

The Quṭbist ‘Alī al-Timīmī in 1998 The Quṭbist Abū Zubayr Saleem Beg in 2000 And ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker in 2017

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

وَأَنَّ هَذَا صِرَاطِي مُسْتَقِيمًا فَاتَّبِعُوهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعُوا السُّبُلَ فَتَفَرَّقَ بِكُمْ عَنْ

سَبِيلِهِ ذَلِكُمْ وَصَّاكُمْ بِهِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ ﴿١٥٣﴾

And this is My path, which is straight, so follow it; and do not follow [other] ways, for you will be separated from His way. This has He instructed you that you may become righteous. (6:153)

Mujāhid said: “The innovations and doubts.” **Al-Bakr bin ‘Alā** said: “I consider that he intended a devil among men, and that is the innovations, Allāh knows best.” Refer to al-I‘tiṣām of al-Shāṭibī (1/77).

Sayyid Quṭb (and Mawdūdī) revived the manhaj of the Khārijites and his books and teachings led to the appearance of **al-Qaeda and ISIS**. In the mid-1990s Salafi Publications was involved in an intense battle against those spreading these doctrines in the West by translating and conveying the refutations of the scholars against Sayyid Quṭb, his writings, his followers and his defenders. The Quṭbists in the West, foremost among them was **Alī Timīmī**, they regurgitated the lies and slanders of deviant Quṭbists and Turāthists in the Arab lands, such as **‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Shayjī**, and applied them to the Salafis in the West. Hence, their labels “Salafiyah Jadīdah” (Neo-Salafism), “Destructive Cult”, “Muqallidah” and so on.

The Quṭbīst, **‘Alī Timīmī** stated in 1998: “While originally a phenomenon that for the most part was a local issue in response to the activities of certain scholars in Saudi Arabia, it, thereafter, grew to a world wide destructive movement which its cancerous teachings were seen from the west coast of the United States to the islands of Indonesia.”¹ He is referring to the stance taken by Shaykh Rabīʿ and the Scholars of Madīnah, against the Surūriyyah Quṭbiyyah, Safar, Salmān, Nāsir al-‘Umar, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Abd al-Khāliq and others who were practically implementing the manhaj of the Khawārij upon the teachings of their inspirational guide, Sayyid Quṭb. They were also repackaging the principles of **Ḥasan al-Bannā** to accommodate the jamā‘āt.

Abu Zubayr al-‘Azzāmī, Saleem Beg (a staunch fanatical Quṭbist, Takfīrī Jihādī) and follower of al-Timīmī in the UK, wrote: “A couple of years back, a brother submitted an email, written by Sheikh ‘Ali at-Tamimi where he exposes a destructive movement, that claims to be holding on to the principles of Ahlus-Sunnah/Salafiyah, but in reality, it has innovated many principles and attributed them to Ahlus-Sunnah... brother Idrees Palmer, who not only exposed, but totally destroyed the destructive manhaj of this cult...”²

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma’ribī was a concealed Ikhwānī who came to infuse principles into Salafiyyah in order to provide protection for Sayyid Quṭb from disparagement and to accommodate the takfīrī groups within Ahl al-Sunnah by making light their deviation and saying that they intend good and so on. This was after he saw how these individuals and groups had received damaging criticism from the great scholars of Salafiyyah

¹ In an email that was distributed against what he and his associate Idris Palmer called “Neo-Salafism”. This email was saved at the time.

² Posted on his forum, 8 August 2000.

such as al-Albānī, Ibn Bāz and others. Shaykh Rabīʿ had written a series of powerful books on the great and serious errors of Quṭb, some of which reached the level of kufr. We translated much of this material at the time. However, al-Maʿribī waited after these scholars passed away in order to launch his revolution. His Ikhwānī principles were refuted and exposed by Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī in great detail in the early 2000s, and we also translated and promoted much of this material. Al-Maʿribī used evil words towards the Companions, he referred to them as “scum” and when illustrating blameworthy qualities in his lessons, he would use the Companions as examples. This is why Shaykh Rabīʿ said of this innovator, in one of his refutations that I translated in November 2002:

“And this is how Abū al-Ḥasan traverses upon this evil path, during the course of his lectures. So he: **1.** Strikes examples of scum (al-ghuthā) using the Companions of Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). **2.** Strikes examples of “the lowly minor ones”, “the contemptible ones” and “the shrimps, dwarfs (small insignificant ones)” using the Companions of Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). **3.** Strikes examples of evil suspicion using the Companions of Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). **4.** Strikes the example of deficiency in tarbiyah using the Companions of Allāh’s Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). **5.** And exemplifies the blameworthy hastiness with some of the Prophets. And we seek refuge in Allāh from these actions that do not arise except from one who does not know the true position of the great people and who does not preserve any respect or nobility for them. So to all of the zealous, fervent Scholars of the Sunnah in every place, upon the sanctities of Islām and its foundations, and its beliefs, do I direct this question of mine: Is it permissible to spread the cassettes of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Miṣrī al-Maʿribī in the midst of the youth of the Ummah, especially amongst Ahl us-Sunnah? Those cassettes that contain these repugnant transgressions upon the Great Prophets and the Noble Companions? May the prayers of Allāh be upon His Prophets and may

Allāh be pleased with the Companions of Muhammad, the best nation brought out for the people” End quote from Shaykh Rabīʿ.

Al-Maʿribī innovated **false principles** by which he could defend his own statements and the statements of kufr that were uttered by Sayyid Quṭb and for which Quṭb was refuted by the Salafi scholars. From them, his mockery of Mūṣā (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ) and his speech with Waḥdat al-Wujūd and others. From these principles was al-Mujmal wal-Mufassal. All of these affairs were clarified at the time, and we conveyed the refutations, we translated them and conveyed them, because there were found those who were supporting al-Maʿribī, here in the West, allying with him upon his falsehood, innovation and false principles. And al-Maʿribī is among those whom al-Bakr bin ʿAlā mentioned, “the devils among men”. His reality became clear, he says Ḥasan al-Bannā was upon the path of the Salaf, that the revolution of Egypt brought honour, that it is obligatory to revolt against an oppressive ruler when it is possible to remove him with less evil than his oppression. He validates democracy as an institution if it means that the ruler will be kept in check, he claims that the Ikhwān and Salafis agree upon the uṣūl of Ahl al-Sunnah and that he loves to bring cordiality between the jamāʿāt, including the Sūfīs, upon what he calls thawābit (unchanging, fixed affairs of religion). This is the known reality of al-Maʿribī through his own speech.³

But this was a great tribulation at the time, and it split the Salafis into two. Those who supported the truth with Shaykh Rabīʿ and those who became staunch fanatical defenders of al-Maʿribī. This second group includes **Abū Usāmah Khalīfah**, **ʿAbd al-Qādir Baksh** (Luton). **ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Baker** and Brixton sided with this group, and likewise with Usāmah al-Qūsī, ʿAlī Ḥasan al-Ḥalabī and Salīm al-Ḥilālī, all of whom

³ Refer to <http://www.themadkhalis.com/md/?nvskb>

sided with al-Ma'ribī. Whilst, the likes of Abū Usāmah and 'Abd al-Qādir Baksh of Luton were very clear in their fanatical defence of al-Ma'ribī and his false principles, Brixton played a fence-sitting game and were not truthful at all. Later, they revealed their colours and made it clear that they are upon the manhaj of al-Ma'ribī and al-Ḥalabī when they promoted and defended some of their Ikhwānī principles. Refer to our brother Abdulilah Laḥmāmī's article on this subject: "A Response to Brixton Mosque's Defence and Implementation of the Innovated Principles of al-Ma'ribi and al-Halabi."⁴

They were rightly criticised by the scholars such as **Shaykh Rabī'**, **Shaykh 'Ubayd** and **Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī** for their lack of truthfulness and support of falsehood. This is what is driving 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker today, in his statements. He is repeating the statements of Qutbīs like 'Alī al-Timīmī and those with him, treating Salafīs as a blind-following cult. Previously, they began to write and publish disrespectful open letters to Shaykh 'Ubayd and Shaykh Muḥammad on their websites and also initiated legal action against Shaykh Muḥammad because he spoke against them and said that they were "not truthful". So this is how they are with the scholars who spoke truth in times of tribulation and attempted to keep unity among Salafīs.

'Abd al-Ḥaqq is a wounded, disparaged man, and when he saw this new group of Shadeed Muḥammad, Muḥammad Munīr and company and those spreading doubts on the tube, he saw an opportunity to participate in the attack, because he has grievances.

