

The Similitude of Shaykh Rabīʿ (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadi: Between the Fortifier of the Castle and the Treacherous Insider

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ، وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ، وَالصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَى رَسُولِ اللَّهِ، أَمَا بَعْدُ:



FROM THE SIGNS of the Innovators is that they label Ahl al-Sunnah ‘Murji’ah’ as mentioned by Harb bin Ismā’īl (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) in his statement of creed: “**And as for the Khārijites, they call Ahl al-Sunnah ‘Murji’ah.**” This same accusation was engineered against the Imāms of the Sunnah in the contemporary era by the modern-day Khārijites, the Qutbiyyah Surūriyyah.

When their figureheads were refuted and shown to be misguided, having the innovations of the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah, Ṣūfiyyah, Khawārij and the poison of the Rāfiḍah, some of these “former” Takfīrīs¹ entered the ranks of the Salafīs and took a new approach.

¹ Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād, after whom the Ḥaddādīs are named, is mentioned by both Shaykh Muḥammad Amān al-Jāmī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) to have been from the Takfīrīs.

They are commonly known as “Ḥaddādīs” and appeared in levels and waves, with a common underlying hatred of Ahl al-Sunnah and their scholars and a display of undue harshness.

Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī (رَحْمَةُ اللهِ) said: “The Ḥaddādī sect has severe enmity towards Ahl al-Sunnah, past and present.”²

As explained by Shaykh Rabīʿ often in his writings, they displayed zeal for Salafiyyah and used harshness and hasty, oppressive *tabdīʿ* as a weapon to create chaos and confusion within the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah under the guise of jealousy for the *ʿaqīdah*, while displaying softness and lenience towards the adversaries of Ahl al-Sunnah.

They selected a specific area of creed as a back door entrance and ideological weapon for the furtherance of their goals.

It is the subject of Īmān and the accusation of Irjāʾ with a focus on the issue of takfīr of the abandoner of prayer (*tārik al-ṣalāt*), the one who dies without any good (*takfīr tārik al-ʿamal*) and what they call the genus of action (*jins al-ʿamal*) and the issue of the excuse of ignorance (*al-ʿudhru bil-jahl*). They capitalised on the controversies and differing in these subjects to create confusion and used them as entry points for their goals. They targeted Shaykh al-Albānī (رَحْمَةُ اللهِ) first, and then other senior scholars.

Shaykh ʿAbd al-Salām bin Barjis (رَحْمَةُ اللهِ) said: “Al-Albānī is a signpost from the signposts of the Sunnah. Rather, he is the head of Ahl al-Sunnah in Shām during his time, just as Ibn Bāz is the head of Ahl al-Sunnah in the Arabian peninsula. The one who throws the accusation of Irjāʾ at Shaykh al-Albānī can only be in one of two affairs: either he is from the Khārijites, or he is from the ignoramuses, or wrongdoers who do not know what is Irjāʾ and who is the Murjiʾ.”³

² In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī (August 2014) , found here: <https://rabee.net/وقفات-مع-بعض-تليبيسات-وجاهالات-عبد-الحمي/>

³ In an audio recording: <https://abuyyaad.com/d/barjis-albani-irja>.

Shaykh ‘Abd al-Salām (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) delivered a lecture in the early 2000s titled “Who are the Scholars?”. In this lecture he explained the lofty status of the elder, senior scholars—from whom are Shaykh al-Albānī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and Shaykh Bin Bāz (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ)—and refuted the doubts of the Surūriyyah who attack the rulers and make takfir of them, find fault with the scholars for not showing rejection against the rulers and not entering into blameworthy politics, accuse the scholars of being scholars of women’s menses and postpartum bleeding and other such slanders. He mentioned the rejection shown against the book, “Milestones” of Sayyid Quṭb, which is the foundation for the modern-day Ikhwānī, Takfirī, revolutionary ideology against the rulers and belittlement and mockery of the scholars. He (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) also explained that the role of the scholars is to explain the Sharī‘ah politics (*siyāsah shar‘iyyah*) and clarify its rulings, and they are not required to function as a “news agency”, by reporting on all events as implied by the Ḥarakiyyīn (political activists) upon their corrupt understanding of “*fiqh al-wāqi*”.

