence and praise of innovators,
- Conspire against scholars through lying and treachery,
- Call to *taḥazzub* and *takattul* with *ghuluww* around personalities,
- Accuse others of what they are actually engaged in (*Taḥazzub*, Ḥaddādiyyah),
- Academic dishonesty, clipping and concealing speech,
- Accuse their opponents of being plants and agents without a shred of evidence.

May Allāh protect us and the *daʿwah* from their evils.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Four Foundations of the Ḥaddādī Methodology

In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[24]

> "Why do you not mention the methodology of al-Ḥaddād which you know full well, which is:
>
> a. Waging war against the contemporary scholars who are upon the Salafī methodology, and hatred and enmity towards them without excepting anyone, and belittling Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn Abī al-ʿIzz and his book, *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah*.
>
> b. Building this methodology upon extremism (*ghuluww*) in *tabdīʿ* and the (principle) that whoever does not make *tabdīʿ* of those whom the Ḥaddādīs make *tabdīʿ* of is also an innovator. And on this basis — in the presence of al-Ḥaddād — ʿAbd al-Laṭīf debated me about the *tabdīʿ* of specific individuals, whose *tabdīʿ* the scholars would refrain from.
>
> c. And his third pillar is the prohibition of invoking mercy upon the people of innovation, or the one who fell into innovation but whose *tabdīʿ* the scholars turned away from.
>
> d. Boycotting the innovator, not upon the way of the Salaf, but upon the methodology of al-Ḥaddād, one of the objectives of which is to confuse the Salafī methodology and its people.
>
> The first to boycott the people of Madīnah from the Ḥaddādīs was ʿAbd al-Laṭīf. He boycotted them upon this foundation

24 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/507-508).

> and strove to split the people of Madīnah and strike some of them through others. Does this not prove your lie and the severity of your deception and fraud? If you had mentioned these matters and given them the clarification they deserve, the people would have screamed [recognising] that this is your methodology, and that you are the severest of people in creating discord through it."

NOTES

01. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf played a game of duplicity, making it look as if he has little to do with Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād despite being his associate and the main promulgator of his methodology, and this is the way of the Ḥaddādīs, they use duplicity and feign ignorance.

Here Shaykh Rabīʿ outlined four foundations of the Ḥaddādī methodology. It is very important to focus more on the **skeletal framework** than the actual people concerned and location in question (in this case, Madīnah) because those were just the circumstances of the emergence of the Ḥaddādī methodology, and it is not restricted to one place or another, but represents a harmful, corroding, destructive approach that surfaces through harshness, just as softness and laxity can also have similar effects in their own way.

Let's look at each of these four principles:

02. **First**, waging war against contemporary scholars and showing hatred and enmity towards them. This should be correctly understood, from its basis. Maḥmud al-Ḥaddād declared past scholars like Ibn Ḥajar and al-Nawawī to be innovators and encouraged the destroying of their books. This was not directed towards those scholars specifically just because they may have had Ashʿarī leanings, or were in agreement with them in certain areas, but it was a general approach of bringing down scholars, past or present, on account of mistakes they may have fell into, but which

are drowned in the ocean of their goodness. Hence, the Ḥaddādīs also belittled Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn Abī al-ʿIzz, and then they moved on to contemporary scholars, making Shaykh al-Albānī their main target.

The principle here is attacking and belittling scholars on account of excusable slips and errors which no person is free from, and rejecting all of their goodness, just because of these slips. This outlook is the foundation of the Ḥaddādī methodology (followed in quick succession by *tabdīʿ*, absence of *taraḥḥūm* and *hajar*) and it operates on a **shoot first, ask no questions later policy**, and the approach of **cutting off the entire limb** at the very first instance of a scratch or minor cut, just to make sure no corners are cut in preserving the body's well-being and integrity. This is the Ḥaddādī mentality. Its butcherous and barbarous as Shaykh Rabīʿ said elsewhere.

03. Second, having extremism in *tabdīʿ*, which is passing oppressive rulings of *tabdīʿ* upon others and then demanding that the *tabdīʿ* be accepted by others and if not, they are also made *tabdīʿ* of and treated like innovators (through warning, boycotting). So this follows on from the first principle of taking what are excusable slips and genuine errors, even if they were in foundations, and using these affairs to make *tabdīʿ* of people, with malice.

> This discussion is about those who have passed and had excusable errors because the truth never reached them, or they had faulty interpretation and other circumstances. As for those who persist upon violations of the foundations and do not recant and repent and show stubborn opposition, malice and resentment after advice and correction, then effectively, they take themselves outside the fold of Ahl al-Sunnah.

04. Third, prohibition of invoking mercy upon the people of innovation, or the one who fell into innovation. This is one of the pillars of the Ḥaddādī methodology. As for Ahl al-Sunnah, they

do not prevent invoking of mercy upon the people of innovation, let alone scholars from Ahl al-Sunnah who had mistakes, or prominent scholars of ḥadīth, tafsīr and fiqh who were affected by innovations, and this emanates from the bonds of Islām and the rights of the Muslims. However, in certain cases, it may be withheld for a particular benefit, but this is an exception, not a rule, as it is with the Ḥaddādīs.

> This pillar is still implemented today by contemporary Ḥaddādīs such as Hishām al-Beily,[25] who prohibited the invoking of mercy for Shaykh Ḥasan bin ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā' (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ). But one should note the difference here. This issue is about invoking mercy upon actual innovators or those who fell into actual innovation, not Ahl al-Sunnah who are oppressively treated like innovators upon the way of Hishām al-Beily and the Ḥaddādīs.

05. Fourth, boycotting the innovator, upon the way of al-Ḥaddād that is, and note that this is regarding boycotting an actual innovator, let alone boycotting those upon whom false, oppressive *tabdīʿ* has been made. This issue of boycotting rests on the previous foundations, which are, taking excusable slips, extremism in *tabdīʿ*, and prohibition of invoking mercy (indicating malice). Hence, they call to this type of boycotting, the aim of which is to cause confusion and chaos among Ahl al-Sunnah.

06. This methodology was first directed towards Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabīʿ from the contemporaries, and its objective was to split the *daʿwah* of clarity (*wuḍūḥ*) in methodology and pit some people of knowledge against others. What is interesting to note about the last paragraph in the quote above from Shaykh Rabīʿ is how the Ḥaddādīs somehow pretend that they are not upon this methodology or some of its aspects, **when it is all but evident and visible in their actions**: *tabdīʿ* (heresification), *taḥdhīr* (warning)

25 Refer to: https://abuiyaad.com/w/arafat-beily

and *hajar* (boycotting) with malice, without credible or sufficient evidence, or on the basis of slips and errors that do not warrant it, thereby bringing confusion and chaos, surges in blind enmity and loyalty, and thereafter, splitting Ahl al-Sunnah by way of it.

07. We can mention once again, some of the traits of the Ḥaddādīs outlined in this series which help to identify the **skeletal framework** stripped of originating or localised circumstances:

- Hate clarity (*wuḍūḥ*) because they operate in ambiguity and evasion,
- Averse to evidence-based discussions,
- Use diversionary tactics to divert from the foundational issues,
- Exaggerate errors and slips of Ahl al-Sunnah and weaponise them,
- Make rulings of unjust, unwarranted *tabdīʿ*,
- Boycotting of those who do not accept these rulings,
- Are lenient towards actual innovators, yet harsh and unforgiving towards Ahl al-Sunnah,
- Have ties to political *aḥzāb* and sympathy, defence and praise of innovators,
- Conspire against scholars through lying and treachery,
- Call to *taḥazzub* and takattul with ghuluww around personalities,
- Accuse others of what they are actually engaged in (Taḥazzub, Ḥaddādiyyah),
- Academic dishonesty, clipping and concealing speech,
- Accuse their opponents of being plants and agents without a shred of evidence,

May Allāh protect us and the *daʿwah* from their evils.

CHAPTER NINE

The Fitnah of the Ḥaddādiyyah Requires Deep Reflection as it Relies on Deception and Cunning



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[26]

> "Indeed, the problems and tribulations of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf require reflection, contemplation and deep thought and what he makes apparent of loyalty to the state and to some of the scholars through deception and cunning cannot be taken (at face value).
>
> The problems of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, his tribulation (*fitnah*) and his tumult require the principle of ʿUmar (رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ), the second righteous caliph and the great genius (*al-ʿabqariyy al-ʿaḍhīm*), that barrier in the face tribulations: 'I am not a deceiver, nor can I be deceived by a deceiver' and (it requires) the comprehension of Ibn ʿAbbās (رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا) which strikes deep."

NOTES

01. The problem of the Ḥaddādiyyah is **a complex one** and this is why it requires deep thought and is not for the simple-minded who do not see beyond the superficialities and judge by appearances and claims. This is because the Ḥaddādī enterprise is **a means to an end** and **makes use of great cunning and deceit**, and behind it are goals and objectives tied to politics and the *aḥzāb* (factions). This is why it is a mistake to take those who manifest it at face value.

26 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/527).

02. Further, it would also be a mistake to think that there are a group of people called **Ḥaddādīyyah** and there are another group of people who are **Mumayyiʿah**, and that they are opposites who fight each other, and fight Ahl al-Sunnah separately.

Rather, each of these two orientations are simply approaches to the same or similar ends, and underlying them and driving them are many things: They can include: a) political ambitions and objectives, b) grievances, c) false principles and commitment to an ideology, d) *taḥazzub* and *takattul*, which are partisanship and amassing followers around an idea or around a shaykh, e) enmity towards Ahl al-Sunnah, f) worldly interests and other such affairs.

03. Thus, the approaches of **harshness (*Ḥaddādiyyah*)** and **softness (*Tamyīʿ*)** can be found in the same person or group of people at the same time, or may be alternated according to time and circumstances. This helps to explain some of **the strangest of affairs**, such as a people who speak a lot about gentleness, softness, forgiveness, unity, cooperation and so on, and then in an instance, they flip and, lo and behold, they are on the bandwagon of *tabdīʿ*, *taḍlīl*, *taḥdhīr*, *tajdīʿ* and *hajar* with a fiery passion.

