

# **Yasir Qadhi and Muḥammad Ḥijāb: Ikhwāniyyah in Theory and Practice**



**Part 3: The Great Companion ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ), the Islamic Creed and Salafiyyah Through the Eyes, Heart and Mind of Yasir Qadhi—1**



الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله

Refer to **Part 2-1** for some brief background information regarding Qadhi and Ḥijab, it can be found here.

<http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?gwppp>

Yasir Qadhi thinks himself to be academically and intellectually superior to others and he has much speech in which he can be found boasting about his achievements. The arrogance of such people is a cause of their ruin and their eventual exposure. Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) leads them to say things with their tongues that reveal what is contained in their hearts of self-amazement, sophistry and departure from the truth.

In June 2014, Qadhi did **a horrendous lecture** which he horrendously titled: “*Towards and Ecumenical Conception of Salafiyyah*”.<sup>1</sup> I wrote some articles on it and published them on Twitter at the time. There were many things that Qadhi tried to do in this lecture and we will address them in this section of the series inshā’Allāh, incorporating some of the content that was written back then.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bdNOZOBjWuY>

The best way to conceive of what is really happening is to imagine that the personas of **Yale Orientalism** and **Ikhwānī Bannā'ism** both stand over Yasir Qadhi and pour their buckets into his mind. These orientations find easy entry because the presence of **swagger**<sup>2</sup> in the heart and mind of Qadhi provides an easy route of access. Then in turn, Qadhi uses his platforms to try to pour the same into the minds of his audiences and to push his poison and his doubts and misconceptions on to them.

Then he finds other **pseudo-philosophers** such as Muḥammad Ḥijab or Mohamed Hegab who will readily give him access to their own audiences and platforms from where he can pour the same doubts and misconceptions upon them with ease and pleasure.

We will refer to this individual and what he represents henceforth as “**Bannā-Yale-Swagger-Qadhi**”, or **BYSQ** for short. Please note that this is **convenient, concise nomenclature** that very accurately depicts a person in the shortest way possible, and provides us with ease of expression. We can convey what we desire to convey from a conceptual point of view with this acronym instead of having to say a mouthful each and every time in what follows.

---

<sup>2</sup> Boasting, bragging, overly-confident attitude, pompousness, self-importance, arrogance.

We see Qadhi's **Orientalist** poison in the doubts he harbours about the Qur'ān, his Orientalist attitude towards Salafiyyah. We see him upon the manhaj of **Ḥasan al-Bannā** in trying to find the least common denominator upon which to unite Muslims, and accommodating Ṣūfīs, Jahmīs, Qa'dī Khārijites and perhaps even the Rāfiḍah within that denominator. He is evidently **a loud braggart**, this is well-known and it is something reported even way back from his days in Madīnah during the 1990s. It was related in those days that he wrote the book "*al-Riyā': Hidden Shirk*", because he was struggling with this affliction himself and was perhaps looking to doctor himself after self-diagnosis. It appears he has not moved on much since those days.

So when we say "**Bannā-Yale-Swagger-Qadhi**", or **BYSQ**, then we are being accurate and to the point in properly characterising this man. Whenever we say: "BYSQ said" in what follows, then you need to recall all of these separate components so you can understand exactly where this man is coming from in every word and sentence he says and the fact that is he is simply trying to **take the biscuit**,<sup>3</sup> or in our case, **the BYSQit**, with his audience.

---

<sup>3</sup> "Taking the biscuit" means to be objectionable, to be worn out, to be of no further use, to be at the end of life. These doubts that Qadhi brings are worn out, old, of no further use, they have been flogged for decades by others and all Qadhi has done is to repackage them and present them to his audience in his own way.

Once that is clear, let us address one of the many issues in this horrendous lecture.

## THE CONTEXT OF THE LECTURE

In essence, Yasir is trying to claim that Salafiyyah is a “**human movement**” like other sects and groups and that it is the result of “**human extraction**” from the texts and that it, like every other “movement”, likes to project itself back on to the earliest type of Islām. He makes it equivalent to Ash‘arism, Māturīdism in this respect. He claims that Salafis today are “**a product of modernity**”. He describes what he considers to be their greatest negative which is that they have taken “**abstract issues of theology and made them the ultimate goal over and above actual religiosity**” which is a fabrication and slander against Salafis.