Speaking about the danger of this type of rhetoric, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Salām (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said: “Among these principles is respect for scholars and recognition of their status in the (Islamic) legislation. It is not surprising that this topic is from the signposts of the religion which if neglected, the religion becomes fractured and its structure collapses. Indeed, the scholars are the link connecting us to the [Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ)] who brought us the Sharī‘ah. They are the carriers of religion, and it is through them that the law of Allāh (سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى) has reached us. If these scholars are not respected and their rights are not recognized, chaos will ensue among the people, especially concerning the most important thing to them: their religion.”⁴

⁴ *Man Hum al-‘Ulamā’* (Dār al-Kitāb wal-Sunnah, 1426H), p. 6. Some people have tried to use this lecture to defend those who are complicit in affairs which if Shaykh ‘Abd al-Salām bin Barjis was alive today (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ), he would not have hesitated to

The Surūriyyah, and after them the Ḥaddādiyyah entered chaos into the ranks of the Salafīs with their accusations of Irjā' against Shaykh al-Albānī, Shaykh Bin Bāz and others, and all of this was connected with the affair of politics and the rulers. They wanted to take down the scholars because the scholars were a hindrance to their political agendas.

Shaykh Rabī^٥ (رَبِيعُ اللَّهِ) said: “The contemporary Ḥaddādī Khārijites have greatly strengthened themselves by adopting the words and methodology of the early Khārijites, and they follow the approach of the earlier Kharijites in accusing Ahl al-Sunnah of Irjā'.”⁵

Shaykh Rabī^٦ (رَبِيعُ اللَّهِ) said: “As is known from the contemporary people of desires, among whom is the transgressing, oppressive Ḥaddādī sect whose methodology and foundations necessitate the accusation of Irjā' against the majority of Ahl al-Sunnah.”⁶

Shaykh Rabī^٦ (رَبِيعُ اللَّهِ) recognised their scheme and over the past decades expended great efforts in writing on these subject matters and exposing them and their evil. This culminated in his very courageous move to tackle the issue of the takfīr of the one who abandons the prayer and the one who has no good deeds and defend the many scholars, past and present who held these views which the Ḥaddādīs

speak out against them, after advice and correction, because he (رَبِيعُ اللَّهِ) was very severe in these issues of rulership, authority, obedience and rebellion. However, with the loss of scholars and shaykhs of this calibre, the true and accurate scales are lost, the weighing (of affairs) is compromised and weakened, and what would never have been tolerated then, is tolerated now. His precious words in this lecture—which were intended to defend the likes of Shaykh Bin Bāz, Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, the senior scholars in Riyāḍ and others from the attacks of those desiring rebellion against legitimate authority—are now being used, ironically, to defend ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadi and his group. How times, understandings and priorities have changed.

⁵ In the refutation against ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī.

⁶ In his refutation of the Ḥaddādī ‘Abd Allāh bin Ṣawān (September 2018), found here: <https://rabee.net/الحجة-الدامغة-لأباطيل-وأسول-الحدادية/>

consider to be Irjā' and agreeing with the Murji'ah, and he did so with compelling evidences.

Pictured: The book, *Atharī Statements in Refutation of the Doubts and Contentions of the Ḥaddādiyyah* (2014), in which the Shaykh refuted the basis of their accusations.

These great efforts of Shaykh Rabī' can be likened to a man in a large castle who works diligently to fortify every gate, every door, and to seal every opening so that no opportunity remains at all for the enemy to enter, as a means of protecting Ahl al-Sunnah.



This is what Shaykh Rabī' did when, during and after the fitnah of al-Ḥajjūrī, he wrote on these issues, despite knowing full well that the Ḥaddādīs will use the scholars in Riyāḍ to extract speech against him and escalate the accusations of Irjā' against him.

From those Ḥaddādīs is **Hishām al-Beily** from Egypt. He and his likes would record his phone calls with some of these scholars without permission and ask them loaded questions, and then drop the name of Shaykh al-Albānī, or Shaykh Rabī' afterwards to capture it in the recording, and they would claim that they fell into Irjā' or agreed with the Murji'ah, and that the scholars whom they recorded have said so, intending by that to create chaos.⁷ Al-Beily also made the same

⁷ Shaykh Badr bin Muḥammad al-Badr said: "All praise is due to Allāh, Lord of the Worlds. I went with my brother Ḥamad bin Rajā al-Ḍhafiri to the Shaykh, hte father, Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān, and we performed the Aṣr prayer with him at Masjid

accusation against the Salafī shaykhs of Egypt and spoke with vile speech against Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā (رحمة الله), calling him “an ignorant man” and prohibiting Allāh’s mercy from being invoked for him.

This man was advised by Shaykh Rabī‘ and the shaykhs of Egypt also advised him, but he continued in his evil path. So they warned against him on account of this and other violations of the foundations of the Sunnah, and his state remains unchanged till this day, since there has been no clear, open repentance.

Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā (رحمة الله) said: **“If he (al-Beily) and those with him are not Ḥaddādiyyah, then who are the Ḥaddādiyyah?”**

Refer to: <https://abuiyaad.com/w/arafat-beily> for details.