This shows that the real drivers are not the harshness and softness in themselves, **but particular interests**, desires and goals which require different behaviours at different times and circumstances or towards different sets of people.

04. Shaykh Rabīʿ mentioned how the problems of the Ḥaddādīs, their tribulation and tumult require a very particular approach comprised in the speech of ʿUmar (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ), which is that **though we ourselves do not deceive and act in a deceptive manner, we will not be deceived by the deceivers either**, as if we do not understand the nature of deception. Likewise, it requires a very profound and deep understanding, and this returns to the fact that this problem is not merely about harshness in and of itself, but that the Ḥaddādī enterprise emanates out of circumstances inseparable

from **the affairs of politics** and **the activities of the** *aḥzāb*, with **hidden loyalties**, hence the importance of understanding the previous point.

05. Shaykh Rabīʿ also mentioned one of the traits of the Ḥaddādiyyah which is that they make **an apparent display of loyalty to the state and to the scholars**. In the originating circumstances of the Ḥaddādī enterprise, it happened to be apparent loyalty to the scholars of Saudi because they had criticisms against Shaykh al-Albānī in relation to the Gulf War and other issues of jurisprudence.

The Ḥaddādiyyah targeted the *daʿwah* of al-Albānī and claimed that Shaykh Rabīʿ was an agent for a secretive political call in Saudi Arabia against the rulers and scholars, and hence, they spoke of "returning to the scholars" and showed apparent loyalty for the state by vehemently opposing the Surūriyyah and Quṭbiyyah, wanting Shaykh Rabīʿ to hastily make *tabdīʿ* of them openly to create tribulations. However, these were just instruments for their real goals.

06. The point being made is that one should not be deceived by their apparent loyalty to the rulers and the scholars, as this is a means to an end. In reality, they would have been very quickly exposed in their claims when, say for example, a matter of war, bloodshed, security and stability arises, and they blatantly oppose the scholars and rulers, and work sedition in the land. This would reveal that their apparent respect for the scholars and rulers was not genuine and simply a means to an end, and that they say and command that which they do not do themselves when required to do so, in the most dire and serious of situations.

07. In short, whoever thinks that Ḥaddādiyyah is just about harshness in and of itself and what is associated with it of *tabdīʿ*, but fails to incorporate the originating circumstances and the dynamics of the Ḥaddādī enterprise as a whole will not grasp its

reality and fail to make a correct interpretation of chains of events and fail to take the necessary precautions.

Allāh exposed the **First Wave Ḥaddādiyyah** through scholars such as Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ), and will continue to expose them through scholars and *mashāyikh* who are upon the same way, those who are not deceived by the deceivers.

COMPREHENSION EXERCISE

What has been explained above can be demonstrated with a case study of a Ḥaddādī in Egypt named Hishām al-Beily. The reader can read the document: *Imām al-Albānī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ). the Ḥaddādiyyah, Hishām al-Beily, the Topic of Īmān and Irjā'*[27] (10 pages), which is a follow-up to an earlier document on the subject,[28] and should note the following:

01. Targeting Shaykh al-Albānī with the accusation that he fell into *Irjā'*, having allegedly agreed with the "Ashʿariyyah Murji'āh".

02. Making an apparent attachment to certain shaykhs, such as Shaykh al-Fawzān and the shaykhs in Riyadh, and extracting speech from them, through secret recordings, to allow Shaykh al-Albānī to be attacked so that the accusation of "agreeing with the Murji'ah" might gain credibility and stick, while shielding oneself by saying, "But I do not say he is a Murji'." This is nothing more than an opening point to penetrate the *daʿwah* and make inroads.

03. Claiming attachment to Shaykh Rabīʿ, while opposing his advice and his verdicts in one's actions.

04. Claiming to have protective jealousy for the foundations of the Sunnah by presenting ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ al-Sīsī has having fallen into *khurūj* (rebellion), but in reality, using the issue out of sympathy

27 Read here: https://abuiyaad.com/d/beily-albani-irja

28 Read here: https://abuiyaad.com/d/rabee-similitude

for Muḥammad al-Mursī and his government and to attack, revile and belittle the Salafī scholarship of the land, Shaykh Ḥasan bin ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Bannāʾ and Shaykh ʿAlī al-Waṣīfī, indicating the role of political motivations and sentiments in opposing senior scholarship, while feigning attachment to another group of scholars.

05. Defending, praising and accompanying deviants such as Maḥmūd al-Kūlī and Muḥammad ʿAbd al-ʿAlīm al-Māḍī, who accuse the Salafī shaykhs of *Irjāʾ*.

06. Attacking and degrading those who call to adherence to the Salafī methodology in the affair of rulership, leadership, legitimate authority and issues of rebellion.

07. Scheming to use some scholars to attack and sideline others and lying to scholars or deceiving them to extract speech in order to justify one's conduct and course of action.

08. Making oppressive *tabdīʿ* of Ahl al-Sunnah, prohibiting the invoking of mercy upon them, and calling for their boycott, and then boycotting and warning from those who do not agree with these oppressive rulings based on lies and misrepresentations.

CLOSING NOTE

As mentioned previously, it is important to focus on the skeletal framework stripped of originating and localised circumstances, as it allows the Ḥaddādī enterprise to be more easily recognised whenever it is in motion.

It also allows us not to fall into the trap of seeing the Ḥaddādiyyah and Mumayyiʿah as two mutually exclusive groups or categories, because it is not the harshness or softness in and of itself that is at the root and core. Rather, there is something deeper that gives rise to the application of harshness and softness as means to certain ends.

This is why you see both behaviours and approaches from the same people, either at the same time, or at different times, based on circumstances. Hence, al-Beily reviles and attacks Ahl al-Sunnah on the one hand, makes *tabdīʿ* of them, calls for their boycotting, but at the same time, he has close friendship with innovators who accuse Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabīʿ of *Irjāʾ*. He appears to call for the absence of rebellion and not going against the rulers in apparent veneration of the foundations, but in reality, it is just a means to attack others. He claims to respect and return to the scholars, but it is only out of cunning and deception, for particular ends. When it comes to the crunch, however, in a major issue affecting an entire nation, he actually opposes the scholars of his land and ignores their statements and verdicts.

Likewise, as noted earlier, it is why some people speak about softness, gentleness, brotherhood, unity, sweet melons and mangoes at one time, then with a quick change of circumstances, they are riding on the Ḥaddādī bandwagon, celebrating and revelling in *tabdīʿ*, *tadlīl*, *hajar*, fiery chillies and bitter colocynths, the next.

CHAPTER TEN

Another Illustration of Ḥaddādī Treachery in Quotation and Ascription: Al-Albānī, Reviling Allāh and Irjāʾ



Towards the end of his refutation of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf's many falsehoods, Shaykh Rabīʿ gives another illustration of his treachery in citation and ascription, this time regarding the issue of the *takfīr* of the one who reviles Allāh, or the Messenger (ﷺ) or the religion.[29]

Shaykh al-Albānī had some speech in the matter in which he cautioned against making hasty *takfīr* of those who, due to evil cultivation and customs, say words which may comprise revilement but which they may not intend due to ignorance, or due to saying them in anger.

This was one of the issues used by the Ḥaddādīs to stir the issue of *Īmān* and *Irjāʾ* as a means to an end. Bāshmīl took a discussion of Shaykh Rabīʿ on the matter from one of his cassette recordings and distorted some of his speech to make it appear that Shaykh Rabīʿ supports the presumed error of Shaykh al-Albānī by making false claims about the view of some of the Salaf.

This is the speech in question, in which Bāshmīl inserted a pronoun to a verb to alter what was intended:

29 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasāʾīl* (9/527).

★إضافته ضميرًا من الضمائر المتصلة في كلامي إمعانًا في الخبث:

حكى عبد اللّطيف أنّني قلت (ص/ ١٦٣):

«أنا أقول: إنّ سابّ اللّه أو سابّ الرّسول كافر، ووجد ناسٌ من علماء السلف ما يكفّرونه، يأتون بأعذار، فأنا أعذره وأناقشه».

أقول:

أنا قلت: وُجد ناسٌ من علماء السّلف ما يكفّرون، هكذا بدون الضمير المنصوب (ما يكفّرون).

ألا ترى هذا الرجل كيف يفتري عليّ.

إنّه جاء بهذا الضمير ليفهم القارئ أنّه عائد إلى خصوص سابّ اللّه، فأكون قد نسبت إلى بعض علماء السّلف أنّهم لا يكفّرون سابّ اللّه، ويلتمسون الأعذار لمن يسبّ اللّه.

In the above, Bāshmīl changed (يكفـــرون) to (يكفرونـــه) to make it look as if Shaykh Rabī' was speaking specifically about the one who reviles Allāh, and was saying that some of the scholars from the Salaf did not make *takfīr* of the one who reviles Allāh and granted him excuses.

Shaykh Rabī' (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:

> "He came with this (extra) pronoun to make the reader understand that it returns back (specifically) to the one who reviles Allāh, such that I had ascribed to some of the Salaf that they do not make *takfīr* of the one who reviles Allāh and make excuses for the one who reviles Allāh.
>
> If he had left my expression as it was, it would not have given this meaning. Rather, it would have afforded the broader meaning because the matters for which *takfīr* is made are many, and the Salaf are agreed on some of them and differed about others. Among them are those who make *takfīr* on account of some of these matters and among them are those who do not make *takfīr*, and provide excuses for those who fall into some of these nullifiers.

> But this is the issue that ʿAbd al-Laṭīf does not want people to understand. Why? Because his extremist Ḥaddādī methodology dictates that he engages in war, destruction and tumult, even if by way of fabricating, lying, distorting, concealing, and adding (to words) and taking away (from words).
>
> Does this *hāʾ* pronoun not resemble the *nūn* of the Jews and the *lām* of the Jahmites?!"[30]

After this, the Shaykh explains how Bāshmīl cited a paragraph from Ibn Taymiyyah, but just like he did previously when he portrayed Shaykh al-Albānī as a bitter opponent to Shaykh Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb through selective citations and concealment of clear speech, he did the same with Ibn Taymiyyah's speech in *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl*, the book that deals with the issue of reviling Allāḥ (عَزَّوَجَلَّ), the religion, and the Messenger (صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ), and through it, he falsely accused Shaykh Rabīʿ of trying to excuse Shaykh al-Albānī and provide a way out for his error by asserting that the issue was differed over among the Salaf.

