

The Slanders of al-Ikhwān al-Muflisīn Against Salafiyyah, Its Scholars and Callers Repackaged With the Social Sciences and Brought to You by ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker and Company

Bismillāh wal-Ḥamdulillāh. During the 1990s, when the Salafi scholars waged war against the Muslim Brotherhood, their misguided doctrines and their extremism and exaggeration in their figureheads, the Ikhwānīs (in the form of the Surūrīs, Quṭbīs and Turāthīs) initiated their slanderous labels: **Murji’ah with the Rulers** (because they call for unity behind authorities and absence of revolution, chaos and destruction). **Khawārij with the Du’āt** (because they refute the agitators and those who rouse whole nations against their rulers, as was the case with Safar and Salmān). **Rāfiḍah with the Jamā’āt** (because they reject the deviant political groups of the 20th century who have been nothing but a tribulation upon the Muslims, and are aimed at uniting sects of innovation into organised masses for political activism). **Qadariyyah with the Unbelievers** (because they stick to Sharīah principles and guidelines that relate to non-Muslims and their states in terms of trade relations, diplomacy, permitted alliances and so on and call for the adherence to the rule of law in matters of jihad, and because they restrict legal verdicts in these issues only for the most erudite of learned and aged scholars and not the young and foolish pretenders).

All of this was packaged as “**Salafiyyah Jadīdah**”, **Neo-Salafism**, a term coined to discredit the actual Salafī methodology and to make it appear as if the Salafī scholars and those upon their way had introduced

a novel form of Salafiyyah not known to the Salaf. They made great the lie. Rather, they used this deceitful method to undermine the Salafī methodology itself.

From those who led this assault were the likes of **‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Shayijī**, a fanatical follower of **‘Abd al-Rahman ‘Abd al-Khāliq**, the Egyptian Ikhwānī who repackaged the doctrines of Bannā’, Quṭb and Mawdūdī for Salafi audiences. He brought them “Political Parties”, “Collective Work”, “Tawḥīd al-Ḥākimiyyah” and “Ta‘addud al-Jamā‘āt”. Al-Shayijī portrayed the Salafis as a “cult” with a cult leader (intending a specific scholar), possessing certain traits and characteristics. This is the well-known and understood way of Ahl al-Bid‘ah of old, who would slander the Salaf with various labels.

Then came the Ikhwānī plant, **Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma’ribī** and he came from the same angle. He waited until the three major scholars (al-Albānī, Bin Bāz, Ibn ‘Uthaymīn) passed away around the turn of the century before coming out in the open to wage war and to propagate his repackaged Ikhwānī principles among Salafis as a means of undermining the Salafī methodology. He was especially and specifically targeting what Shaykh Rabī‘ had performed in the previous decade of exposing the Ikhwān, Sayyid Qutb, Mawdūdī and their destructive principles aimed at takfīr and revolution. Likewise as a means of shielding the innovators, the political jamā‘āt and compromising the great, protective role of the manhaj of disparaging and refuting innovators and deviants and liars.

This manhaj is part of the ways and means by which Allāh preserves His dīn. Without this we would not have the purity of revealed text and nor sound creed and nor sound methodology, and the Muslims would have thereby followed the ways of the Jews and Christians, who have an

altered, distorted (muḥarraf, mubaddal) dīn. And Allāh said of the Ahl al-Kitāb: **“They used not to prevent one another from wrongdoing that they did. How wretched was that which they were doing.”** (5:79). The Salafī scholars as whole stood to perform this obligation and among them were those who played a tremendous role due to their detailed knowledge of some of these figureheads.

So al-Maʿribī waged this war and he found staunch, fanatical, vocal supporters in the West such as **Abū Usāmah Khalīfah**, **ʿAbd al-Qādir Baksh** (Luton) and those who allied with his followers such as Brixton and others. After al-Maʿribī came al-Ḥalabī and then al-Ramaḍanī (and more recently al-Ruḥaylī), all carrying principles which were extensions or reformulations of those earlier principles.¹ All of this activity was aimed again at a particular scholar who has played the greatest, most active role in exposing Qub, Mawdūdī and the Ikhwān in general through writings and speeches. So these were the **Mumayyiʿah**, those who soften and water down the principles of the religion, especially in the field of al-jarḥ wal-taʿdīl, standing against deviation and misguidance, and displaying loyalty and building unity around the truth.

