A Response to the Lies, Doubts and Fallacies of Zakariyya bin Shu'ayb and the Aden Callers Regarding Their Participation in Rebellion

By Sheikh Ali Al-Hudheifi (Audio recording)
https://t.me/cashefattalbisat/469

Praise be to Allah, Lord of the Worlds, and may the peace, blessings, and benedictions of Allah be upon our Prophet Muhammad, and upon all his family and companions.

To proceed:

I was asked about a dawrah (conference) held in Kenya—organized by certain brothers who are referred to as Mashayikh Aden [The Shaykhs of Aden]. I was asked about this dawrah (conference) and although I was able to warn against it, its organizers, or the "mashayikh" conducting it and yet I did not issue a warning (from the conference). I was also asked to offer advice to the youth (regarding it), yet I refrained from warning against it.

However, I was surprised today when some brothers sent me the speech of Zakariya bin Shu'ayb and in the audio contains very bad statements that came from Zakariya bin Shu'ayb; and Allah bears witness that Zakariya told several lies in it (in the audio clip).

I intend to post (present) Zakariya bin Shu'ayb's audio recording on my channel, and I will provide a concise response addressing his words, lies, and fallacies.

Firstly: Zakariya bin Shu'ayb stated—in essence—that their creed is Salafi and that they teach the prohibition of rebelling against the ruler; so how, he implies, could they possibly rebel (against the ruler)? In other words, he is arguing: "We teach that rebelling against the ruler is forbidden, so how could we rebel ourselves while teaching this?"

Glory be to Allah (SubhanAllah)! Does everyone who speaks of Salafiyyah—O Zakariya—actually practices it? Does everyone who speaks of Salafiyyah become infallible, incapable of error or deviation?

Fine, tell me, then, about the students of Shaykh Muqbil who became partisan, joined the Qutbi associations, and began declaring rulers to be disbelievers, and so forth. During a lesson on methodology in Dammaj—one of the methodology classes—I played a recording for the brothers (there were dozens of them) of some individuals who had left Dammaj—men who had been among the Shaykh's best students. I let them hear these men making sweeping generalizations, declaring that anyone who does not rule by what Allah has revealed is a disbeliever.

In fact, Zakariya, among those who left Dammaj and studied under the Shaykh—may Allah have mercy on him—some actually became muftis for ISIS. I do not know if you are aware of this or not; if you are unaware, do not deny it. It is a fact—ask about Abdul-Majeed al-Raimi.

Fine, O Zakariya, where did Safar and Salman emerge from? Did they come from Tehran or Istanbul, for instance? Did they emerge from a Rafidi or a Sufi environment (surrounding)? Where did they come from? They studied under Salafi scholars, yet they became among the most severe Takfiris in the Arab world. Someone came along and corrupted them, even though they had been students of Shaykh Ibn Baz; some of them used

to say, “We seek knowledge from Shaykh Ibn Baz and Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen,” and so on.

Furthermore, the brother, I want from the brother Zakariya that he does not mislead people by asking, “How could we possibly rebel [against the ruler] when our creed is Salafi?”

No, this speech does not benefit (you) O Zakariya, this speech does not benefit (you).

If your words say one thing but your actions contradict them (contradict your speech), I judge you by your actions. What use are your words when your actions go against them?

That is the first matter.

The second matter: Zakariya asks, “If we were to rebel against the ruler, would they leave us alone? We study, travel from place to place for Da’wah (preaching), and hold dawrat (conferences)—so why would they tolerate us (or be silent about us) if we were Kharijites?”

I ask Zakariya a question: Does the state punish everyone who breaks away from it (i.e. rebels against it)? Does the state punish everyone who rebels against it? Did the state punish all the Al-Qaeda members it managed to apprehend? Did the state punish the parties (al ahzab) that rebelled against it—such as the Muslim Brotherhood and their ilk (likes)? Did it punish the political parties that rose up against the state, like the Transitional Council?

Did the state punish Abdullah al-Marfadi? You know very well, O Zakariya, that he was—and still is—a takfiri. Despite this—and the fact that the state is aware of his involvement in takfiri activities and the indoctrination of youth—the state never

arrested him; he moves about freely, and there were even instances where he was questioned and then released him.

Did the state punish Aidarus al-Zoubaidi after he fought against it?