---

30 Referring here to what the Jews did of adding the letter *nūn* to the word *ḥiṭṭah*, which they were ordered to say when entering Bayt al-Maqdis, and it meant the seeking of forgiveness for their sins. However, they distorted it by adding an extra letter to turn into *ḥintah*, which is a type of wheat. As for the Jahmites, they added a *lām* to *istawā* to make it *istawlā* and this is due to their rejection of Allāh's Attributes and Actions. Hence, this is *taḥrīf* of the wording. And this is one of the traits of the Ḥaddādīs, which is to add letters and words to speech deliberately.

To give an example, someone might say something factual regarding worldly sciences and industrialisation, that the Arabs: "recently came out of the desert into oil riches and used the money to buy foreign expertise" — something openly said by prominent statesmen in those same countries — and then someone upon the way of Bāshmīl comes along and ascribes the statement: "the scholars are desert Bedouins who are not proficient" to the author of that speech. For more examples, refer to https://abuiyaad.com/w/arafat-lies.

So Shaykh Rabīʿ responded to this:

> "I — and praise is for Allāh — replied about this issue — the *takfīr* of the reviler — with what all of the Imāms of the Sunnah hold, and with the verdicts delivered by our scholars, shaykhs and associates, not the scholars and shaykhs of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, the extremist Ḥaddādī.
>
> But those (who I am referring to) are not your shaykhs, and nor have the Ḥaddādīs taken knowledge from them, rather you have clung to some of them for a time for Satanic objectives, and from them is to say to people: "Our mashāyikh, our scholars", in order to promulgate your rebellious Ḥaddādī merchandise behind the veil of Salafiyyah, and as a means to instigate tribulations between Ahl al-Sunnah.
>
> But to those who know the Ḥaddādis, you are known and unveiled, so go easy on yourself."

Then Shaykh Rabīʿ — having read *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* a while back and suspecting that Bāshmīl was treacherous in quoting — he returned to the book to verify the quote, and he found what he suspected. That Bāshmīl omitted key details before the paragraph that he quoted and failed to present the matter objectively and with integrity.

The Shaykh brought the citations from Ibn Taymiyyah over the next page and a half.

The essence of it is that Bāshmīl quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah a consensus of the disbelief of the one who reviles Allāh or the Messenger, and then he quoted a paragraph in which Ibn Taymiyyah said what some like al-Qāḍī Abū Yaʿlā fell into, of saying the revilement is only disbelief when it is declared lawful (*istiḥlāl*), was because they were affected by the speech of some of the later theologians (*mutakallimīn*), who held that *īmān* is the assent (*taṣdīq*) of the heart, and that it is a big mistake.

However, Bāshmīl excluded a sentence of Ibn Taymiyyah right before the quote in which he had said:

«وهذا موضع لابدّ من تحريره، ويجب أن يُعلم: أنّ القول بأن كفر السَّابّ في نفس الأمر إنّما هو لاستحلاله السبّ؛ زلّة منكرة، وهفوة عظيمة، ويرحم اللَّه القاضي أبا يعلى، فقد ذكر في غير موضع ما يناقض ما قاله هنا، وإنّما وقع مَن وقع في هذه المهواة بما تلقّوه من كلام طائفة من متأخّري المتكلّمة، وهم الجهميَّة الإناث، الذين ذهبوا مذهب الجهميَّة الأولى في أن الإيمان هو مجرّد التصديق الذي في القلب، وإن لم يقترن به قول اللّسان، ولم يقتض عملًا في القلب ولا في الجوارح»[1].

> "May Allāh have mercy upon al-Qaḍī Abū Yaʿlā, for he has mentioned what contradicts what he said here in other places..."

And it appears that he did not want the reader to know this, because it goes against his objectives. This is because Ibn Taymiyyah asked Allāh to show mercy to Abu Yaʿlā, and the Ḥaddādīs have an issue with invoking Allāh's mercy for those who fall into innovation or are accused of it. And also, he said that Abu Yaʿlā has other speech contradicting this view in other places. So this is from the angle of justice and mercy which the Ḥaddādīs do not recognise as their methodology is based on oppression and malice.

On this matter there are some points and observations which we can discuss below.

NOTES

01. As we said in previous articles regarding the Takfīrīs and Khārijites, when they cite from scholars, and in particular from Ibn Taymiyyah, **the base rule** is to be suspicious, cautious and unaccepting of their quoting as it is replete with academic dishonesty and treachery through additions, omissions, concealments and distortions. **It's the same with the Ḥaddādīs**. They are treacherous in citation as it relates to both their opponents and to the scholars whose words they rely upon.

02. Bāshmīl misquoted Shaykh Rabīʿ by changing his words, thereby changing his intent, and he did so in order to make it appear that Shaykh Rabīʿ supports or defends al-Albānī in a presumed error, in this case, the issue of reviling (*sabb*).

> The Takfīrīs, Ḥaddādīs, Quṭbīs took al-Albānī's speech about revilement (*sabb*) and bad cultivation, and accused him of the *Irjā'* of Jahm bin Ṣafwān, making it appear as if he does not hold revilement to be disbelief, and that disbelief does not occur through speech and action, but only through belief. And they would use some speech of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding the matter to accuse him of the *Irjā'* of the Jahmiyyah and Ashʿariyyah.

03. This issue that was stirred against Shaykh al-Albānī was later clarified by the Shaykh himself when Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿUbaylān went to al-Albānī and recorded a discussion about the matter. In it Shaykh al-Albānī clarified his actual position. This was the cassette recording which upon the advice of Shaykh Rabīʿ, I translated in 2000 and published with Allāh's *tawfīq* in refutation of the Quṭbīs, Takfīrīs and the Ḥaddādīs.

04. The essence of the matter was that Shaykh al-Albānī was speaking about the conditions required to make *takfīr* of a person in this issue, and said that he must **"know and intend what he is saying"**, and not that he was denying that reviling Allāh and His Messenger is disbelief on its own. The shaykh gave an illustration of a person who could be in a fit of rage and say things without knowing or intending revilement through what the said.

The Shaykh (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said in the discussion with Shaykh al-ʿUbaylān:

> "So reviling like this, if it happens when a person is enraged, it means that repentance should be sought from the person, and he should be punished, and lashed etc.
>
> But if we want to pass a judgement that he has become a disbeliever, and apostatised, then we must accompany it with

> his approval of what he has done. If he approves of it, then it is apostasy and he is to be executed, as is well-known in Islām, from his saying (ﷺ): '*Whoever apostatises from his religion, then kill him.*'"
>
> ~
>
> "But if he follows his words with asking for forgiveness, and with repentance to Allāh (ﷻ) then this is a proof that it was an eruption of rage, and we cannot apply to it the same consequences that we would apply to speech emanating deliberately and intentionally."
>
> ~
>
> "It is known to all of the scholars that sayings are to be taken in accordance with the intention (*qasd*) of those who said them..."
>
> ~
>
> "So this person was not intending (*qasd*) revilement of what he reviled, so it is not permissible for us to judge him in accordance with his words when his heart is in opposition to his saying. This is my view concerning this matter."

Thus, the speech of al-Albānī was regarding making the actual judgment of *takfīr*, and ensuring the conditions are met, and he distinguished between words through which revilement is intended and are deliberate and those which are not, and all of this from the perspective of the great danger of making *takfīr* of a Muslim. He affirmed the revilement (*sabb*) is *kufr*, and that *kufr* occurs by speech, as it does by action, and also spoke of the conditions and barriers to *takfīr*, all of it in agreement with the speech of other scholars, past and contemporary.

05. The quote used by Bāshmīl from Ibn Taymiyyah regarding the grave error of al-Qāḍī Abu Yaʿlā that revilement is *kufr* when it is made lawful (*istiḥlāl*) was to enable the accusation that al-Albānī

has *Irja'* (of the Ashʿariyyah, Jahmiyyah), and that Shaykh Rabīʿ defends him.

So, we have:

- Bāshmīl misquoting and lying upon Shaykh Rabīʿ by adding to his words,
- Selectively quoting from Ibn Taymiyyah and misapplying his speech regarding al-Qāḍī Abū Yaʿlā and the issue of *istiḥlāl* of revilement to a different issue that al-Albānī was discussing, and
- Omitting the part where Ibn Taymiyyah invokes mercy for Abu Yaʿlā.

All in order to stir controversy, tribulation and tumult.

Shaykh Rabīʿ stuck a final stake into this Ḥaddādī through his closing remarks on the issue,[31] and in short, the Shaykh explained how those Ḥanbalī jurists who erred in this matter are to be treated, they are respected, Allāh's mercy is invoked for them, and are from Ahl al-Sunnah, loving the Sunnah and defending it. This is the way of Ibn Taymiyyah, not the way of the extreme Ḥaddādīs, like Bāshmīl who wishes to belittle and sideline scholars and who makes use of treachery and lying in aid of his cause. The Shaykh asked these Ḥaddādīs to judge people with the scales of justice and fairness, and not by Satanic scales, and asks them if they are going to truly repent.

06. After Shaykh al-Albānī clarified his position in the discussion with al-ʿUbaylān, about which Shaykh Rabīʿ said that it should be spread, the Ḥaddādīs continued in their lies and fabrications and provided fuel for the Takfīrīs and Quṭbīs to continue using this issue. As a result, accusations of the Irjā' of the Ashāʿirah and Jahmiyyah against Salafī scholars remain till this day.