¹ The poison of Ikhwān had two aspects, one which related to the rulers, which is ḥākimiyyah, takfīr, khurūj all disguised as “jihād” (as found with Quṭb) and the other relating to destruction of the uṣūl of the sunnah as it relates to their position towards the deviant sects and the innovators and walāʾ for the Sunnah and its people (as found with al-Bannā). So some of these deviants, like al-Maʿribī, al-Ḥalabī, al-Ramaḍanī had speech against the aspect that relates to rulers and takfīr and jihād, but they fell into error in the other aspect and that was because of their ties and connections with the Quṭbiyyah like Muḥammad Ḥassān, ʿAdnān ʿArʿūr and Ikhwānīs like Abū al-Ḥasan al-Maʿribī, and some of them were taking funds from Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth, the umbrella organisation responsible for spreading Ikhwāniyyah in the name of Salafiyyah during the 80s in 90s. So they had mistakes in this area and they were refuted in that respect by the scholars, at the head of them Shaykh Rabīʿ.

On the other side were the **Haddaadiyyah**, Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād, ‘Abd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl. They had ghuluww in tabdī‘ (of past scholars like Ibn Ḥajar), ghuluww in their leaders, and they instilled hatred towards scholars. These earlier and pioneering Ḥaddādīs also had their origins in the Ikhwān, they were former takfīrīs. This series of Ḥaddādiyyah and its traits culminated in al-Hajuri and his followers who launched a large-scale assault against Shaykh Rabī‘ and the Shaykhs of Madīnah. All of them, the early Ḥaddādīs and the later ones, were spoken of and refuted by Shaykh Rabī‘. And they too brought out the same descriptions, what amounted to treating Shaykh Rabī‘ as a cult leader, followed by a cult.

In the 1990s, we saw many articles written at the time, “Regarding the Jāmī Cult”, “The Madkhalī Cult” and so on. Jāmiyyah was a label they invented after Shaykh Muḥammad Amān al-Jāmī who was extremely vocal against the Surūrī Khārijites and he was physically attacked and also maligned a great deal, Allāh have mercy upon him. They coined “Madkhaliyyah” as well, and this was taken and adopted also by the various other sects such as the Jahmite Ash‘arīs, the Ṣūfīs and likewise non-Muslim academics. So all of these terms were coined by people of bāṭil and gained currency among people of bāṭil in their various types.

Today, there are inheritors of these methods, these labels, this type of language which we have observed and experienced from all the deviants and innovators in the past, from the 1990s, such as ‘**Alī al-Timimi**. He said exactly the same things (making accusations of cult behaviour and cult leadership) and likewise **Idris Palmer** who was an extremely angry and vocal spokesman for the Quṭbiyyah, a hardcore fanatic, he was unequalled and unrivalled in that. Likewise, **Abū Zubayr al-Kadhhabī** (as we called him during our defence of Shaykh al-Albānī against his lies sixteen years ago) and whose real name is Saleem Beg. Likewise, **Shakeel Beg** (a Suroori upon the madhhab of ‘Abd al-

Raḥmān ‘Abd al-Khāliq, Safar and Salmān), and there were many others. They used the slogan “Salafiyah Jadeedah” or Neo-Salafism and they intended by this to portray Salafis as a cult.

These names and labels arose because of their bankruptcy in evidence, and because they had been exposed, their principles demolished and their figureheads refuted for the deviation that was apparent and clear in their teachings and writings.

Today, the legacy and heritage of those people has been taken up by another group and they include: **Tāhir Wyatt**, **Shadeed Muhammad**, **Muhammad Munir**, **‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker** and their likes. Between them they vary as to the degree to which they express their feelings, with Tahir Wyatt being the most cunning and careful.

Some of them realise that the type of da’wah they want to carry for the lands in which they live is not one that can be based upon the methodology of the Prophets in rectifying the servant and the land. Shadeed Muhammad, for example, belittles the effect of Tawhid in rectifying societies.

