

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَالصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَى رَسُولِ اللَّهِ وَبَعْدُ:

## Re: “Working under” one man in da‘wah.

Following the previous statement on this subject, I was sent the following via whatsapp:

**Moosaa Richardson** @1MMEducation · 3d  
Replying to @1MMEducation @BakkahPubs and 11 others  
And regarding what I said that I encourage the shuyookh & centers in the West to work under him is poorly worded. Instead: I encourage them to continue their excellent efforts in this da'wah, and their cooperation with him, support of him & benefiting from his support & advice.

Which is a reference to this speech:

THIS WORKBOOK HAS BEEN PREPARED BY MOOSAA RICHARDSON FOR BAKKAH PUBLICATIONS, AS A SERVICE TO OUR ELDER, SHAYKH ABU MUHAMMAD AND HIS CLASSES. AS MY SHAYKH, 'ALLAAMAH RABEE' IBN HAADEE (MAY ALLAH PRESERVE HIM) PERSONALLY ENCOURAGED ME TO WORK UNDER ABU MUHAMMAD AND SUPPORT HIM, I ENCOURAGE OUR SHUYOOKH & CENTERS IN THE WEST TO DO LIKewise, AND I ENCOURAGE OUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN GENERAL TO BE VIGILANT ABOUT BENEFITTING FROM HIM AS A PRIORITY.

This makes matters worse, because if encouraging the shuyūkh and centers in the West to **work under** one man is “poorly worded”, then **what has been ascribed to Shaykh Rabī** (“personally encouraged me to work under”) itself requires recanting from.

Either the Shaykh gave this advice which entails taḥazzub, or his speech was poorly comprehended and improperly conveyed. **We cannot let such a thing be ascribed to Shaykh Rabī as it runs contrary to his manhaj and his lifelong da‘wah.**

In short, Shaykh Rabīʿ is free of this type of speech, he does not call to this, and we have never heard, read or known of any such advice from the Shaykh in over two and half decades.

Saying that one’s own speech was “poorly worded” while not freeing Shaykh Rabīʿ from what has been directly ascribed to him at the same time does not resolve anything.

Rather, it only makes the matter worse because it implies that when you say “work under”, it was “poorly worded”, but when Shaykh Rabīʿ says “to work under” (as ascribed to him), it can be left as it is and does not require clarification. Freeing yourself from blameworthy speech while leaving it ascribed to an Imām of the Sunnah can be considered a revilement.

Further, lying (kadhib) is defined as informing about something upon other than what it is, in its reality, and this can be deliberate (what we call “lying”) or not deliberate (what we call an error). We do not accuse anyone of deliberately lying upon a scholar, as this could have been due to misunderstanding and error.

However, once the affair has been made clear and apparent, then continuing to ascribe something to a scholar what he did not say or intend can in fact become a deliberate lie. Thus, this matter remains unresolved. Either Shaykh Rabīʿ personally encouraged you to work under one man, or you misunderstood it and ascribed to him what he did not say.

Finally, there is nothing behind this except to exonerate a scholar, an Imām of the Sunnah of our time, from something he is free of, rather from something that he is wholly and vehemently opposed to.