31 Read here: https://abuiyaad.com/d/rabee-bashmil-sabb-last-remark

From the Ḥaddādī deviants upon this path is Hishām al-Beily[32] who claims that al-Albānī agreed with the Ashʿarī Murjiʾah while there are found those who **defend him, praise him and say he is a Salafī with no errors**,[33] having the right to criticise al-Albānī and to attack those who attack him in retaliation, and they also just happen to be involved in other things such as:

- Complicity in rebellion and sedition in a Muslim land, against legitimate authority, and matters of bloodshed and war.
- Supporting the causes of political factions (*aḥzāb*).
- Conspiring to deceive scholars regarding matters of war and bloodshed and concealing some of the verdicts that run contrary to political ambitions and agendas.
- Treachery and lying in citation and ascription, inserting words and concealing highly relevant speech.
- *Tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl* of Salafīs without evidence.
- Calling to boycotting (*hajar*) of Ahl al-Sunnah.
- Specifically targeting Shaykh al-Albānī on fiqh related issues.
- Calling to *tahazzub*, *taʿaṣṣub* and *takattul*.
- Splitting Salafīs all across the world.
- and more.

07. Also of note is what Shaykh Rabīʿ mentioned about how Bāshmīl and the Ḥaddādīs make an opportunistic attachment to scholars and present themselves as those who return to the senior scholars and respect them, but in reality, this is just a show for spreading their Ḥaddādī merchandise. They do this in order to instigate tribulations through controversial knowledge-based issues, but without really respecting and returning to those scholars more broadly speaking, in grave and serious matters. One of the clearest of proofs for this is that when it comes to major issues of leadership,

32 Refer to: https://abuiyaad.com/d/beily-albani-irja

33 Refer to: https://abuiyaad.com/w/arafat-beily

obedience, rebellion, war and bloodshed, they do not return to the senior scholars, rather, they precede them, oppose them and try to deceive them.

CLOSING NOTE

What was mentioned previously should be emphasised again which is that while we must return to originating and localised circumstances to understand the emergence and evolution of ideologies and movements, we must also abstract the findings beyond them for the purposes of pattern recognition, because we are supposed to learn and benefit from past events and understand present events in light of them, so we can make better sense of them, otherwise, there is the danger of not being able to see the wood for the trees.[34]

So based on what we have learned from the Salaf and the Salafī methodology and how scholars such as Shaykh Rabīʿ exposed the Ḥaddādī extremists decades ago, is that when you see a man stirring the issue of al-Albānī and *Irjāʾ*, scathingly attacking the senior Salafī scholars of his land, having close friendships with Takfīrīs and Daeshites and when you see another man defending him and praising him while also making *tabdīʿ* of Salafīs on false, unwarranted grounds, alongside calling to *taḥazzub*, and involvement in political projects, with scheming and cunning, even trying to deceive senior scholars therein, and academic dishonesty and treachery, then know that he is already advanced on a dangerous path.

34 This is an idiom, the meaning of which is that if you stand very close to one tree, you will not see the forest, and it highlights the issue of focusing too much on small, minor details and, as a result, failing to understand or see the bigger picture of a situation.

Do not be deceived by the flex of his clueless followers as that is the state and nature of most of those who are misled by the glitter of endorsements, copious knowledge and the slick tongue. Moderation upon the Sunnah with scant knowledge is better than exertion in falsehood, partisanship and innovation (dishonesty, rebellion, bloodshed, tribulation, dividing Ahl al-Sunnah etc.). It is better to die a *miskīn* righteous believer knowing only the ḥadīth of *niyyah* and the ḥadīth of Jibrīl, than to perish with tomes upon tomes on your back and meeting Allāh with these types of enormities.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

From the Traits of the Ḥaddadīs is Feigning Respect for the Scholars



Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) quotes the speech of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, the arch-Ḥaddādī of the 1990s, in which he boasts about his apparent connection and respect for the scholars:[35]

> "For our scholars — and praise is for Allāh — are our reference-point (*marjiʿ*) for these knowledge-based issues, we do not depart from them, and nor do we go to others besides them. They — and praise is for Allāh — are alive, they explain these issues with their evidences from the Book and the Sunnah. [Our] connection should be with them and the blessing lies with them, as is authentically related from the Prophet (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) in the ḥadīth in which he said: "Blessing lies in their senior ones.'"

Shaykh Rabīʿ then comments:

> "**1.** I say: Indeed, the scholars are worthy of honour and respect, and they — with Allāh's praise — through their comprehension and understanding of Islām, reject this foul Jāhiliyyah that you call to, based on Allāh the Exalted's saying:
>
> ﴿إِنَّمَا ٱلْمُؤْمِنُونَ إِخْوَةٌ﴾
>
> **"Verily, the believers are brethren" [49:10]**
>
> — and from the saying of the Noble Prophet (صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ): "*[Are you calling] with the call of Jāḥiliyyah? Abandon it, for it is foul*", when a man from Anṣār said: "O Anṣār" and a man from the Muhājirīn said: "O Muhājirīn".

35 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasāʾīl* (9/539-540).

And the saying of the Prophet (ﷺ): "*Whoever leaves obedience (to the leader) and separated from the Jamāʿah and dies, will die a death of Jāhiliyyah. Whoever fights under a blind banner (of fanaticism), out of zeal for a faction, or calling to a faction, or in aid of a faction, and is killed, then he will die a death of Jāḥiliyyah.*"[36]

2. If you were serious and truthful in this (display) of Jāḥiliyyah, the affair would have been somewhat lighter. However, (the contrast between) your hostile methodology towards the Salafīs and their methodology prevents us from believing you in your deception here.

3. Indeed, your methodology is the most severe of methodologies in evil and tribulation. Its evil was not sufficient for you until you advanced it, or it was advanced for you, whereby you added very destructive weapons (in its arsenal), such as this foul Jāhiliyyah (partisan) support.

You desire a storm which destroys all the brotherly bonds of creed and methodology among the scholars and rulers in this land, and between their brothers in the whole world: in India, Pakistan, Afghanistan and all the Muslim countries.

So do you derive the likes of this misguidance and tribulations from the Salafī methodology? Absolutely not, and far be it from any truthful believer to harbour such a thing. And Allāh, His Messenger and His religion are innocent of all the *jāhiliyyāt* (displays and calls of ignorance) that emanate from you and your likes."

36 Related by Muslim (no. 1848).

NOTES

01. From the traits and behaviours of the Ḥaddādīs, in this case ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, is to make a display of loving and venerating the scholars, and turning those whom they found utility in to be the reference-point ***marjiʿiyyah***, who cannot be deserted and with whom the connection should be (exclusively), and who should not be left to go to others.

And how did Shaykh Rabīʿ respond to this?

02. The Shaykh said yes, indeed, while those scholars are worthy of honour and respect — and he means the senior scholars of that time in Saudi Arabia — they themselves would reject this foul Jāḥiliyyah of *ḥizbiyyah* and *taʿaṣṣub* that Bāshmīl calls to. Meaning, this restriction in scholarship and calling to a faction would be rejected by those scholars. Shayk Rabiʿ quoted an *āyah* about brotherhood, and ḥadīths by which he condemned such *taḥazzub* and *taʿaṣṣub* around those scholars, and described it as a call of Jāhiliyyah.

> This is the same as what some people call to today with the very same language. To Shaykh Rabīʿ — in relation to scholars of the calibre of Ibn Bāz, Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn and other scholars of Saudi — it was considered a call to foul Jāḥiliyyah, disguised as "respecting and returning to the scholars". Today, it's presented by some as among the foundations of the Salafī methodology. However, the Salafi methodology does not call to specifying some shaykhs as an exclusive reference while leaving all the rest.

03. Shaykh Rabīʿ called the speech of Bāshmīl — as beautiful and lofty as it seems — to be **foul, putrid Jāhiliyyah**, based on the ḥadīths of Allāh's Messenger (ﷺ). Alongside this, he said to Bāshmīl that if what you said was actually true, the affair would be lighter. But the reality is that the attachment of the Haddādīs to the scholars is **an opportunistic and scheming one**.

To Bāshmīl and the Ḥaddādīs, the scholars and their views and statements are only respected when they are useful in attacking and defaming others, to stir controversies through knowledge-based issues. Hence, even their so-called honour and respect of scholars is not genuine. In other words, the putrid Jāhiliyyah that Haddādīs like Bāshmīl make a display of, they are not truthful in that even, which makes the affair of these Ḥaddādis much worse.

Alḥamdulillāh, the way of those scholars in question was different to the hostile methodology of the Ḥaddādis. They would have rejected this foul Jāḥiliyyah if they were aware of this call to *taḥazzub* and *taʿaṣṣub* around them, which is why Shaykh Rabīʿ effectively declared Bāshmīl a liar in his claim and indicated that these texts from the Book and the Sunnah is what the way of those scholars emanates from, texts that condemn what Bāshmīl was calling to.

04. Then Shaykh Rabīʿ described the methodology of Bāshmīl as the **most severe of methodologies in evil and tribulations**, in which this "call to Jāḥiliyyah" as he put it, (around a faction of scholars) became one of their main weapons. In other words, making a faction of scholars to be the *marjiʿiyyah*, and calling for the connection to be with them, without going to others.

05. The Shaykh said that through this weapon of *taʿaṣṣub* and *taḥazzub*, they seek to destroy the brotherly bonds of creed and methodology that exist between Salafīs (scholars, students and common-folk) in all parts of the world, in all Muslim countries.

06. Finally, Shaykh Rabīʿ exonerated the religion from these "*jāhiliyyāt*" as he called them, which emanate from these Ḥaddādīs like Bāshmīl and others, and which the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah are free of.

07. *Alḥamdulillāḥ*, we remain upon the way of Shaykh Rabīʿ and the way of the senior scholars, and we have not changed nor abandoned it. Our rejection of these calls is continuous and consistent, because

it derives from the Book, the Sunnah, the way of the Salafi and the eminent, senior scholars who see the harmful effects these calls have upon the *daʿwah*, despite the lofty and alluring slogans they are decorated with.