Zakariya—may Allah guide you—the state is unstable; it may be preoccupied with other matters, or there may be issues it deems more pressing. It might see that the time now is not right to carry out punishment, or it might grant amnesty for the sake of the greater good.

Do you not know, O Zakariya, that the state in Algeria opened the door for takfiris to return? President Bouteflika realized\saw that if these takfiris persisted in their path, the harm they caused would only escalate; thus, he chose to grant amnesty and offer a way back to those willing to return.

The state may take certain actions (ijtihad) based on its own specific perspective. So your speech (argument), therefore, is weak and not knowledge based (lacks scholarly merit), as it is easily refuted.

Then Zakariya asks: “What is the evidence that we rebelled against the ruler?”

Fine, what do you call your fighting against military institutions, O Zakariya? Your combat against military institutions?

That is precisely the point I am making: your fighting. You might not have been there personally, but you issued a fatwa permitting combat against these military institutions—and you know very well, Zakariya, that these military institutions include the Presidential Brigades and others. These brigades were established by the President to protect the state, yet you fought

them; in other words, you actively sought to engage them in combat.

You are well aware of this. Do not ask, “Where is the evidence?” I am not obliged to produce an audio recording of you admitting, “We rebelled against the ruler.” I look at your actions, my brother; your actions demonstrate that you were intent to fighting the state and incited people to fight the state. Where do we go with your actions? [i.e. What do your actions signify?]

Are we to limit ourselves only to words, while actions do not incriminate a person?

Then, among the incoherent (confused) statements he made, Zakariya says, may Allah guide him:

“They say that Shaykh Rabee’ erred in his fatwa regarding fighting Haftar in Libya.” Who said this, O Zakariya? Can you provide evidence for it? Who said that Shaykh Rabee’ was mistaken? We have stated—and we repeat this time and again—that the Shaykh issued a fatwa to fight ISIS; he did not issue a fatwa to fight the government. You claim that Shaykh Rabee’ issued a fatwa to fight the government in Libya; I even discussed this matter with Ahmed Bahoukhan over the phone, and he insisted, “Yes, Shaykh Rabee’ issued that fatwa.” I told him, “Do not say that about Shaykh Rabee’, do not spread it, and do not tarnish his image. Shaykh Rabee’ never issued a fatwa to fight governments; Shaykh Rabee is an Imam (a leading figure) in Salafiyyah and would not issue such a ruling to fight governments.

So, tell us: who said Shaykh Rabee’ was mistaken?” Furthermore, what is so strange about someone claiming Shaykh Rabee’ erred? Did you not claim he erred regarding a fatwa fighting of Kitaf? Do you remember, O Zakariya, when the

Shaykh issued a fatwa declaring it an individual obligation (wujub ‘ayni) for Yemenis to go Kitaf and break the siege on their brothers in Dammaj? You used to say it was wrong—incorrect. If you want us to produce witnesses, we will do so, O Zakariya.

And then, Zakariya, you say: “We went to ask the mashaykh (scholars) of Medina: ‘Are we to blame?’“ Well, let me ask you a question, O Zakariya: Is the person who conceals Hani’s name from Shaykh Rabee’—or the one who tells inquirers, “Do not mention Hani bin Braik’s name to Shaykh Rabee’ because it makes him angry”—is that person blameworthy or not? Is someone who betrays Salafi scholars in order to extract a fatwa that leads to bloodshed—is that person a traitor? Or is he just an ordinary person?

Speak to the people; tell them; be frank and courageous with them. By Allah, you know full well that it was Arafat who said this—you know it, and you all know it.

Tell me, O Zakariya: what about the person who communicates with Hani after the fatwa coming out from Shaykh Rabee and other than him—the one who communicates with Hani while Hani is in another country and you... I mean, those who went to Shaykh Rabee were in Medina while Hani was abroad in another country—and (they) give him the good news, they tell him, “Praise be to Allah, we have secured a fatwa authorizing combat against the government on the grounds that it is the Muslim Brotherhood (or linked to the Muslim Brotherhood).” Hani then speaks to those around him, saying, “The young men (shabab) have obtained a fatwa from Shaykh Rabee”—and this happened after Shaykh Rabee had already warned against Hani bin Braik.

Is such a person to be blamed, O Zakariya, or is this acceptable by your standards? And what of the person who traveled from

Medina—covering some 850 or 900 kilometers—all the way to Riyadh to visit the leaders of the Transitional Council, yet did not stop by or acknowledge the state government—which was also present in Riyadh, close to where the Transitional Council leaders were staying? He bypassed the state entirely to meet with the Transitional Council leaders; are such people to be blamed or not, O Zakariya?