This group also sees itself as a fully qualified, independent scholarship, and this is clear from the likes of Tahir Wyatt and Munir Muhammad, they have made statements which indicate that this is the direction they are going in, and what they conceal is more than the little that they reveal.

This group relies upon the very principles of those previous innovators who were refuted and exposed by Shaykh Rabī‘ and others, in order to justify their chosen actions in da’wah, their behaviours, their positions and their alliances. Knowing that there is a strong body of evidence refuting those principles, they have sought to shield themselves by

spreading lies and slanders among the general folk, most of whom will not have been around in the 1990s and 2000s, or are new to Salafiyyah, or do not grasp these affairs. So they are trying to shield their audiences and confuse others by using these labels, trying to throw the “cult label” upon Salafis and their scholars and this is because of their bankruptcy in arguments. Historically, they sided with those who were clearly in error. So whilst those individuals were disparaged and refuted, and rightly so, and with evidences, this party were the ones who were inviting them or hosting them or accommodating them here in the West, or allying with their supporters and defenders. And this is famous and known.

So now, they have gone to the social sciences as a means of casting what has taken place over the past 20 years of the refutation of the Ikhwān, their plots for the da‘wah of Ahl al-Sunnah, their infusion of destructive principles and the likes, to cast all of that, and showing loyalty around correct, evidence based positions as “cult behaviour”.

This is because they found no argument in the religion, in terms of the Salafī uṣūl. They have full knowledge that the evidences and the truth are with the Salafī scholars who have spoken in these matters. It is evident to them that Shaykh ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-‘Abbād was wrong on the issue of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma‘ribī and the truth was with Shaykh Rabī‘ all along. Refer to our article: “Regarding Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma‘ribī al-Ikhwani: Why Shaykh Rabī‘ Was Correct and Shaykh ‘Abdul-Muḥsin al-‘Abbād Was Wrong (Yet Both Are Rewarded)”² which makes this matter lucidly clear. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma‘ribī is a hardcore Ikhwānī upon the manhaj of Ḥasan al-Bannā to the letter and he exposed himself openly during the so-called Arab Spring in 2011.

² Refer to the article <http://www.themadkhalis.com/md/?nvskb>

So they have no basis within the religion itself, from within the Salafī uṣūl, all of that is against them and their positions cannot be supported from the Salafī uṣūl and from the books of the Salaf such as Uṣūl al-Sunnah, Sharḥ al-Sunnah, al-Ibānah, Sharḥ Uṣūl al-ʾItiqād. And nowadays, we even see them discouraging from these books, because they do not like the clarity of these books and because these books turn people away from their daʿwah. They discourage from teaching Sharḥ al-Sunnah for example, because what it contains of the Salafi methodology which convicts and undermines their own actions and behaviours.

ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Baker, in a recent short 10 minute audio clip frames love for scholars because of the truth they carry and convey and walāʾ for the truth and its people—within the historical context of the refutations of the Salafi scholars against deviants such as al-Safar, Salmān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿAbd al-Khāliq, ʿAdnān Arʿūr, Maghrāwī, al-Maʾribī and their likes—as “behavioural extremism”. He claims that this emerged during the late 1990s, from 1996 onwards, and this is when the war gained momentum between ʿAlī al-Timīmī, Abū Muntaṣir and company representing Safar, Salmān and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿAbd al-Khāliq and their Ikhwānī, Bannāʾī manhaj and the Salafis who were upon the manhaj of the Salaf. Positions were taken against ʿAlī al-Timīmī, Abū Muntaṣir, then a Jihādī Takfīrī and staunch follower of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿAbd al-Khāliq’s doctrines and others. The books of Shaykh Rabīʿ refuted Quṭb, Bannā and Mawdūdī as well as the promoters of their doctrines. This in turn had an impact on those in the UK who held positions on these issues such as Suḥayb Ḥasan for example and became defenders of Ikhwānīs like ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿAbd al-Khāliq.