Shaykh Shihāb bin Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā said in a recent audio clip: “This Hishām al-Beily, may Allāh give him what he deserves, he says that is not permissible to invoke mercy upon Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā. Meaning, when he dies, it is not permissible to invoke mercy upon him, or after he dies, it is not permissible to invoke mercy upon him. This is the speech of Hishām al-Beily, and Shaykh ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī defends him, that he is good, and he, this Hishām al-Beily, reviles Shaykh al-Albānī, Imām

Ḥammād al-Salāmah in the al-Fayḥā’ district of Riyaḍ on Wednesday, the 18th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah, 1434H. After the prayer, we accompanied him part of the way and I asked him some questions, including: I said to him: “O Shaykh Ṣāliḥ, there is a man from Egypt who came to you and questioned you about Shaykh al-Albānī. He secretly recorded this and attributed statements to you that give the impression that you are attacking the ‘aqīdah of Shaykh al-Albānī.’ Shaykh Ṣāliḥ said: ‘That is a lie and slander. That is not true. I am not attacking al-Albānī and I am not warning against him. These people are looking for *fitan* (tribulations). Leave them alone and do not concern yourselves with them. We know nothing but good about al-Albānī.’ Then I said to the Shaykh: ‘May Allah protect you, O Shaykh. Indeed, these people are seeking *fitan*.’” *Diḡā’at al-A’lām Fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Beily Hishām* (p. 310).

of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah, the Ḥāfiḍh of the Sunnah, the transmitter of the Sunnah and the authenticator of the books of the Sunnah, he says that he is a Murji', or he says that he agreed with the Murji'ah. Does this man have knowledge, is it right for Shaykh 'Arafāt to defend this man. I debated this issue with him and said that he should turn away from that so that he is not in agreement with him in his revilement of Shaykh al-Albānī and nor in agreement with him in his saying of the absence of invoking mercy for Shaykh Ḥasan al-Bannā'. And with this absence of invoking mercy for Shaykh Ḥasan al-Bannā', this al-Beily is accusing him of disbelief (*kufri*), or accusing him with apostasy (*riddah*).”⁸

As for the similitude of 'Arafāt al-Muḥammadi, it is the man on the inside of the castle who looks for the openings, or creates these openings, in order to allow the likes of Hishām al-Beily to enter, or sends the inhabitants of the castle to him,⁹ after praising him a lot, trying to convince the inhabitants that this Ḥaddādī deviant is an upright man of the Sunnah, a Salafi, with whom there are no issues, and who has the right to retaliate against those who criticise him and the right to “scratch” anyone who scratches him.

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

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

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

⁸ Video clip: <https://abuiyaad.com/d/shihab-beily-arafat>.

⁹ One of 'Arafāt's students and followers Mūsā Khalaf said in an audio clip that was circulated: “A small question: I was in Madinah with Shaykh 'Arafāt and spoke with him a little about Egypt, and he praised Shaykh Hishām al-Beily very highly. I wanted to ask where he is now. Is he nearby, or is he far away?” This proves that 'Arafāt al-Muḥammadi endorses Ḥaddādī deviants to his students.

Refer to: <https://abuiyaad.com/w/arafat-beily> for evidences.

Al-Fuḍayl bin ‘Iyād (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said: “A person of the Sunnah does not incline towards a person of innovation except out of hypocrisy.” And he also said: “Whoever honours a person of innovation has aided in the destruction of Islām.” And Imām Aḥmad (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) was asked by Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī about seeing a man from Ahl al-Sunnah with a man from Ahl al-Bid‘ah, whether he should speak to him or not. Imām Aḥmad said that he should first inform him that he is a person of innovation, so he either stops speaking to him, or he (Abū Dāwūd) should stop speaking to him. And al-Barbahārī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said in Sharḥ al-Sunnah: “When you see a man sitting with a person of desires, then warn him and inform him. If he then sits with him after knowledge, then beware of him, for he is a person of desires.” This is for the one who accompanies and befriends an innovator. As for the one who directs others to do so, and praises and defends the innovator, then he is much worse.

This is the clear Salafī methodology, and anyone who values this methodology and proceeds upon it in knowledge, belief and action, will not hesitate to judge the actions of ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī by it, and take the necessary, clear, unwavering stance regarding his treachery towards Imām al-Albanī, Shaykh Rabī^c and Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā, and to the generality of Ahl al-Sunnah, which is all but apparent in his praise and defence of this Ḥaddādī and his attempt to re-enter him into the ranks. This one issue is sufficient, for the person of the Sunnah who values the status of the senior scholars, the guidance of the Salaf and the principles they clarified for the protection of the Sunnah and its people.

Hence, you are either with the senior scholars who are most worthy of the label of “scholar (‘ālim)” such as Imām al-Albanī and Shaykh Rabī,^c and you respect them and their positions, or you are with

Hishām al-Beily, ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī and his followers in a matter that is as clear as the daylight sun.