In conclusion, making this type of call, creating storms in the *daʿwah* through it and the chosen knowledge-based talking points, instigating tribulations, and splitting Salafīs all around the world is one of the hallmarks of the Ḥaddādī methodology, you have to be blind not to see it. And we praise and thank Allāh for the scholars and shaykhs who recognise it and have the courage to call it out upon the way of Shaykh Rabīʿ and his brethren from the senior scholars.[37]

37 **Follow Up Reading:** I refer the reader to the article: *Response to ʿAbd al-Ilāh al-Rifāʿī: Regarding Commendations of Scholars, the Speech of al-Maʾribī and Partisanship* (https://abuiyaad.com/a/rifai-maribi/print) in which I echo the above firm speech of Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) from over a quarter of a century ago, based on other speech of Shaykh Rabīʿ from the same time-period.

In the article, I explain how one should benefit from all the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah, quoting once again, the speech of Shaykh Rabiʿ bin Hādī, and how all of them collectively should be reference points for us. Then I reject calls to restrict these affairs to one or two shaykhs, just as I reject, in line with the speech of Shaykh Rabīʿ (https://www.abuiyaad.com/d/rabee-03-adnan-arur-tahakum), the cunning scheme of calling for "arbitration" to a specific shaykh when unable to reply to legitimate criticisms or failure to provide evidence for oppressive judgements (in which the criterion of truth is the Book, the Sunnah and the Way of the Salaf, and is binding upon everyone). Then I also state that in great issues which affect nations (such as war, bloodshed, rebellion, leadership) only the most senior scholars should be returned to.

CHAPTER TWELVE

Taḥākum (Arbitration) Is to the Book and the Sunnah, Not Ferkous



The Salafīs in Algeria split over the Muḥammad bin Hādī and Muṣaʿfiqah *fitnah* and there was a side that went with Muḥammad bin Hādī. They are Muḥammad Ferkous, ʿAbd al-Majīd Jumuʿah and their followers. There were other issues of contention besides the issue of Muḥammad bin Hādī as well. In an audio recording published on the tube there is a discussion between Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) and a group of Algerians, and the issue in question was ʿAbd al-Majīd Jumuʿah publishing *taḥqīqāt* (verifications) of known historical people of innovation from the Malikī *madhhab*.[38]

So the people in the audio recording mention the excuse of ʿAbd al-Majīd which is that many people are Mālikī in his land, so it is from wisdom and easier to make *taḥqīq* of these works as it will be more readily accepted by the people. So Shaykh Rabīʿ said:

> "This is empty speech, it is falsehood, if he says this speech, itis falsehood, this is a false excuse... this is false excuse, it is falsehood, falsehood, falsehood... spreading the books of Ahl al-Bidʿah."

Then they start to mention that the other side, they also praise Ahl al-Bidʿah, so the Shaykh said that anyone who has an error he must recant and repent, and that the issues return to the Book and the Sunnah, and that they should be with the Book and the Sunnah.

Towards the end of the discussion (5m:35s), one of them says:

---

38 Refer to the audio here: https://abuiyaad.com/assets/audios/rabee-ferkous-tahakum.mp3

> "What if they take their dispute to Shaykh al-Ferkous, this is from justice?"

And he repeats this a few times, and another speaker, interjecting in order to explain, says it more clearly:

> "They go for arbitration (يتحاكمون) to Shaykh Ferkous..."

Shaykh Rabīʿ said:

> "Ferkous is the other party (in the dispute). They should make *taḥākum* to the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of Allāh's Messenger. They should judge by the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of Allāh's Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). They judge to the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Messenger. With you O so-and-so is such and such (error), recant from it..."

NOTES

01. In this recording the speakers were trying to argue for ʿAbd al-Majīd Jumuʿah and make excuses, which Shaykh Rabīʿ rejected as false excuses. So they argued back saying that the other side have praises for Ahl al-Bidʿah as well, so they must repent too. So then a few of them suggest that the other side should return to Muḥammad Ferkous for arbitration (*muḥākamah*).

02. However, Ferkous is **a contending party** in the dispute, so how can he be returned to for arbitration? Shaykh Rabīʿ swiftly rejected this and said that referring judgement (*taḥākum*) is to Allāh's Book and the Sunnah of the Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) Hence, when there are issues of right and wrong, truth and error, guidance and misguidance, oppressing and being oppressed, then these matters are returned to the Book and the Sunnah and the methodology of the Salaf, not to a shaykh, in this case, Ferkous, who was considered by these people to be a senior one (*kabīr*) of Algeria, and a reference point for them.

03. These were the tactics employed by the Muṣaʿfiqah and it was done in the name of justice (*ʿadl*), and in general, these are the tactics of those who evade the truth and play games. When they are asked to make (*taḥākum*) to Allāh's Book and to the Sunnah of the Messenger (ﷺ) in order to determine what is right and wrong, or who is right and wrong, what is truth and falsehood, and oppression and justice, and who needs to recant and take back their speech in great and serious matters (such as *tabdīʿ* of Salafīs, or even issues of leadership, rebellion, war, bloodshed, praising and defending innovators, or publishing their books and so on), they call for *taḥākum* to a shaykh who is one of the disputants. So Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) saw through it and swiftly cut it off.

In reality, it seems that al-Rifāʿī is acting as if he has a guilty conscience, perceiving that the article is describing what he and his likes are doing, of demanding Salafīs to return their affairs to one or two shaykhs only. They intimidate others by posting on social media, **"Are you happy with returning to so-and-so shaykh for arbitration between us?"** Since when is that from the Salafī methodology?

> What happened to: Are you happy to return to the Book, the Sunnah, the way of the Salaf and the principles of the Salafī methodology as a judge between us in distinguishing truth from falsehood, right from wrong, the guided and the misguided, the correct and the errant, the oppressed and the oppressor? This is what is obligated upon everybody, including the people of knowledge, **and this is the foundation (aṣl) of Salafiyyah**.

04. This method has been employed by those who followed Muḥammad bin Hādī in his path[39] of making *tabdīʿ* of Salafīs without evidence and they also praise heads of innovation and defend them. It is established that they have associations and affectations with the Ḥaddādīs or Ḥaddādī roots and origins from their initial upbringing.

39 Refer here: https://abuiyaad.com/q/rabee-musafiqah

So when these clear and evident affairs which are from **the basics of Salafiyyah** are explained to them directly from the speech of scholars such as Shaykh Rabīʿ, they do what the people of desires are known to: **lie, deceive and act treacherously to accuse people of what they are innocent of, and turn the plain truth that has been said into misguidance and falsehood, and then to deceptively extract speech from people of knowledge to aid their futile cause.**

05. It's almost as if these people are saying, through both the tongue of disposition and the tongue of expression:

> Hey look at what we are doing: We proudly and unashamedly mimic the actions of the Ḥaddādīs and the Muṣaʿfiqah, and we do exactly as they do (make *tabdīʿ* of Salafīs without evidence, create tribulations in *daʿwah*, split Ahl al-Sunnah, foster enmities, demand *taḥākum* to particular shaykhs with open threats), and then we extract speech from scholars through lies and treachery in a matter that we are guilty of (calling for taḥākum to those who are a side in a dispute) so that we can fight against anyone who aids and supports the foundations of the Salafī methodology through the speech of the senior scholars such as Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī.

So all praise is due to Allāh who made them testify against themselves by their own actions, and when they try to clothe themselves with tricks and games, we denude them with history and past tribulations.[40]

---

40 **Follow-Up Reading:** I refer the reader to the article: *Response to ʿAbd al-Ilāh al-Rifāʿī: Regarding Commendations of Scholars, the Speech of al-Maʾribī and Partisanship* (https://abuiyaad.com/a/rifai-maribi/print) in which I echo the above speech of Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) from eight years ago regarding *muḥākamah* to Ferkous, based on other speech of Shaykh Rabīʿ from a quarter of a century ago. In the article, I explain how one should benefit from all the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah, quoting once again, the speech of Shaykh Rabiʿ bin Hādī, and how all of them collectively should be reference points for us. Then I reject calls to

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Our Daʿwah Is Clear and Open, We Have No Need for Lying, Tricks, Camouflage, Ambiguity and Coercion



In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said:[41]

> "We call people to the truth with clear evidences and plain proofs, upon the way of the Messengers and the Righteous Salaf, not upon the path of the Bāṭinīs and Freemasons using tricks and coercive (submission). We have explained more than once that we do not accept error or falsehood from any person whoever it may be.
>
> This is our *daʿwah*, as clear as the sun in our lessons, lectures and books. We declare it openly, without any ambiguity or secrecy. We are not in need of lying, camouflaging and drawing people gradually through tricks, but we say: She accused me of her own iniquity and slipped away.

---

restrict these affairs to one or two shaykhs, just as I reject, in line with the speech of Shaykh Rabīʿ (refer here: https://www.abuiyaad.com/d/rabee-03-adnan-arur-tahakum), the cunning scheme of calling for "arbitration" to a specific shaykh when unable to reply to legitimate criticisms or failure to provide evidence for oppressive judgements (in which the criterion of truth is the Book, the Sunnah and the Way of the Salaf, and is binding upon everyone). Then I also state that in great issues which affect nations (such as war, bloodshed, rebellion, leadership) only the most senior scholars should be returned to.

41 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasāʾīl* (9/527).

> Rather, you are the ones who need tricks, camouflages and drawing people (gradually) to your falsehood, and this is the affair of every caller to falsehood, not the caller to truth."

NOTES

01. Shaykh Rabīʿ is responding here to the accusation of ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl against him that he uses the way of the Ḥizbīs and Ikhwānīs to target students of knowledge who are aware of Shaykh al-Albānī's errors, that such ones are considered by Shaykh Rabīʿ and those with him as "suspects", and that if they do not respond positively, they label each one as a "new Ḥaddādī", and that they (Shaykh Rabīʿ and others) start making contact in various cities and regions to warn against this suspected "new Ḥaddādī". This harassment continues until this suspected "new Ḥaddādī" stops warning from al-Albānī's errors, due to this harassment and coercion.