'**Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker** in 2017. "What we seen emerge from the Salafīs since the late 90s, 1996, 97 onwards, and it emanated from the UK was

⁴ Available at <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?rhttpw>

the behavioural extremism, where Salafis, or those claiming to be Salafis started a disparagement of other Salafis, and basically denigrating them, insulting and using the deen to try and marginalise particular salafi entities, personalities and it didn't stop there, the local, geographical region that they were from, it spread like a cancer, around to the extent that they found ground and excuse and reasons, many of them based on lies to discredit scholars as well... the question that needs to be posed to senior scholars are 'Can cults actually be Salafi?'"⁵

First make note of the use of the word "cult" and the reference to cancer, the same words employed by the Quṭbists. **Second**, given the time period he mentioned, he can only be referring to our stances against 'Adnān 'Ar'ūr, Safar, Salmān, 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Abd al-Khāliq, Muḥammad al-Maghrāwī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma'ribī, Alī al-Timīmī and others, all of whom were Quṭbīs, Ikhwānīs, Takfīrīs pushing the manhaj of Ḥasan al-Bannā and Sayyid Quṭb and those who supported them in the West, or defended them against disparagement. Likewise our positions towards Green Lane and Ṣuhayb Hasan and positions that were necessitated by the clarity that was emerging with respect to the Ikhwānīs and Quṭbis who had been refuted. **Third**, his distinction between *ideological extremism* (referring to the Khārijites) and then *behavioural extremism* by which he is referring to the behaviour demanded by the Salafī uṣūl of giving preference to the truth and showing loyalty around it. It is a reference to what the manhaj of the Salaf requires towards the people of innovation, misguidance and deviation who persist in their deviation such as Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma'ribī. By this, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq is referring to our position towards al-Ma'ribī first, and then towards those who staunchly defended his ideas, such as Abū Usāmah and 'Abd al-Qādir Baksh, and they were declared innovators by

⁵ In a video published online 8 September 2017.

the scholars, such as Shaykh Aḥmad al-Najmī. And then our position towards Usāmah al-Qūṣī, al-Ḥalabī and al-Hilālī who allied with al-Maʿribī after the truth was made clear to them and after they acknowledged it. They had signed a bayān with Shaykh Rabīʿ and Shaykh Muḥammad ʿUmar Bazmul which convicted al-Maʿribī for his errors in November 2002.⁶ But then they turned on their heels.

So this behaviour of taking with acceptance the evidence based rulings of the scholars, holding these positions, and showing walā and barāʾ for the truth and so on, which is from the foundations of the religion, they refer to this as “cultism” and “behavioural extremism”. And they do not mention, what is the standard of behaviour through which this behaviour is considered extreme? What was the standard of behaviour of the Salaf with respect to deviants like al-Maʿribī and those who support falsehood knowingly? So they cannot really go there, they cannot provide a standard, because that standard can only be the standard of the Salaf.

Whilst ʿAlī al-Timīmī was referring to the Shaykhs of Madīnah, such as Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī and Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī among others, ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Baker of Brixton Masjid is referring to Maktabah Salafiyyah who supported the truth that these scholars were upon regarding the Surūriyyah, Quṭbiyyah and Turāthiyyah. He is also referring to our position with respect to those who were visiting the West and trying to monopolise the daʿwah. This includes Abū al-Ḥasan al-Maʿribī, whose aim was to cut off daʿwah in the West from the scholars, to cut it off from Shaykh Rabīʿ and the Shaykhs of Madīnah and others, because he wanted a watered down Ikhwānī daʿwah for the West, based upon his innovated principles.

⁶ See <http://www.salafitalk.net/st/viewmessages.cfm?Forum=6&Topic=660>

However, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq is not truthful and he knows full well he is lying. He and those with him portrayed that they were with Maktabah Salafiyyah, at least outwardly, till around 2002. Then they along with Luton went their separate ways from us by either staunchly supporting al-Ma‘ribī as was done by ‘Abd al-Qādir Baksh and Abū Usāmah Khalīfah, or playing games, fooling around, sitting on the fence and make excuses and so on, as was the way of ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq and company. They sided with the staunch defenders of al-Ma‘ribī such as Usāmah al-Qūsī and Salīm al-Ḥilālī and invited them to their Return to ‘Ilm Conference in 2003. On account of this behaviour, Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī later said of them that they were “not truthful”, after he advised them.⁷