I once again call upon all of Ahl al-Sunnah in the West who value the Salafī methodology and the great efforts taken by Shaykh Rabīf against this destructive path to take a clear, open, unified, uncompromising stance against this man which is necessitated by the Salafī methodology and its principles.

Claiming to love and defend the senior scholars while turning a blind eye to these treacherous attempts to sneak Ḥaddādī deviants who revile the senior scholars into the fortress of Ahl al-Sunnah cannot be reconciled. In our similitude, it is like some in the fortress who witness a treacherous man trying to sneak in an open adversary through a backdoor or a secret opening. However, they just walk away without any concern and remain totally silent thereafter while claiming to love and defend those notables in the fortress whom the adversary has targeted, in this case with an ancient accusation made by the evil Khārijites against the Imāms of Ahl al-Sunnah in the era of the Salaf. Further, when the treacherous insider has been exposed for giving shelter to an open adversary—this being just one of his acts of treachery—he pretends as if nothing happened and then mobilises his proxies and soldiers to attack those who exposed his act of treachery. This includes accusing some of them of being plants and infiltrators because they advised people in the fortress to be cautious of harmful foreign medications from Ahl al-Kitāb. All of this, in order to create smoke and mirrors to divert people’s attention from seeing the obvious, plain reality of the situation.

I leave the reader with the pertinent speech of Shaykh ‘Alī al-Huḍhayfī, perhaps it may lead people to take heed.

Abu ‘Iyaad

8 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1447 / 25 May 2026

Dr. ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī is the Cause of These Tribulations

By Shaykh ‘Ali al-Hudhayfi

“As long as Arafāt Al-Muḥammadī continues to treat the callers in this way, the problems, the discord, and the disagreements will persist.

‘Arafāt is a very evil man, and I hope you will listen to the wise witnesses, those who desire goodness for the Salafi da‘wah and are far more virtuous than ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī, and there is no enmity between them and ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī.

If a man becomes notorious for evil things, and news about him to that effect circulates widely from all sides, then it is not permissible to ignore these reports, as if one had not heard anything and was unaware of anything.

I have highlighted certain matters concerning Dr ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadī, including things I personally observed during my acquaintance with him, such as his positions regarding some political parties, and numerous accounts about him shared by many esteemed brothers from various countries, including Arab countries and beyond, which no fair person could deny.

All these reports indicate that he is a very dangerous man for the Salafi da‘wah.

Reports of his corruption have received wide circulation (*tawātur*), in ways that make it impossible for the people involved to collude to lie, and these reports have come from Madinah, Yemen, Bahrain, Egypt, Indonesia, the United Kingdom, and other countries. In some of these countries, the reports are abundant and have been received from more than one location. So, how then, if these reports are combined with other reports? And if these reports are abundant from just one person due to the multitude of routes (of reporting), what if

they are abundant from many trustworthy and virtuous individuals, and from various countries?

Therefore, even if some of them were not independently true, these reports (due to their abundance) could not (all) be ignored. So what, then, if they are independently true? It is not permissible—by Allah, it is not permissible to disregard this plentiful transmission.

Dr ʿArafāt al-Muḥammadi has divided the Salafis in many parts of the world through his deception, oppression, and conspiracies. He conceals the truth, he endorses certain innovators and deviants, covers for other deviants, and harasses students of knowledge who oppose his conspiracies, targeting them by unleashing his gang of fools against them, and so on.

This man's conspiracies have reached the point where he conceals information about knowledge and fatwās (of scholars), supports certain political parties in their endeavours, the shedding of innocent blood and the overthrow of the ruler. His conspiracies even went so far as to support those calling for the partition of Yemen. What vileness could there be after this?

By Allāh, this man should receive a fair trial and be punished in a way that deters him and other traitors like him.

He deceived some young people and threw them into the arms of certain political parties in Yemen, so these poor young people became (sacrificial) victims of this man.

Scholars have criticised the Ḥaddādiyyah because they make tabdīʿ of errant Salafis on account of errors that do not warrant tabdīʿ. As for ʿArafāt al-Muhammadi and those with him, they fought the honourable people and expelled them from Salafiyah because they were honourable and protective of the daʿwah. They refused to involve Salafiyah in the conflicts of political parties.

Many people have attacked the integrity of ‘Arafāt al-Muhammadi. Those who have done so include scholars and students of knowledge, and they are numerous. They knew him very well.

They accused him of serious things so it is not permissible, by Allāh, to remain silent about these widely-reported deviations. In remaining silent about them, there is great harm to the Salafi da‘wah.

By Allāh, we will be held accountable before Allāh for the da‘wah, for the splitting of the youth, and for allowing the innovators to rejoice (with malice) about the (harms to the) da‘wah.”

—From his article of 17 Sha‘bān 1447 (5 February 2026)

<https://t.me/AliAlHuthaif55/3145>