In reality, ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Baker’s speech—and that of the others—is not about the Salafīs in the West, it is about Shaykh Rabīʿ. However, they cannot really come out with that, they cannot ascribe the development of a cult to Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī, Shaykh ʿUbayd, Shaykh Aḥmad

al-Najmī and others—though this is their real intent—so they have thrown this upon those who carry the statements, guidance and rulings of those scholars upon Ikhwānī individuals, and this is the way of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker, they blame some of these scholars, this is their orientation, but in presenting it outwardly, they say that it is Salafis who have made it all into a cult and some of them say they have tricked and used these scholars for their own ends, in order create a monopoly thereby entering into the realm of conspiracy theories.

With respect to Shaykh Rabī‘, the Imāms of the Sunnah such as Shaykh al-Albānī, Shaykh Ibn Bāz, Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn and Shaykh Muqbil described Shaykh Rabī‘ as:

- “An Imām of the Sunnah”, Shaykh Bin Bāz.
- “The carrier of the flag of al-Jarḥ wal-Ta‘dīl”, Shaykh al-Albānī.
- “From the most insightful of people of the jamā‘āt (partisan groups) and the taint (dakhan) of the jamā‘āt in this era”, Shaykh Muqbil.
- “He filters out the Ḥizbiyyīn with a filtering and he makes clear what they are upon”, Shaykh Muqbil.
- “A sign amongst the signs (āyāt) of Allāh in knowledge of the Ḥizbiyyīn.” Shaykh Muqbil.
- “Shaikh Rabī‘ is from the Ulamā’ of the Sunnah, and from the people of goodness. His aqidah is sound and his manhaj is strong and sound. However, when he began to speak about some of the symbolic figureheads of some of the people, from amongst the latecomers they began to tarnish him with these faults.” As was said by Shaykh Ibn ‘Uthaymīn.

Two of these Shaykhs are the teachers of Shaykh Rabīʿ (al-Albānī, Ibn Bāz) and the other two are his peers.³ This is what grieves them. That an Imām like Rabīʿ bin Hādī has been praised by the greatest scholars of the era and that he has stood in the face of misguided Ikhwānīs like al-Maʿribī and others. They themselves, this band of people who raise this accusation of “cult behaviour”, either stood on the wrong side of the fence between truth and falsehood or they actually sat on the fence itself. In doing so, they relied upon what are now known to be errors, such as the position of Shaykh ʿAbd al-Muḥsin who wrote on this subject, but was in error, because the reality of ʿAbū al-Ḥasan al-Maʿribī has become manifestly clear.

Towards the end of the 1990s, Shaykh al-Albānī admitted that Shaykh Rabīʿ was more knowledgeable of Sayyid Quṭb than him, because Shaykh al-Albānī continued to speak well of him, until the realities became clear. Likewise with respect to Safar and Salmān, Shaykh al-Albānī finally realised the evil they were upon and labelled them Khārijīyah ʿAṣriyyah. He spoke harsh words against them and he admitted again that the Shaykhs in Madīnah were more knowledgeable of them than him. In a similar manner, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Muḥsin did not know the reality of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Maʿribī, and upon that he wrote some short works, such as Rifqan Ahl al-Sunnah, which in their own right, completely divorced from the issue of al-Maʿribī, contain that which is beneficial, but they were written in light of al-Maʿribī and his fitnah, and in that the Shaykh, as it is now apparent, was in error. So the likes of these people rejoiced with those types of writings from those scholars in the midst of the fitnah. However, all of the mist and fog in that regard has been lifted and uncovered and the likes of ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Baker and company can no longer rely upon those arguments any more.

³ Refer to our ebook: “Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī's Advice Regarding Daʿwah” on <http://www.salafiebooks.com>

They were criticised for either supporting falsehood or being indifferent to it or using feeble doubts to avoid speaking with the truth due to lack of humility, and this grieves them tremendously. Hence, they inherited this slander from those before them, the slander of treating Salafis as a cult, those Salafīs who recognised the truth and aided it because it is the truth and agrees with the way of the Salaf, not because of who said it, but because it is based upon evidence. That’s all they can resort to now, due to bankruptcy in evidence.