So the issue is clear, they are the ones who split on account of the tribulation of an Ikhwānī innovator, and they were spoken against by scholars for their lack of truthfulness in their positions and lack of unity with their brothers, they were advised to remain with Maktabah Salafiyyah. This is the grievance they carry till today. And now, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker has made clear where he stands, he is reproducing statements that are similar to those of al-Shāyijī, ‘Alī al-Timīmī and others, treating Salafis as a cult. This language he uses, these terms and these accusations came from the followers of Sayyid Quṭb, from the Takfīrīs and Jihādīs and from those who came to infuse Ikhwānī principles into Salafiyyah.

⁷ In reality, there were prior differences before this, when they were backing Suhayb Hasan and Abū Āliyah around 1997/1998. Then there was the Brixton contract of 1999 which led to a widening gap. Then they tentatively came back. Then, after a conference in which al-Maghrāwī the Takfīrī was in attendance and after that, the issue of al-Ma‘ribī, all of this cemented their split. So in truth, they have not been upon stability from well before 2002. But they acted outwardly as if they were with us and with the scholars.

The word “cult” means **a system of religious veneration and devotion directed towards a particular figure or object**, its origin lies in homage paid to a divinity, from French culte or Latin cultus ‘worship’, from cult- ‘inhabited, cultivated, worshipped’, from the verb colere.⁸

And they mean here that Shaykh Rabīʿ is a leader of a cult since all cults must have leaders. This is why ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Baker, Shadeed Muḥammad, Muhammad Munīr, all of them use this word. By definition, they can only be referring to Shaykh Rabīʿ, and that is whom they ultimately intend, even if they skirt around the issue or even deny it. It is the inevitable outcome of their position that it is Shaykh Rabīʿ who is ultimately intended. Here are the verbatim words of Muḥammad Munīr: “...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...” This is what they mean when they use the word cult. They are referring to Salafīs who hold evidence based stances provided by recognised, erudite scholars with respect to those who have deviated from the way of the Salaf in beliefs, sayings, actions or means of daʿwah and persist upon their deviation.

And as we said in our previous article, it is not Shaykh Rabīʿ per se that they intend, but the Salafi methodology that he carries, especially with respect to refuting bidʿah and warning from it. This methodology comes in the way of the (Ikhwānī) daʿwah some of them are either engaged in, or trying to justify and engage in. And because they know Salafīs hold

⁸ See <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/cult>

fast to Salafī principles and methodologies, they fear that their deviation will be exposed. Hence, they are trying to neutralise that by claiming that the Salafīs are a cult. They intend by this to scare the naive and ill-informed people, it is a type of intellectual terrorism. Your history is clear, your errors are clear, and you fear that your future errors will be spoken of too. So they try and pull the wool over the eyes of the people with these labels, after their bankruptcy in evidence has been made clear.

So the sum of the situation is that the Qutbists, Turāthists, Takfīrīs and Jihādists brought these accusations of **ghuluww**, **false principles**, **cult behaviour**, **neo Salafism** etc., in order to attack Shaykh Rabīʿ and to defend the doctrines and methodologies of Sayyid Qutb and Ḥasan al-Bannā. Then al-Maʿribī came along with repackaged principles to carry on from where his predecessors left off, such as ʿAdnān Arʿūr, Salmān al-ʿAwdah and others. He was halted, exposed and put in his place and the likes of Abū Usāmah Khalīfah, ʿAbd al-Qādir Baksh defended the innovated principles of al-Maʿribī. And Brixton, they allied with them and chose allegiance with al-Maʿribī and his defenders and allies over allegiance to the truth and those upon it.

So today, when ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Baker jumps on the bandwagon, in a very insidious and treacherous manner, to accuse the Salafis of being a “cult”, then we all know where he is coming from and the historical background to it. He has grievances because he and those with him were disparaged by the Scholars, like Shaykh Rabīʿ, Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī, Shaykh ʿUbayd, for deserting the truth. So they are simply venting their frustration by attacking Maktabah Salafiyyah, but they really intend these scholars, and then the manhaj they are upon, which is the manhaj of the Salaf.

Abu ʿIyād

24 Dhul Hijjah 1438 / 15 September 2017