And what about the person who went to ask Dr. Al-Bukhari about a trip to Riyadh to meet these individuals (STC), but did not ask Shaykh Rabee because he knew Shaykh Rabee would be angry? Is this blameworthy, O Zakariya, or is it considered normal? Is it normal to you?

And what about those who hung the emblems of the Transitional party in Sunni mosques—and in your mosque, O Zakariya, where the flag of the Socialist Party (which serves as the emblem of the Transitional Council) was displayed? I am not saying the Transitional Council is Socialist—I am not saying that now—but I am saying that the Socialist flag is present among the Transitional Council's slogans and has been hung in mosques of Ahlul Sunnah; you know this well, O Zakariya.

Why do I tell you that you are lying, evading (going around circles), and being deceptive? You know these facts, yet you conceal them from the youth. My brother, go and teach people Aqeedah (creed); at the very least, teach them Tawheed and Aqeedah. Leave people to their innate nature (fitra); do not pollute their innate nature with such fallacies—you are teaching them fallacies, O Zakariya. Regarding all the evidence cited in the criticisms leveled against the Shaykhs of Aden—evidence comprising over fifteen points demonstrating your leanings toward the Transitional Council—are you to be blamed for these things or not?

Zakariya says, “They claim we have deviated; where is the proof?” I have already mentioned the proof to you, O Zakariya. You say, “Do not mention Hani bin Buraik’s name to Shaykh Rabee’.” What do you call that? Do you call it openness and honesty with Shaykh Rabee’, or do you call it concealment? Do you call it betrayal? And when you—or rather, the questioners (I do not know if you were among them or not, but the questioners who asked the Shaykh)—said, “Shaykh, there are people coming to Aden—among them Houthi sympathizers, ISIS members, and so forth—who will enter Aden, kill the Ahlul Sunnah, and do such-and-such...”—don’t ask me where the information came from; I heard you all saying this, and Samih—Shaykh Samih—also spoke of this and stated that this was the question put to the Shaykh (Rabee). The Shaykh answered you based on the question asked; he said, “Repel them and defend yourselves.”

What did you want the Shaykh to say? Did you want him to tell you to let them slaughter and kill you? The Shaykh answered you based on the question asked; he acted with benevolence, not malice—may Allah have mercy on him and forgive him. He did what was right and issued a ruling in accordance with the question. The problem lies with you people—you are the ones who committed betrayal, concealed the truth, and altered things (changed). Otherwise, the Shaykh issued his ruling based on the question presented to him. You claim they want to infiltrate the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah etc

You claim they wanted to attack the Ahl al-Sunnah] and kill them, and so on. Who told you that? The conflict was between the government and the Transitional Council; what did Ahl al-Sunnah have to do with it? What was the connection to Ahl al-Sunnah? This is what I conveyed to Shaykh Rabee; I told him, “Shaykh, the information they relayed to you is incorrect. This is a political fight between the Transitional Council and the

government." The Transitional Council toppled the government and drove it out of Aden—drove it right out of Aden. Then, the government sought to return to Aden and regrouped; a clash occurred at the entrances to Aden—or about a hundred kilometers away, give or take—a fierce clash between the Transitional Council and the government. The government wanted to return to Aden to carry out its duties, while the Transitional Council opposed its return, citing the presence of the Muslim Brotherhood and the like.

So, when the Shaykh—may Allah have mercy on him—heard my explanation (speech), he revised the ruling (fatwa) and said, "Place yourselves under (be with) the Coalition or under the Coalition's supervision." That is the conflict that took place in Abyan, O Zakariya. You tell people that forces arrived from Marib—forces that had been there for ten years? Man, have some shame, O Zakariya; just have a little shame—have a little shame, O Zakariya. By Allah, it is shameful—shameful for you all. You are grown men; our beards have turned grey while we are still engaged in this—it is shameful for you, by Allah.

As for those who came from Marib, O Zakariya—that was a separate incident, a different event entirely. You went to Shaykh Rabee seeking a ruling regarding the Transitional Council's fight against the government; stop the fabrication and stop the lying. Your fight was against the government; the Transitional Council's fight was with the government. You claim, "These people came from Marib"—referring to a different incident, not the one in question. The forces fighting the Transitional Council were state forces—government institutions—operating under the supervision of the Minister of Interior, Ahmed Al-Maysari, and the Minister of Transport, Al-Jabwani. It was a state-led effort under the authority of the former President—may Allah have mercy on him—Abdrabbuh Mansur Hadi.