In his slander, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker simply uses the word “cultism” and says there is no cultism in Salafiyyah... all of this is a revival of the statements of the 1990s, “the Jāmiyyah Cult”, “the Madkhalī Cult”, “Salafiyyah Jadīdah”, save that ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker has removed the names Jāmī and Madkhalī and just used the word “cult”. So this is what they are doing. But if you ask them, let us evaluate all of our positions, one by one regarding for example: ‘Alī al-Timīmī, Suḥayb Ḥasan, Safar, Salmān, Iḥyā al-Turāh, ‘Ar’ūr, al-Maghrāwī, al-Ma’ribī and so on... let us see where the truth lies, that which should be held onto, then they cannot go in that direction, because they already lost those battles, because the truth was not with al-Ma’ribī and nor al-Maghrāwī and other Ikhwānīs. Likewise, they cannot contest the falsehood of the principles that Ar’ūr and al-Ma’ribī brought, “We correct but do not disparage”, “If you judge, you will be judged”, “verification (tathabbut)”, the vast manhaj (al-manhaj al-wāsi’)” and so on, because the truth is against them. They cannot contest on these issues because they know they will lose, and they know that practically speaking, they themselves implement these principles. So they can neither debate these issues, nor can they go to scholars with respect to these issues because they come back down to evidences. The evidences are established and known that al-Ma’ribī and others are upon pure falsehood and that they are Ikhwānīs who brought these principles which are simply repackaged Ikhwānī principles aimed

at undermining the Salafī manhaj and allowing an Ikhwānī type da‘wah to proceed unhindered.

They cannot go to Salafi scholars and build this accusation of “cultism”, as it cannot be based on the actual knowledge-based issues under contention. Instead, they have gone to the social sciences of the disbelievers and to non-Salafi or non-Muslim academics and started using terms such as “cult behaviour”, “groupthink” and so on. So this is their approach these days, and it is nothing new, they desire to pass judgement upon the Salafi methodology through these sciences. They cannot substantiate their position by starting with the uṣūl of the Salaf, so they have gone to the social sciences and built the accusation of “cultism” and then tried to make religious texts and sayings of scholars to support the construction of their accusation.

All of these things came from al-Shayijī and Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma‘ribī, and Usāmah al-Qūṣī and others. They said there is ghuluww in Shaykh Rabī, exaggeration and this is who they really intend. This is not about cult behaviour, these are just bankrupt statements that are being regurgitated today by ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker, whose speech is empty, but this is about the manhaj that we find in the books of the Salaf. It goes beyond Shaykh Rabī too, since the Shaykh is a follower (a muttabi‘), a follower of the manhaj of the Salaf. And these people do not like that the Salafi methodology is promulgated especially when it is in relation to the innovations of the Ikhwānīs that pertain to refutation, disparagement, loyalty for the truth and so on. This is why some of them, they dislike that book such as Sharh al-Sunnah should be taught and some of them undermine the āthār of the Salaf.

So their only response to all of this is to describe, as per the social sciences and the books they are reading, what the Salaf did in the era of

Imām Aḥmad for example as cultism. With respect to the issue of the Qurʾān, when thousands of scholars returned to the speech of Imām Aḥmad and his disparagements upon individual Jahmites who were in positions of influence and leadership and scholarship, they would treat all of this as cult behaviour. This is because if you look at all of this purely from the angle of behavioural psychology and social anthropology and so on (and strip everything else out), then you can characterise that as cult behaviour in terms of what is going on, behaviourally.

In fact, following the same approach as Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker and this group, you can do the same thing with the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and the Companions and his ummah and say that the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), and we seek refuge in Allāh, is a cult leader and Islām is a cult, and this is actually said by the disbelievers, and then you can list all the so called cult characteristics. So if you look just at the behaviours, stripped of their background and stripped of the notion of truth and falsehood, guidance and misguidance, Tawḥīd and Shirk, Sunnah and Bidʿah then you can look at those behaviours as cult behaviours when looked at through the lens of the social sciences of the disbelievers. Likewise, you can take the uṣūl of Salafiyyah, you can take the manāhij of Salafiyyah, which are in fact uṣūl and manāhij of Islām, and you can take the statements of the Companions and the Salaf and identify “cultish characteristics”. Thus, when the Salaf said, “I would eat with a Jew or a Christian, but not a person of innovation”, or “That pigs and apes accompany me is better than a person of innovation accompanies me” and so on, or when Shaykh Muqbil says that Shaykh Rabī is a “sign from the signs of Allāh in knowing the ḥizbiyyīn” and so on... You can compile a huge list, and from the lens of the social sciences of the disbelievers, you can say these are all cult characteristics and that we are dealing with a cult, because all the traits and qualities fit exactly.