02. The reality is that these methods of trickery, camouflage, ambiguity and targeting students to bring them into the fold through coercive submission are actually the ways of Bāshmīl and the Ḥaddādiyyah. For their *daʿwah* is not clear and open, and they are evasive, ambiguous, and unclear. They are the ones who use schemes and tricks to draw people to their views and positions. They are the ones who find suspects who do not align with their extremist views including *tabdīʿ* of Ahl al-Sunnah and their vicious campaigns, contacting people, forcing their views, making them resign from their occupations as Imāms and teachers, pressuring others, and boycotting those who do not submit.

> These are the type of deeds of Bāshmīl and his likes, not those of Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) who was free and innocent of them, but he audaciously ascribes his own iniquities to Shaykh Rabīʿ. And this is one of the traits of the Ḥaddādīs, they project their own deeds on to others.

03. Ahl al-Sunnah have no need to use tricks and to coerce people into submission through threats and intimidation. If they have a view in a matter or criticise a view or a person, they do so with proofs and evidences while implementing fairness and justice, and they are happy to have their writings subjected to scrutiny in case they have erred, because their pursuit is the truth and nothing else, it is not to amass people around an idea or a personality[42] or to pursue political ambitions and projects.

04. As we said before, if we ignore the names, locations and originating events and look purely at **behaviours**, then we can see that similar and resembling behaviour has been observed from **ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadī** and his followers in various countries such as Holland, Germany, Australia, India, the US and elsewhere, wherein they target people in the community who do not fall in line with their **unwarranted *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl*** upon the manhaj of Fāliḥ and Ibn Hādī and demand compliance, to the extent that they call for boycotting, blocking (and firing) anyone who does not fall victim to their methods of coercive submission.

That this methodology has found its way into the ranks of the Salafīs, through the handiwork of ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadī, with the havoc and consequences all but evident for all to see not just in one country, but many countries, where splits and enmities have been seeded by him and his followers and loyalists, leaving once united communities divided and bickering among each other, is not the astounding part, as it is expected that there will be carriers and inheritors of certain ways, traits and behaviours.

The astounding part is the silence and absence of standing up in the face of such obvious and blatant violation and corruption that goes against everything that Shaykh Rabīʿ stood for and wrote

42 Refer to Chapter Five.

regarding this vile, barbarous methodology[43] over the past decades, especially in the European and Western lands where the harm is most pronounced.

05. Compare the way and methodology of Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) regarding the errant from Ahl al-Sunnah[44] with that of the ʿArafātiyyah:

> "I advise (him) and I strive and strive (with respect to him). I know that he has erred, no doubt, but I treat (him), I say: The one who errs, he is treated. The sick person, when he stumbles, we take him to the hospital (to heal him). We do not bleed him (to death) and kill him and finish him off (completely), may Allāh bless you.
>
> Those Ḥaddādīs, when they disparage a person, they destroy him. If he falls, then that's it, he should not get up again and just perish. Or if they imagine that he erred or fabricated it against him, then he must die.
>
> So this is not a methodology that is Islāmic, nor Salafī and nor even a humane one. This (methodology) is barbarism (brutal, beastly). It is a barbarous methodology that preys on people, unjustly and transgressively."

It is a methodology traversed only by the most vile and filthy beasts. So this methodology is rejected dear brothers, it is a methodology devised to enable splitting and splintering, may Allāh bless you.

Every methodology that splits and splinters, then this is a clear sign for you (regarding it), as (clear as) the sun.

The one who cannot see the difference between these two ways, that of Shaykh Rabīʿ and the way of ʿArafāt and his followers has been blinded, despite the clear signs in front of their noses. Further, they

43 Refer to: https://www.abuiyaad.com/d/rabee-09-beastly-manhaj

44 Listen here: https://abuiyaad.com/d/rabee-haddaadiyyah-barbarism

(ʿArafāt and his followers) bring the deeds of the Muṣaʿfiqah and the Ḥaddādiyyah (*tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl* without evidence, splitting Ahl al-Sunnah, coercion, intimidation), and then accuse their victims of being upon these ways after their blatant, evident falsehood and extremism are rejected. She accused me of her own iniquity and slipped away.

HISTORY: ʿARAFAṬ REVILED THE WAY OF SHAYKH RABĪʿ

Years ago ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadī made **an apparent repentance**[45] for **reviling the methodology of Shaykh Rabīʿ**[46] of having patience with Ahl al-Sunnah. It seems that he never really changed, and continues in his disastrous path of hasty *tabdīʿ*, *taḍlīl* and *tajdīʿ* of Ahl al-Sunnah without sufficient evidence, and without patience, wisdom and observing the benefits and harms of his conduct.

In this revilement, he was preceded by the **Ḥaddadī ʿImād Farrāj**, who said that having patience with the opposer is an innovation and not from the way of the Salaf. Farrāj wrote a refutation against Shaykh Rabīʿ on this very matter — titled: *Bidʿah al-Ṣabr ʿalā al-Mukhālif* (The Innovation of Having Patience with the Opposer) — claiming it is Shaykh Rabīʿ's "bidʿah". He said it is not the way of the Salaf, words which are similar to those of ʿArafāt. So as has been said, either ʿArafāt took it from ʿImād Farrāj directly, or he derived it independently due to having a similar mentality and outlook as Farrāj.

This was one of the things raised against ʿArafāt by those who supported Muḥammad bin Hādī, who was unable to validate his hasty *tabdīʿ* with satisfactory evidences, and nothing he brought justified it. As I said previously and say again, ʿArafāt

45 See here: https://abuiyaad.com/d/arafat-rabee-patience-tawbah

46 See here: https://abuiyaad.com/d/arafat-rabee-revilement-testimony

al-Muḥammadī did not have clean hands, his shenanigans go back to the *fitnah* of al-Hajūrī, who is also one of his mentors and teachers, influencing him in haste and exaggeration in *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl*, and many of his followers may be unaware of these realities.

> ʿArafāt was initially with **al-Ḥajūri** and upon his path, then he was convinced by **Ṣāliḥ al-Bakrī** of the grave errors of al-Ḥajūrī, so he left al-Ḥajūrī, and according to Bakrī, ʿArafāt stole his points of refutation against al-Ḥajūrī and published them under hidden identities and pen names on the web, such as "al-Barmakī", and this is known regarding him. Then he came under the wing of **Muḥammad bin Hādī**. They fell out with an internal dispute of sorts, which led them to turn on each other, and Ibn Hādī had perceived something of his shenanigans. But Ibn Hādī went overboard, made hasty *tabdīʿ*, and got overtaken by anger and pride when he was held to standards and principles in protection of the Salafī methodology in this arena. He was unable to do so and this split Ahl al-Sunnah everywhere, polarising them between those appealing to his status and insight (*firāsah*) and those requiring adherence to Salafī principles and methodology. When his *tabdīʿ* was rejected in late 2017 and early 2018,[47] those who had sided with him and supported him began to bring past issues against ʿArafāt, trying to exonerate Ibn Hādī and prove he was right all along in his *tabdīʿ*. However, Ibn Hādī had zero evidences justifying his *tabdīʿ*, *taḍlīl*, *taḥdhīr* and *tajdīʿ* and the turmoil he created. This is just like ʿArafāt today who has zero evidences to justify his path of *tabdīʿ* and his evil conduct in splitting Ahl al-Sunnah and seeding enmities between them. His blind followers and loyalists are engaged in frantic activity to justify his extremist methodology. Look at how today resembles yesterday.

47 Refer here: https://abuiyaad.com/w/musafiqah-fitnah

In his approach, ʿArafāt resembles his teachers, al-Ḥājūrī and Ibn Hādī, though he is a step further. He has enlisted soldiers all over the world to engage in relentless trolling and bullying on his behalf, to corroborate and justify his *tabdīʿ* and to dress up this Ḥaddādī-type conduct with the garment of jealous zeal for the Sunnah and its scholars. In the process, they have split Ahl al-Sunnah in many places, which is one of **the clear signs** of the barbarous methodology which Shaykh Rabīʿ and other scholars are free and innocent of. Then, to shield and camouflage what they are doing, they accuse anyone who exposes their reality of being Muṣaʿfiqah and Ḥaddādiyyah, when they are most worthy of it themselves, and which is all but evident from their brazen conduct.

Observation: In the *fitnah* of Muḥammad bin Hādī, those who sided with him and appealed to his scholarly status and insight (*firāsah*) were of categories: a) those who followed him genuinely in his error, with good intentions, thinking the truth was with him, b) those who blindly-followed him without understanding, and c) those who followed him because they had past grievances and grudges against others, so they took this as an avenue to exact their revenge and pursue interests, from the most prominent examples is Abū ʿUmar al-ʿUtaybī. Similarly, those who opposed Muḥammad bin Hādī were of types: d) those who opposed him strictly on the basis of methodological principles with firm grounding, and e) those who opposed him out of blind following or without much understanding, or due to loyalty and partisanship to those Ibn Hādī disparaged.

Today, the fifth category above are the ones sailing upon the same boat that was traversed by Ibn Hādī, and they are ones on the same side of the fence as ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadī. If they had been from the fourth category, they would not be sailing on this boat today, and would have remained consistent and true to principles, and

shown open rejection today against what they showed rejection against in 2018.[48]

48 For further reading:

- https://abuiyaad.com/d/bilal-unjust_tabdi
- https://abuiyaad.com/d/unwarranted-tabdi
- https://abuiyaad.com/w/arafat-lies-dana
- https://abuiyaad.com/d/hudhayfi-arafat-tribulations
- https://abuiyaad.com/q/hudhayfi-oppression
- https://abuiyaad.com/d/hudhayfi-advice-support-eng

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

A Summary and Conclusion of the Study on ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl



Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) provides a very important and enlightening summary of the First Wave Ḥaddādī enterprise in the late 1990s, and as we said earlier in this series, it is important for the reader to abstract beyond the originating circumstances, leaving behind the names, locations and events, and observing only the **methods, behaviours and processes**, so that the **quintessence** of Ḥaddādḍiyyah can be **precipitated and crystallised** and seen, smelled, touched and tasted directly, similar to the precipitation and crystallisation of salt and sugar, save that unlike salt and sugar which have benefits, the Haddādī essence is noxious, toxic and corrosive and should not be approached, post-precipitation.