He was angry with the Transitional Council and publicly expressed this anger during a national holiday. How can you claim that your conflict has been with those coming from Marib for ten years? Well, my brother, let us—for the sake of argument—assume that these people did come from Marib. What gave you the religious justification (fatwa) to fight? Why do you issue rulings (fatwa) justifying this fight? Why? Why do you claim, "They are coming to slaughter and kill us"? Why the lies? Why the lies? Be honest, O Zakariya, and stop lying.

Zakariya mentions that people are now talking about Dr. Al-Bukhari—meaning Dr. Abdullah Al-Bukhari. Allah knows exactly whom you mean, O Zakariya. But I say to you O Zakariya: are you referring to those who used to admire Dr. Abdullah Al-Bukhari but then took issue with him for publicly criticizing Ali Al Hudheifi on a global stage without justification?

Are you referring to those who were offended—asking why he spoke against the man? The man offered counsel (advice)—may Allah reward him for his good intentions—and spoke publicly. Is it these people—those who took offense at Dr. Abdullah—whom you mean?

Or perhaps you mean the followers... do you mean the instance where some of Dr. Abdullah Al-Bukhari's followers warned against Ali Al Hudheifi? Ali Al Hudheifi wrote to him (Al Bukhari), explaining the injustice he had suffered, yet Dr. Abdullah's stance did not change. Do you mean, O Zakariya, those who felt aggrieved by Dr. Abdullah's inaction—those who note that Ali Al Hudheifi wrote to him (Al Bukhari) four times saying, "Dr. Abdullah, your followers and associates are wronging me," while he remained silent and unchanged? Is that whom you mean?

Or do you mean the honorable Sudanese people who used to love Dr. Abdullah Al-Bukhari? When he disparaged their state—equating the Sudanese National Army (which, after Allah Almighty, is the force fighting for Sudan) with the rebel Rapid Support Forces—they were angered. They confronted him, saying, "Doctor, your words have offended us in your statements"—essentially asking, "Is there no man of wisdom among you?"—and demanded a clarification (from Dr. Al Bukhari). Yet, the Doctor (Al Bukhari) merely dismissed the matter by saying, "He is not a scholar, so I should not respond to him." Do you mean those people who felt slighted?

Or perhaps you mean the rational individuals who used to make excuses for Dr. Al-Bukhari? When the Hadhramaut issue arose—and after the facts became clear, the truth was revealed, and matters were set right—they expected at least a word of conciliation or reassurance from Dr. Abdullah Al-Bukhari to the others, yet nothing of the sort came from him.

Your behavior (affair) is truly baffling, O Zakariya. You get angry on behalf of Dr. Al-Bukhari and the honor of others, yet—I do not know what you call it—you ruthlessly tear apart the reputations of others. You relentlessly attack the reputations of Nizar, Ali Al Hudheifi, Fawaz, Bilal, and fellow Salafis who still adhere to the path of true scholars. As for our reputations (honor), you grind them into the dust; by Allah, you attach no value to them—not even a single penny (fils). Yet, when it comes to Dr. Abdullah Al-Bukhari, speaking against him or challenging him is suddenly forbidden.

Why, O Zakariya? Why resort to such tactics? Why? Do you have any evidence that elevates Dr. Al-Bukhari's honor while rendering ours (our honor) permissible (to violate)? Are we not Muslims just like Dr. Abdullah? Or is our honor considered permissible to violate? Who authorized the violation of our

honor? Fear Allah, O Zakariya, and rise above this kind of discourse; it is truly shameful.

Zakariya demands an audio recording with them saying "we have rebelled against the ruler." Zakariya says: "Bring us an audio recording proving that we rebelled against the ruler." The vast crowds—the vast crowds within Aden—bear witness against you; where can you go? The reports reaching us are widespread and consistent (Tawatar), and I am one of the witnesses—one of dozens, nay, hundreds of witnesses against you—confirming that you sided with the Transitional Council against the State (government).