And this is what they have resorted to, they have stripped the element of the dīn, because within the contextual framework of the dīn, what Imām Aḥmad did for example and how he was viewed, all of this was Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) aiding and supporting the truth through a scholar. And Allāh aids His dīn and holds the innovators and deviants at bay by way of scholars who speak the truth, in every age and era. So when you strip out all the notions of truth and falsehood, and you evaluate things upon the social sciences, then you can quite easily frame those behaviours as cult-like behaviours.

And this indicates the greatness of the bankruptcy that is with these people such as Shadeed Muḥammad, Muḥammad Munīr, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker and others, and the greatness of their misguidance. They rejected the truth previously in previous tribulations, or were at least indifferent to it and now their misguidance is being compounded and made even greater, through these lies they are uttering. This is Salafiyah to them, to make the social sciences of the disbelievers a foundation for identifying the so-called cult characteristics of Salafis. But you never see them citing the āthār of the Salaf and founding their speech upon the āthār of the Salaf. And that’s because what they are calling cult characteristics are actually behaviours required by uṣūl of Islām such as standing up for truth, of speaking a word of truth, of striving against those who say what they do not do and do what they have not been commanded, as per the ḥadīth of the Hāwāriyyūn and Anṣar (Helpers) of the religion,⁴ and boycotting the people of desires, and returning back

⁴ The ḥadīth of ‘Abd Allāh bin Mas‘ūd (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) from the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ): “There was no Prophet that Allāh sent to a nation before me except that he had sincere followers and helpers who took from his Sunnah and adhered to his command. Then there appeared after them generations of latecomers who said what they did not do and did what they were not commanded. So whoever strives against them with his hand is a believer and whoever strives against them with his

to the scholar who has evidence and proof and making one's company and loyalty on the basis creed and methodology and the inevitable positions they require one to hold.

So ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker is the greatest of liars in his slander against Salafi Publications, against Abū Ḥakīm, Abū Khadījah and others, he is a slanderous liar in his claim and his bankruptcy is plainly evident. In fact, he knows that he was continually advised all the way to 2002 and beyond, and we have the details and the emails present, I have emails documenting him being advised and his visits to the Shaykhs of Madīnah. So how can he say that this cult began in 1996, when he was with Salafi Publications in their positions until Brixton and Luton sided with al-Ma’ribī and his supporters such as al-Qūsī, al-Ḥalabī and al-Hilālī in 2002.

‘Abd al-Haqq knows he is lying and he is just jumping on the bandwagon of these current wave of attacks. He could only talk in generalisations and ambiguities in his ten minute clip and regurgitated the “cult” label but was unable to furnish any evidence. They think that this new wave of attacks via social media and the tube, they believe this has some traction and momentum. And ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker has come out, thinking that he can play his role in this because he has some **long standing grievances**, he has been disparaged by Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī that he and those with him “are not truthful”, and this has really grieved him, that a scholar, from direct experience with them, who advised them on issues, said of them, “they are not truthful” after his knowledge of and direct experience with them. So he has taken this opportunity to come out and slander the likes of Abū Ḥakīm, Abū Khadījah and others by reference to “Salafī Publications” and this would include Abū Talḥah

tongue is a believer and whoever strives against them with his heart is a believer, and beyond that there is not even a seed of faith.” Reported by Muslim.

Dāwūd Burbank, because all of his positions were identical, to the word and letter. However, in reality, their problem is with Shaykh Rabī[‘] and Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī, and then it goes further, it is with the Salafī methodology itself, but they can’t go their and reveal their true colours. So the easiest thing to do is to accuse the Salafīs in the West and throw labels and accusations upon them so that their own errors and deviations can remain concealed. And in this, they have followed the vilest method they could find, which is to evaluate the Salafi methodology and adherence to it through the writings and ramblings of disbelievers in the fields of social science, behavioural psychology.

