

Excerpts from the Statement of Shaykh ‘Alī al-Waṣīfī and Shaykh Ḥasan bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al- Bannā on the Fitnah and Ghuluww of Muḥammad bin Hādī: Part 3¹



الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلاة والسلام على أشرف الأنبياء والمرسلين

The story of Muḥammad bin Hādī and his alleged evidences against the so-called “Ṣa‘āfiqah” which his blind-followers chase (as mirages) in the desert and in the depths of the darkneses of the oceans.

☞ **“The First Observation:** That when Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī presented his affair to the Imām, ‘Allāmah, Shaykh Rabī‘ bin Hādī al-Madkhalī—may Allāh preserve him, and he is the bearer of the flag of al-

¹ Full Arabic text is here: <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?uyryh>. All the notes in this text are from me to clarify, explain or emphasize the point being made.

jarḥ wal-ta‘dīl in this era, as was testified to by Imām al-Albānī (رحمة الله)—then he presented [the affair] to him [upon the sense] that he [Shaykh Rabī‘] is a qādī who will judge between him and his disputants. He did not present [the issue] to him [in the sense that he, Shaykh Rabī‘ is] a disputant [in the affair] or a mere witness. The role of the qādī is that he should be neutral, look at the evidences and to give each person who has a right his due right, and to judge with justice. And ‘Allāmah Rabī‘ embarked upon that and read the evidences of Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī letter by letter, and reviewed it word by word. He then issued his decisive judgement in that affair: That Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī al-Madkhalī does not possess proofs, evidences or [have any justified] reasons that call for the feud [which he initiated] and nor revilement upon Salafis.

In addition, from another angle, Shaykh Ḥasan [bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā] presented the risālah [called], ‘Nadhīr al-Şā‘iqah’—in which some of the evidences of Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī were compiled—to Shaykh Rabī‘. He read them word by word and then said, ‘Who is the author?’ They said, ‘An unknown (mahjūl)! So his response was: ‘An unknown writer and a pitiful method [of writing].’²

² This is the most amazing thing! The so called “other evidences which Shaykh Rabī‘ has not seen or was prevented from seeing” were nothing more than the ramblings and writings of some of his

It was obligatory upon Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī to be satisfied with the judgement of ‘Allāmah Rabī, to cease and then withdraw from kindling this issue among the general-folk from the students of knowledge.

As for him then proceeding to claim that Shaykh Rabī did not read the evidences and did not look at them and for some of his close students to claim that Shaykh Rabī threw the evidences on the floor and did not read them, then this **is a clear revilement and disparagement of Shaykh Rabī**. It is accusing him of inclining away from the truth and amounts to declaring his reports to be lies.

It is obligatory for him [Muḥammad bin Hādī] to be faced up to and for him to be made accountable in the most severe way because he rejected the ruler [ḥākīm] and the [authority of] judgement [ḥukūmah] in the issue without due right, and then sought the aid of his students in order to spread that [rejection].³

blind-followers who had compiled things and were too cowardly to put their names to them. So Muḥammad bin Hādī considered these as his evidences, possibly without him even knowing who the authors were! The reality is that Muḥammad bin Hādī was bankrupt and empty-handed in evidences from the beginning and he simply led his ignorant blind-followers on a wild goose chase, leading them on and on until the illusion could no longer be sustained, similar to a mirage in the distance, which one will never reach because nothing is there is reality.

³ This is what was really taking place during a large part of 2017, and it was when many of the people who had grievances, desires,

If we were to grant that he has the right of appeal in presenting his evidences once more, it would have been permitted for him to do so. Thus, he could either compile them all, numbered and organised, and then give them to the Imām, ‘Allāmah, Shaykh Rabī[‘] or present them to Imām ‘Allāmah Shaykh ‘Ubayd or to Shaykh, Dr. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī, may Allāh preserve them all⁴, and this—[having the right of appeal]—is the affair of every claimant in any matter [of dispute]. However, he did not do that. Rather, he did not do what the Khārijites did when Ibn ‘Abbās (رضي الله عنه) requested them to present their

scores to settle and personal ambitions started to join his caravan, until he reached the situation where he had replaced his former company of the likes of Shaykh Rabī[‘], Shaykh ‘Ubayd, Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī and many of the Salafi students and callers whom he had known for decades, with the riff-raff among the ignoramuses and people of personal interests and dubious individuals who have histories in past tribulations. They all flocked around him and this eventually became an argument of the Muṣāfiqah: If Muḥammad bin Hādī is wrong, how come his attendance has increased so much—and this retardation in intellect was demonstrated by some of his well-known followers in the US and elsewhere.