We present a translation of the summary and to facilitate the **precipitation and crystallisation** processes some appropriate commentary is provided, (bracketed titles are for ease of reading and organisation):[49]

[HUNTING FOR MISTAKES]

Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) said in 1419H (1998 CE), concluding his treatise on Bāshmīl and his falsehoods:

> "**1.** I do not rule out that ʿAbd al-Laṭīf has investigated our books and cassettes but found nothing in them that can be criticised regarding creed, nor methodology nor other than that."

Comment: Given that Ḥaddādism is founded upon exaggeration of slips, mistakes, or contrary views, the end goal being *tabdīʿ* and

49 *Majmūʿ Muʿallafāt wa Rasā'īl* (9/547-548).

taḍlīl, the Ḥaddādīs start out looking for fuel for their fire, and that is by investigating books, cassettes, lectures and writings of their targets. They do not find clear-cut deviations in creed or methodology, and hence have to rely upon slips, mistakes or contrary views in areas of controversy and differing, and if not, then lying, deception, distortion and treachery in citation.

And whereas Ahl al-Sunnah are people of good, clean intentions, integrity and justice, and do not hunt out mistakes of Ahl al-Sunnah with this outlook or objective, if they happen to come across slips and mistakes, or they become apparent in the course of things, they treat the individual and his error in the appropriate way, upon the Salafī methodology. As for genuine and unintended slips and errors in religion, which no one is free from except the chosen Prophets, then Allāh, from His mercy, conceals them for the believers, and they may simply pass, be forgotten and never surface in the ordinary course of things. However the Ḥaddādī methodology seeks to tear apart this cover which Allāh mercifully provided to His servants, thereby taking the affairs in an irregular direction, in order to disturb the peace and instigate tribulations.

[LIES AND FABRICATIONS]

"**2.** But when he was unable to find anything which we could be criticised for, he resorted to lying and fabricating (things) against us, and slandered us with (things) that Allāh, the believers and the truthful know that we are innocent of, such as:

a. That we are followers of al-Albānī,

b. That we are partisan to him,

c. That we have taken his errors as a methodology that we follow and call to with extreme secrecy,

d. That we have loyalty towards him and his errors and label everyone who criticises him a Ḥaddādī.

> e. He provided one example for Rabīʿ (from the cassette) in which he completely missed the mark, and the cassette (as a whole) convicts him as a liar, fabricator from many angles which I mentioned in the very same cassette."

Comment: Bāshmīl was unable to find clear deviations in foundations, such as the innovations of the Khārijiyyah, Jahmiyyah, Rāfiḍah, Ṣūfiyyah, Muʿtazilah, Ikhwāniyyah, Tablīghiyyah and so on, so he resorted to lying, fabricating, clipping and distorting in order to arrive at outrageous accusations that are wholly contrary to everything known from Shaykh Rabīʿ and his writings.

These accusations were based on clipping and extraction from cassette recordings or audios, and the refutation of these claims are in the very same recordings themselves. The aim behind all of this is to justify *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl* in order to cause splitting and division in the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah.

That's the type of conduct that Shaykh Rabīʿ was alluding to over a quarter of a century ago, and he provided us with diagnostic means to help us identify it and its various stages, which include splitting and splintering of Salafīs through such methods:[50]

> "So this methodology is rejected dear brothers, it is a methodology devised to enable splitting and splintering, may Allāh bless you." Every methodology that splits and splinters, **then this is a clear sign for you** (regarding it), as (clear as) the sun.

However, the Ḥaddādī methodology devised an antidote for those clear signs, and it is in the form of **intellectual terrorism**:

50 Listen here: https://abuiyaad.com/d/rabee-haddaadiyyah-barbarism

[INTELLECTUAL TERRORISM FOR SILENCING AND COERCIVE SUBMISSION]

> "**3.** From his ideas and his methods of treachery and clipping (of speech) it becomes clear: that he is an extremist Ḥaddādī, and even worse than that is that he rides the train-of-thought of al-Ḥaddād, exaggerates in it (further) and advances it to the level in which (normal) life is not sustainable, through: destructive (intellectual) terrorism which stifles voices, shattering (i.e. demoralisation) of souls, to paralyze their hands and tie their tongues, if its opponents (give up and) submit to it (i.e. if they fail to counter it and just give in)."

Comment: Shaykh Rabīʿ pointed out that Ḥaddādī methodology had evolved — even in its early first wave — to a degree that it made life difficult, because a hostile, aggressive atmosphere was nurtured and cultivated which if not openly and firmly challenged and countered, allows the predominance of intellectual terrorism the goals of which are:

- **To stifle voices**, making them fearful of speaking the truth.
- **To shatter the souls**, meaning to demoralise them, by incessant, continuous hostility, to make them give up and just say: "pay no attention to them, leave them to their ways, do not reply to them". Shaykh Rabīʿ, some years later, in his refutations of Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī and Fawzī al-Baḥraynī, said that he was given this advice by others. But ultimately, there was no escape from addressing their lies and dealing with these individuals head on and exposing them, else they become a systemic risk.
- **To paralyse their hands and tying their tongues**, which follows on from the demoralisation. Meaning, to make them unable and unwilling to respond or do anything.

Shaykh Rabīʿ said that they achieve this if their opponents **just give up**, which is the actual goal behind all of this **aggression and hostility**, which few are wise to.

This is why the Ḥaddādī methodology is most dangerous. It makes inroads into the Salafi *daʿwah* with the claim of loyalty to and defence of scholars. It uses the glucose of deception, lying, cunning. It accuses others of Ḥaddādiyyah as a deflection and protective shield (so as not to be identified and thereby, evade T and NK cells and macrophages). Further, as it gains followers and supporters (cells, capillaries and arteries), it becomes embedded and difficult to treat, like late stage cancer, which has been allowed to advance due to ignorance, neglect, indifference and violations in diet, habits and lifestyle, meaning, not taking the right actions at the right time.

Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) went through all of these great efforts back then to warn Ahl al-Sunnah of this danger, and he continued doing so all the way to the *fitnah* of Muḥammad Ibn Hādī, some years after *fitnah* of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī, so that people pay attention to the early warning signs.

[HATEFUL AND MALICIOUS]

> "It is not permitted in his methodology that a person be mentioned with good from near, nor from afar. And woe to the people of Madīnah, especially if they mention him with good through any expression or indication, even if he has tens of authorships aiding the Sunnah and the Salafī methodology."

Comment: The Ḥaddādī methodology is founded upon malice, contempt, anger and resentment, and they see their adversaries as obstacles. Hence, they detest that anything positive or good should be made known about them, and strive to belittle them and mention them with evil, emphasise their errors and faults,

whether genuine, exaggerated or fabricated. And even if a person has great efforts in aid of the Sunnah and Salafī methodology, they despise that this should even be hinted at.

The reason behind this is that they have underlying goals and objectives, whether political in nature, through affiliation with the *aḥzāb*, or domination and ascendancy, or grievances of sorts, or resentments surrounding their figureheads who were spoken against, or they have bigotry around particular views in religion wherein scholars have differed (such as certain issues connected to Īmān) which serve their goals and which they wish to enforce upon others. These are the types of affairs that bubble beneath the surface, leading them to operate out of malice and hate, and to swerve from justice.

[DUPLICITY, TWO-FACES]

> "**4.** I myself have not encountered a greater liar than him, and nor more severe in obfuscation, deception and treachery. For he presents himself as a Salafī, while he displays severe enmity towards Salafiyyah and wages war against it and its people, and he disavows the Ḥaddādiyyah while not waging war and showing loyalty except for the methodology of al-Ḥaddād, and he is one of the greatest callers to it, he is its theorist and its developer and he pretends that the madhhab of al-Ḥaddād has ended in order to hide his Ḥaddādiyyah and the (continued) existence of the Ḥaddādīs."

Comment: From the tactics used by Bāshmīl were to openly disavow the Ḥaddādiyyah and to claim that he is not from them, yet everything observed from him screamed Ḥaddādiyyah if one was wise to its signs. This was all done out of great duplicity, lying and treachery.

As we said earlier, one of the means of deflection and shielding used by the Ḥaddādīs was to accuse their opponents of being Ḥaddādīs, and this is why they infuse and encourage *tabdīʿ* (upon other than sound principles) in the Salafī ranks so that it can be used in a number of ways. First, to create confusion and chaos in the midst of which they themselves thrive while Ahl al-Sunnah become embroiled with each other, and second, to be able to accuse their opponents of Ḥaddādiyyah to provide themselves cover. *She accused me of her own iniquities and slipped away.*

It is important for the reader to conceive the ground realities of the time in order to fully understand Ḥaddādiyyah and its associated traits and behaviours.

> They resented Shaykh al-Albānī because he was a threat to their political aspirations, as they had ties and connections with the *aḥzāb* and were sympathetic towards them and their goals, so he was targeted by them in a calculated manner, by raising the issues of *Īmān*, the Gulf War (seeking foreign assistance), and *fiqh* issues. They wanted Shaykh Rabīʿ to make *tabdīʿ* of Safar and Salmān so that they could call him a Ḥaddādī and turn people against him. They pretended to love the scholars and defend the rulers, but that was just a scheme to deceive people, otherwise, in crucial matters, they were not with the rulers and scholars, only in matters that did not conflict with their interests. They pretended that they were not with Ḥaddād and were not Ḥaddādīs (while riding upon his methodology) but wanted their opponents to be seen as the Ḥaddādīs as this provided them cover.

As we said before, one should not necessarily think of the **Ḥaddādiyyah** and **Mumayyiʿah** as distinct groupings, but more as a set of **variable traits, behaviours and tactics** that enable pursuit of interests. A person can display traits of Ḥaddādiyyah and Mumayyiʿah at the same time. Hence, you may find them making

tabdīʿ of Salafīs on the one hand, while having affection, praise and defence of innovators on the other, which are contradictory. It is **the underlying interests** that govern the traits and behaviours, and these behaviours vary according to circumstances.