By Allah, I am astonished by the words of some laypeople—mere laypeople, O Zakariya—who were, I swear, more sensible than you. What did some laypeople say? They said: "Glory be to God (SubhanAllah)! You used to listen to and obey 'Afash'—Ali Abdullah Saleh, the former president—even though he was Zaydi—his roots were Zaydi—yet when Abdrabbuh Mansur came to you—a Sunni—you turned against him."

The laypeople saw you for who you are, O Zakariya; I swear, these are the words of laypeople, not of a student of knowledge; the laypeople themselves condemned your actions.

Zakariya says: "They aimed their arrows at us while leaving the Hajawira and the Ikhwan alone." O Zakariya, for seven years—seven years—you have been grinding into my honor with injustice, falsehood, and slander—in gatherings and study circles, using anonymous pens and hired pens dedicated solely to attacking me—yet I remained patient with you.

By Allah, I used to pray for you—I swear, during the Witr prayer—I used to pray: "O Lord, grant them insight; O Lord, guide them and set them right." I used to pray for you. I swear

by Allah, I never spoke about what you did—except in general terms shared publicly—until that first recording, which was merely advice for Kantoush.

That was—if I recall correctly—around August 2024, or perhaps 2025; I honestly don't remember the exact date. It came after nearly five years of patience on my part, while you were constantly targeting me with your words.

Some people malign us, calling us "Transitionalists" [affiliated with the Transitional Council]; yet I never called you that. I never said that about you. In every dawrah (conference) of discussions, they label us "Transitionalists," but we never applied that label to you—so do not lie. Brothers would bring me audio recordings and show them to me, and I would tell them: "Leave them be; Allah will guide them; Allah will set them right."

Zakariya claims: "You fought us and left..." You were the one who fought us, Zakariya—have you forgotten? Have you forgotten how you took the mosque away from us—even though we were teaching your fellow brothers from Ahlul Sunnah—and defied the directives of the Minister of Endowments (Awqaf)? Do you remember this, Zakariya, or not?

You said the minister was a Ikhwani [Muslim Brotherhood sympathizer]. As for the brother involved—Ahmed Al-Busairi—he had been the deputy imam and became the imam after the previous one was temporarily suspended. Yet, you ambushed him with Zakariya's new appointment right after he returned from burying his father—even though Zakariya lived very far from the mosque. And why was this done? When Zakariya was asked "Why?", he said: "So that Ali Al Hudheifi and he—meaning Sameh Al-Adani—wouldn't hold lessons (duroos) there." Man, fear Allah! What kind of lessons were we

holding? Lessons calling for the worshipping of graves? We hold lessons on Tawhid (monotheism), denouncing polytheism (Shirk) and its manifestations, and refuting secularists.

I never mentioned you—I swear by Allah, I never mentioned you or your associates, not even once. Find a recording—bring me just one audio clip where I mentioned you. Yet, despite that, you were determined to strip us of the mosque. So fear Allah, O Zakariya.

In the audio recording, Zakariya says—justifying the call for secession—that we should not join hands with the Houthis. He asks, "How could we join hands with the Houthis? They have seized control of the North, and we cannot possibly join hands with them." Ma shaa Allah, Ma shaa Allah...

Unfortunately, Zakariya, the State is wiser than you and has a better understanding of the objectives of Sharia; the State maintains that we cannot leave any part of Yemen under Houthi control. By Allah, the State's position is exactly what Shaykh Rabee' has said. Yet you—along with Kantoush and others—claim we cannot join hands with the Houthis. But who told you we would join hands with them? The State says, "We will cleanse Yemen of the Houthis," while you say, "We do not want to join hands with the Houthis." What does that mean? Does it mean, "Here, Houthis, take the North, and we will take the South, just so we don't have to join hands with you"? You are handing them the land, you poor soul; you are giving them the land right now.

I remind Zakariya, Zakariya: fear Allah. Fear Allah regarding your own soul. By Allah, I did not want to respond to you—for, sadly, you do not deserve a response—but I feel pity for those young people in Africa, those poor souls waiting for someone to teach them beneficial knowledge. Yet, by Allah, you are not fit

for this task. By Allah, O Zakariya, virtuous noble and sensible brothers warned me about you before these problems even arose; they said you were not on the level of a true student of knowledge. What drove you to this? What brought you to this state? I used to say, “No, perhaps the brothers misunderstood.” But I found—to speak the truth—that you were not merely what they described; you were worse.

I will stop here, In shaa Allah. May Allah’s peace, blessings, and grace be upon His servant and Messenger.