⁴ One should note that Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī requested the evidences in person, visiting Muḥammad bin Hādī in his house, however, he left empty-handed. And Shaykh ‘Ubayd rejected the speech of Muḥammad bin Hādī because he failed to provide the requested evidence to him as well.

reasons for seeking revenge against ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib (رضي الله عنه). They said: ‘He fought and did not take captives, he granted me the authority to judge in the religion of Allāh and erased the title of ‘Chief of the Believers’ from himself.’ And as for that one [Muḥammad bin Hādī], in relation to a limited set of points, he did not do that. Rather, he left [the company of] Shaykh Rabīʿ and isolated himself from him. He kept himself aloof with his students and the common folk from all around came by his side. [He did this] in order to raise the level of enmity [he already harboured], and to accuse his disputants and everyone who sided with them with ignorance (jah) and bankruptcy (saʿfaḡah). He then left the people to search for the evidences in a [deep] fathomless ocean, having darkneses layered on top of each other,⁵ as if they are trying to find water in a [desert] mirage.⁶ And he

⁵ This is a good, appropriate similitude (see Sūrah al-Ḥajj, 24:40) and illustrates the likeness of the blind-following Muṣāʿfiḡah very well in that they are in the depths of the ocean looking for Muḥammad bin Hādī’s evidences for his tabdīʿ of Salafīs—treating those Salafīs—as if they were the Jahmiyyah and Muʿtazilah in the era of Ṭābiʿīn who were making tabdīl of the religion. And yet, if they were to stretch out their hand, they would not be able to see it because of the intense darkness, and if that is the case, how are they going to find Muḥammad bin Hādī’s evidences therein?!

⁶ Another good, appropriate similitude (see Sūrah al-Ḥajj, 24:39). The evidences of Muḥammad bin Hādī are a mirage in the desert.

[Muḥammad bin Hādī] said to them, ‘Those are the evidences’ and thereby opened up the arena for some of the unknowns (majāhīl) to direct what had been simmering in their hearts of feelings, sensitivities and revilements towards the Salafīs.⁷

And he [himself] until now has not brought except some extracts of speech which he selectively quoted from audio [lectures] that were given offhand⁸ in order to use them as evidence against his disputants, as is done by all the common-folk with the major scholars.⁹ And there is no doubt that a scholar can err whilst he is speaking offhand when his tongue precedes his intent, without him believing the [speech that he uttered]. And if

From a distance you see them, but every time you get closer and closer, you find that there is nothing there.

⁷ This is precisely what happened. Those harbouring grievances, hatred, enmity, with personal ambitions and scores to settle, they came out on social media or their own online platforms to start writing and pouring out whatever was in their hearts against Salafi students of knowledge and callers. And all of this was used to mask from the public the fact that Muḥammad bin Hādī was empty-handed of his so called evidences.

⁸ Meaning that these were lectures that were delivered offhand, without previous thought or consideration and within which a person may have made numerous slips of the tongue or used expressions that were not exact.

⁹ Meaning that the way Muḥammad bin Hādī behaved is similar to the way of the common-folk, who take things selectively to the scholars in order to get the outcome they desire.

the disputants of Shaykh Muḥammad fell into that, then Muḥammad bin Hādī himself has fallen into that as well. His student, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Jazā’irī notified him of that, for he [Muḥammad bin Hādī] said in some of his lectures that ‘the Qur’ān is created’ without actually intending that for sure. Nor did he believe that, but it was a slip of the tongue. So likewise, he should renounce his speech against his disputants in the errors he criticised them for because the foundation they have with them is Tawḥīd and Sunnah. And just as he is excused for the slip of the tongue, then Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh bin Şilfīq al-Dhafīrī denied that he said that the Mīzān (Scale) is an attribute from the attributes of Allāh, despite the fact that it is established in his audio recordings. However, at the time that he denied it, he did not know and this indicates that it was a slip of the tongue. It did not have a place in memory such that it became a belief which he would defend.¹⁰

¹⁰ This would be similar if someone accused Muḥammad bin Hādī of speaking with the creation of the Qur’ān, which he would vehemently deny, without him realising—had he not been informed—that he actually did state these words explicitly and that they are recorded. But because it was a slip of the tongue which he would have been unaware of, then his outright denial of having said such a thing cannot be counted as a lie because he had no knowledge of the slip of the tongue he fell into. And this is what happened with Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Dhafīrī. However, the blind-followers, they agitated their leader [Muḥammad bin Hādī]

So the opportunity is in front of Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī—if he is one who [truly] does not fear the blame of the blamers in the path of Allāh, and if no pressures are being exerted upon him from any direction causing him to continue in his dispute with his brothers—to gather all of his evidences. And the doors of Shaykh Rabī have not ceased to remain open [to him], and rectification is better than disputation..”

Translated by Abu ‘Iyaḍ @abuiyaadsp
 22 Dhul Hijjah 1439
 2 September 2018
 v1.1

and their leader agitated them, and they started throwing labels such as “kadhdhāb” (liar) against Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Dhafīrī, not knowing that they themselves are the liars in the actual state of affairs—this is because Allāh has pardoned the slips and unintentional mistakes of this ummah. And then, any bystander and onlooker who did not know the reality of the affairs, would think that the Muṣāfiqah were correct in what they said, and he too would be drawn into their fitnah. And this is the nature of trials and tribulations, they are dark and gloomy and a person finds it hard to penetrate through them and see truth from falsehood. Rather, one could be utterly convinced that he is upon truth—such as in issues where slips of the tongue have been made—when in reality, he is upon falsehood because the affairs are not as he has thought them to be. And he entered into this situation because of the hawā of someone else, Muḥammad bin Hādī, coupled perhaps with his own hawā.