So the speech of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker is empty, its dark and gloomy, and you almost sense that he himself knows this as he is speaking, as he is unable to bring anything from himself and refers instead to the writings of the ḥamqā’ (idiots) as evidence for the cult characteristics of Salafis, as they allege.

In contrast, listen to the Salafīs, listen to the speech of Abu Ḥakīm,⁵ listen to the citations, listen to the evidences, listen to the āthār, listen to the accurate historical record being recounted, listen to the clear evidences being brought against those who were rightly disparaged and you get satisfaction... you get satiation, you know that you are tasting the uṣūl of the Salaf being described and implemented and you see adherence to the Salafi methodology and reliance upon the āthār.... But listen to the speech of these people, Tāhir Wyatt, Shadeed Muḥammad, Muḥammad Munīr, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker and this is what you see in their speech, accusations of “cultism”, “monopoly”, all based on jealousy, hatred, resentment and so on. Accusations based upon distortions and misinterpretations of what really took place historically. They are just

⁵ Refer to <https://soundcloud.com/masjidassunnahaston>, the “Doubts About the Da‘wah” Series which deals with these slanderous accusations.

giving their twisted version of events, because they did not take the correct Shar‘iyy stances in accordance with the Salafi methodology in the trials and tribulations that affected the da‘wah, such as those of al-Maghrāwī and al-Ma‘ribī. This was due to their jahl and weakness in knowledge. Rather some of them staunchly defended these innovators in spite of the evidence such as Abū Usāmah Khalīfah and ‘Abd al-Qādir Baksh. So now, they have become inheritors, inheritors of those who came before them and who said, “The Jāmiyyah Cult”, “The Madkhaliyyah Cult”, “Salafiyyah Jadīdah” and so on and those who said the Salafīs worship their scholars and that their scholars have been made tāghūts. And this is the same speech coming from this direction.

In fact, Allāh has exposed what they possess of sickness in that they surpass and excel in the very things they accuse Salafis with. Muḥammad Munīr, in his 90 minute diatribe against Mūsā Richardson’s warranted criticism of him and his speech against a particular scholar,⁶ said the following disgraceful words: “...So we don’t disagree with you that there will be people who will forsake the scholars, we say that you may be one of them and your other friends and buddies and tagalongs *who worship certain scholars* basically and blindly follow *and put them on a status only Allah knows of what they put them on...*” So in this vile and evil speech of Muḥammad Munīr, he has accused thousands of Salafis of shirk with Allāh the Mighty and Majestic and has attributed to them that of which they innocent and free of and his reckoning is with

⁶ Muḥammad Munīr hinted at “a scholar” when he said, “This scholar couldn’t care less about your and your country” or words to that effect, and from the many qarā’īn, he was likely referring to Shaykh Rabī. He was then harmed and wounded by an article Mūsā Richardson wrote in defense of Salafī scholars and so he went to all the effort of a recording and publishing a 90 minute video in which he exposed his arrogance and ghuluww and in which he tried to vainly defend his prior speech and within it he said that he is not required to make any bayān despite the fact that he is sat there for 90 minutes doing just that.

Allāh. And we have pointed out this before, that these people, like Tāhir Wyatt, Shadeed Muḥammad, and here Muḥammad Munīr as well, they fall into things worse than what they falsely accuse their opponents with, and we have given clear examples of this, one can refer to manhaj.com in the articles about Tāhir Wyatt and Shadeed Muḥammad. For when Tāhir Wyatt was rightly criticised for being used by the Nation of Bāṭinī Kāfirs and Farrakhān and company as a tool for their own promotion, he accused those who criticised him with the traits of major nifāq, he attributed major kufr to them and described them as those who do not want Islām to spread. And Shadeed Muḥammad, those who correctly stated that a sinful Sunnī is better than a pious Bid'īyy, as per what is in the Sunnah and āthār in this regard, he accused them of kufr, he accused them of making istihlāl (legalising) sin. And likewise Muḥammad Munīr, his saying is the sickest and most vile and it competes with that of Tāhir Wyatt who accused Salafīs with major nifāq because his mistakes in da‘wah were rightly criticised as being harmful and misguided.⁷