> This is why a person can speak about love, forgiveness, gentleness, mercy, unity, fraternity, overlooking faults and mistakes, one moment because it suits interests, then in an instant, they are on the bandwagon of *tabdīʿ*, *taḍlīl*, harshness, *imtihān* (testing people) and *ḥajar* (boycotting). The secret to it all is the prevailing interest and the underlying motives.

[FEIGNING RESPECT FOR SCHOLARS]

> "And he feigns respect for some of the scholars falsely and deceitfully, and it is impossible upon his developed Ḥaddādī methodology that he should love a Salafi scholar. Rather, he who follows this path harbours nothing but hatred and enmity towards them."

Comment: The feigning of respect for scholars was a means to an end for Bāshmīl, because it served a purpose, and it occurred in the context of geopolitical events and the differences regarding them. So when one group of scholars and their views were conducive to these ends, Bāshmīl made display of love, respect and defence of those scholars, as it is an effective means of winning support, sympathy and loyalty from those who genuinely love and respect the scholars. This is the way of every deceptive bankrupt rascal, to invoke the slogans of "scholars", "return to the scholars" and "defend the scholars", when his falsehood is laid bare or when he is unable to respond to his critics with knowledge and evidence.

[UNRIVALLED VILENESS]

> "The calamities of this man are very many, and he has reached such levels of vileness, evil and ferocity that he is unrivalled — as far as I know and among those I know — by any innovator who has malice towards the Salafī methodology. Hence, all of the problems (caused by) the people of innovation and the problems of the *aḥzāb*, their sedition, and their false rumours are trivial to the Salafīs. Whoever reads his book with awareness and insight will comprehend that."

Comment: Ahl al-Sunnah are not harmed by the groups and sects of innovation and nor their heads and callers more than they are harmed by the Ḥaddādī methodology and its promoters. There is a natural suspicion, aversion and distrust of the innovators, their enmity is open and clear, and Ahl al-Sunnah are on guard.

As for Bāshmīl, and those who followed his way, they operate from within the ranks, showing jealousy and zeal for Salafiyyah, and for some of its scholars. They focused around particular issues to display that protective jealousy, but it was all a cover, because their real aim was to give breathing space for the *aḥzāb* (political factions) where their real sympathies lay, while causing turmoil in the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah.

[REFUTATIONS AND EVIDENCES REMOVE CONFUSION]

> "Whoever is confused about him, let him read (this) discussion of mine with reflection, justice and comparison, and in light of that the affair will become clear to him in a way that is clearer and stronger than what is in this summary.
>
> All of his plots and Satanic methods will fade and evaporate.
>
> And Allāh is predominant over His affair and the Aider of His religion as He promised the people of truth: **"And Allāh will**

> **surely aid those who aid Him (in His cause). Verily, Allāh is Powerful and Mighty."** (22:40).
>
> May Allāh make good mention of our Prophet, and upon His family and companions and grant them safety.
>
> This beneficial book — in which falsehood was refuted with Allāh's aid and truth was supported by the promise of Allāh who never breaks His promise — was completed on 25 Muḥarram 1419H [22 May 1998 CE]."

Comment: Seeing the danger posed by this methodology, the Shaykh went to great lengths to expose the reality of Bāshmīl. How insightful he was, because this methodology has continued to surface again and again in the three decades that have followed since, and it has consumed and splintered the Salafi *daʿwah*. Ultimately, these plots fade and evaporate, but not without them surfacing again some time later.

Confusion is lifted — after the period of necessary patience has expired — by tackling this methodology head on, calling it out, exposing it and its people, refuting their lies, exposing their deception, unveiling their tactics and cunning methods in a relentless manner, openly rejecting their oppression and calling them to account so that the average Salafi is not deceived by them.

Ḥaddādiyyah is a ferocious methodology which seeks submission and seeks to exhaust its victims. So whoever said, "Leave them, ignore them" after its evil has surfaced and spread never really grasped the first *fitnah* of the Ḥaddādiyyah in the late 1990s, such that he should have any *baṣīrah* about it thereafter, and ignoring the malignant disease is not a tried and tested method, unlike the way of Shaykh Rabīʿ towards this very particular ailment.

CONCLUDING NOTES

This is the final part of the series on First Wave Ḥaddādiyyah personified by ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl, which provides a broad overview and a summary of Shaykh Rabīʿ's treatise on the subject. The aim was to turn the abstract into the physical through **precipitation and crystallisation**, such that the Ḥaddāḍī way acquires physicality, and can be seen, smelled, touched and tasted from the angle of "**I learned of evil — not for the sake of evil — but to guard against it.**" When things remain in solution, the fluidity of fast-paced events which overwhelm the senses prevents people from seeing things for what they really are, and a great deal can be missed. It's a bit like travelling fast on the motorway and not having enough time to see close objects from the side, perpendicular to the direction of travel.

There are some final notes to round things up:

01. The Ḥaddādī methodology appeared alongside the exposure of the Surūrī methodology. They had laid the groundwork for infusing false, destructive principles and behaviours among Ahl al-Sunnah by their position towards Ibn Ḥajar, al-Nawawī and others, which is to dismiss scholars on account of excusable slips and errors and declare them innovators. That allowed them to target and belittle scholars like Shaykh al-Albānī, the real motives being their sympathies with the *aḥzāb* (political factions) and their grievance that they had been countered and subdued.

So they used the issue of *Īmān* and *Irjāʾ* and they picked on al-Albānī's fiqh positions and made attachment to the scholars in Saudī to attack Shaykh al-Albānī and anyone who held a just and fair position in the matter. They presented themselves as defending the rulers and scholars, and they accused their opponents of being agents for a highly secretive political call working against the rulers and scholars of Saudi Arabia. To create distractions and turmoil,

they focused on finding errors and slips, or to fabricate lies, to preoccupy Ahl al-Sunnah and weaken them, so that they can continue unnoticed and untouched. They made *tabdīʿ* on flimsy grounds and encouraged it as a means of sowing discord, division and enmity. Tremendous deceit, lying and cunning was involved in the process, such as would bewilder most people, thinking it inconceivable and unbelievable.

02. Those who came after Bāshmīl were of types: a) those who added to and developed the methodology further through principles, or b) those who resembled their traits and behaviours without necessarily subscribing to the core ideology and its goals. Such traits and behaviours nevertheless, bring similar destructive effects. They include those who make *tabdīʿ* of Salafīs on flimsy, baseless grounds and instigate tribulations in their ranks.

03. Due to its very nature, it is a fatal mistake to remain indifferent to the Haddādī methodology and to just "give up" and think it will go away and there will be rain, sunshine and daisies tomorrow. This is naïve, wishful thinking.

Innovations, ideologies and movements, just like men, share characteristics with beasts and animals. There are some animals and beasts you are allowed to kill, such as snakes.

Ibn ʿUmar (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا) related that the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said while on the pulpit: "*Kill snakes.*" Ibn ʿUmar said: "After that, I would not leave any snake that I saw but I would kill it."[51] And Ibn Masʿūd (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) related that the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said: "*Kill all snakes, and whoever fears their revenge does not belong to me.*"[52] The scholars have explained that it is permissible to kill snakes outside the house. As for those inside the house, it is preferable for snakes to be warned before being killed.

51 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (no. 3299), *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (no. 3233).

52 *Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd* (no. 5249).

Just as there are beasts and animals that can be killed due to their toxic, poisonous, harmful and potentially fatal nature, there are ideologies and methodologies that are toxic, harmful and potentially fatal as well.

Ḥaddādiyyah is one of them. If it's not killed quickly enough, it will continue to grow and wreak havoc. It is the height of naivety and foolishness to think that after all the manifestations of this vile, beastly, toxic, barbarous methodology over the past three decades and the tremendous harm it has caused, it can just be ignored after its very obvious and apparent signs have already appeared, fearing its revenge.

Ḥaddādiyyah is a systemic threat and not localised to any particular group or party.

May Allāh reward Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) tremendously, with Jannah al-Firdaws for his great efforts in illuminating and safeguarding Ahl al-Sunnah through his valuable writings and guiding them to clarity in these great affairs.

Shaykh Rabīʿ's Refutation of the Chief Ḥaddādī ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl

Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād seeded the Ḥaddādī ideology which is based on **exaggerating excusable and unintended errors and slips to facilitate tabdīʿ as a destructive weapon** to use against Ahl al-Sunnah, and to infuse divisions and enmities among them. His speech began with attacking **al-Nawawī, Ibn Ḥajar** (رَحِمَهُمَا ٱللَّهُ) and their likes, whose oceans of goodness and service to Islām drowned the errors they fell into, which they had inherited from their shaykhs and teachers. However, this was just a prelude to generalising this approach to contemporary scholars of the Sunnah, and the first of those they targeted was **Shaykh al-Albānī** (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) due to his role in standing up to and exposing the *jamāʿāt* and *aḥzāb* of *ḥizbiyyah* (partisanship) and *siyāsah* (politics). The associate of Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād, **ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl**, claimed that the Shaykhs of Madīnah, such as **Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī** (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ), were calling to a deviant political methodology in complete secrecy built upon the errors of **Shaykh al-Albānī** (رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ). He accused them of being infiltrators, working on the inside for political objectives. He also claimed that they were following the ways of the Ikhwānīs by not making *tabdīʿ* of certain callers in Saudi Arabia. These Ḥaddādis had exaggeration in matters of *tabdīʿ* and *tajrīḥ*, aiming to incite discord and chaos within the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah. To support their claims, they attached themselves to well-known scholars in Saudi because they opposed Shaykh al-Albānī on various issues, and they leveraged this attachment to attack Shaykh Rabīʿ and others. Bashmīl is from the **first wave Ḥaddādīs of the 1990s**, and even though Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād is the origin and he disappeared into obscurity after being expelled from Saudi, Bāshmīl became the main promulgator, spokesman and caller to the ideology in the late 1990s. After them came the **second wave Ḥaddādīs in the 2000s**, such as **Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī**, then **Fawzī al-Baḥraynī**, and they carried on the methodology with their own infusions.

Abū ʿIyaaḍ
Amjad bin Muḥammad Rafīq

abuiyaad.com
@AbuIyaadSP
t.me/abuiyaadsp