And this example of Muḥammad Munīr is a disgraceful one, to attribute to thousands of Salafīs, shirk with Allāh the Mighty and Majestic, may Allāh hold this mujrim to account for his wicked slander and attribution of kufr to innocent Salafīs who venerate the Tawḥīd of Allāh and shun the worship in all of its forms and types, of others besides Allāh. And this is what they do not like, that words are used with respect to them, on account of their disgraceful crimes, that are accurate, warranted, justified, truthful... for Muḥammad Munīr in this statement, this firyah, this buhtān against thousands of Salafīs is a kadhdhaab. Rather, he is a

⁷ Refer to “Shadeed Muhammad, Innovation and Legalising Sin: More Display of Ghuluww and Jahl” - <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?efccr> and “Tahir Wyatt, Shadeed Muhammad and the 'Nation of Islam': Part 1” <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?nrnfu>

safīḥ and aḥmaq in this speech of his, because even the misguided Qutbīs, many of them, they never went to this level, they never stooped to this level of ghuluww (exaggeration).

So all praise is due to Allāh who has exposed these people through their own words and made clear the reality of what is in their hearts through their own statements and writings and their resemblance to the people of falsehood who came before them, who said the very same words: You worship Shaykh Rabīʿ, you have turned him into a ṭāghūt, you are cultists, neo-Salafists and so on. Their statements resemble each other because their hearts resemble each other. These statements are said by the Shīʿah, yes, the Shīʿah, and likewise the Jahmite Ashʿarīs and of course the Takfīrīs, the Khārijites, and they are said by Western academics even, who have taken these lies and slanders and ran with them. So all praise is due to Allāh who made our word and speech to follow on from the word and speech of Shaykh al-Albānī, Shaykh Bin Bāz, Shaykh Ibn ʿUthaymīn, Shaykh Muqbil, Shaykh Aḥmad al-Najmī, Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī with respect to Shaykh Rabīʿ and his manhaj and all praise is due to Allāh who has exposed the vile saying of the likes of Muḥammad Munīr as the saying of the Rāfiḍāh, Ṣūfiyyah, Khārijīyyah and others from the enemies of the daʿwah who attack Shaykh Rabīʿ.

And in reality what grieves them is that their daʿwah is a daʿwah that only appeals to the firaq and jamāʿāt. As for the daʿwah of the Salafis which venerates the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allāh and which venerates the way of the Salaf and proceeds upon the āthār and venerates the truth, calls to Tawḥīd, calls to Sunnah, calls to the madhhab of the Salaf, calls to unity around that, then it appeals to a heart that values all of these affairs, a heart that values clarity and purity and does not value ambiguity and confusion, a heart that desires guidance upon the way of the Salaf. And over the past 5 years this

da‘wah has grown tremendously. People like Tāhir Wyatt and ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker know this well, and this bothers them. So they spread lies about the alleged disarray, confusion, chaos and so on, all of which exists only in their minds. The disarray is in their minds because of the jahl and hawā that prevented them from taking the positions they were obligated to take by virtue of their claim to Salafiyyah. They fell prey to the Ikhwānī fitnahs which harmed Salafiyyah and they got caught up in that to varying degrees, in either their non-existent stances or weak stances or stances competing with that which is correct.

And so today, they spread these lies and slanders, claiming that the da‘wah proceeds upon cultish behaviour and it is all about financial empires and so on. All of these slanders and lies, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker will be called to account for them, and we are certain that he knows he is a liar in his claims, but he has succumbed to the alluring opportunity of getting his two pence worth in within this current wave of attacks.

All of these lies and slanders which are appearing now have already been refuted and addressed, they were made by ‘Alī al-Timīmī, Idris Palmer and company and they were drinking from the fountain of al-Shayjī and other innovators and deviants. This is the mashrab (drinking place) of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker, Tāhir Wyatt, Shadeed Muḥammad, Munīr Muḥammad and others, and all of them have statements in this respect. They have repackaged those older terms into something new and just made it more obscure, and used the social sciences to make their speech appear intellectual and evidence-based. They have only deluded themselves and they only misguide themselves further. May Allāh protect us from such evil.

Abu ‘Iyād

23 Dhul Hijjah 1438 / 14 September 2017