In reality, this statement of **BYSQ** falls back upon the Salaf themselves, because they are the ones who spoke, wrote and authored works in this regard in order to keep the Islamic creed intact and pure. They removed the influences of the **Greeks, Sabeans, Hindus, Buddhists, Jews, Christians** that came upon the minds of Muslims, entered into issues of creed, and led to splitting and differing, and the emergence of the Qadariyyah, Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah, Ash‘ariyyah, Māturīdiyyah and others.

Ibn Taymiyyah said in Dar' al-Ta'arud (1/166):

And there is combined in those who turn away from **the Prophetic Salafi Way** (الطريقة النبوية السلفية) both this and this, following the alluring desires and misguiding tribulations, thus there is misguidance and allurement within them to the extent of their departure from the way Allaah sent His Messenger with.

However, we see **BYSQ** speaking with words and tones in which you can clearly see that he is saying that Salafiyyah is a “human extraction” and a “movement” and he appears to imply criticism of the Salaf **for spending so much time** writing and warning against the Jahmites whom he claims were only 50 or so men who expired from history, when in reality, the opposite is the case. For the Jahmites, as a genus, grew in number over the centuries until they became widespread in the lands of the Muslims.

He laments that the Salafis give importance to the particulars and details of the 'aqīdah and tries to make it appear as if this is the ultimate goal for them and not religiosity, meaning, taqwā, 'ubūdiyyah and so on. How can that be when taqwā and 'ubūdiyyah are founded upon a sound creed, upon belief in Allāh's 'uluww, His uncreated Speech, upon His attributes and so on.

So these are unjust words. His criticism returns back to the Salaf in reality, whose way Salafis follow in calling to **tarbiyyah**, cultivation, on top of **taṣfiyah**, purification of creed, which is a necessary, required step for true rectification and genuine unity.

### STATEMENTS ABOUT ‘UMAR (رضي الله عنه)

It is here that **BYSQ** makes mention of ‘**Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb** (رضي الله عنه) to make his point about “abstract issues of creed” and in this is a belittlement of this great companion as we shall explain. Let us quote the relevant speech from this lecture and we shall then comment upon the tremendous misguidance and twisting of realities which it contains.

**Bannā-Yale-Swagger-Qadhī**—or **BYSQ** for short—stated, speaking about Salafiyah (33m:50s):

“It has taken issues of theology, abstract issues of theology and made them the ultimate goal over and above actual religiosity. So it is more important for many Salafis to affirm Allāh’s attributes than it is to worship Allāh through those attributes. It is more important to be tested about their creed, “Where is Allāh” and what does it mean when Allāh has risen above the throne, than it is to actually have religiosity.

And Salafis need to realise that, **let me be very blunt**

**here, that if ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb (may Allāh the Exalted be pleased with him) was amongst us right now and they gave him a quiz of ‘aqidah, the fact of the matter is, that test as you put in front of him, he would have failed.** Think about what I am saying [unclear sentence].

You will ask ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb: ‘What are the categories of Tawḥīd?’, what do you think he is going to say?

You will ask ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb: ‘What does it mean, “ar-rahmanu ‘alal-‘arsh istawā”, explain the detail?’

You will ask ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb about the realities and intricacies of abstract issues that they never thought about.

You will ask ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb even about basic issues of fiqh that were memorising in our textbooks, right, ‘What are the nawāqid of wudu?’, ‘What are the nawāqid of this and this?’, ‘What are the shurūṭ of wudu?’, ‘What are the shuroot of Salah?’. The Ṣahābah did not think in these ways!

So the question I’m asking, who is more Salafi? The Salafi or ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb. Think about it! If someone even as austere and great as him would not be thinking along those lines, why, because again this is the era of organic synthesis, the thought is just beginning, the seed has been planted. Wallāhi, ‘Umar

ibn al Khaṭṭāb is million billion, any number of times better than me and you, we know this, **and yet if a Deobandi, a Salafi, an Ashari, if anybody was to quiz him, a first year exam from Dār al-‘Ulūm, Madīnah, al-Azhar, from any institution, he would fail every single subject.**

Later in the lecture (39m:08s onwards) **BYSQ** said:

I say this is **the safest extraction, human extraction** of theology, because in the end of the day its **human extraction** as I said, **if you were to ask ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb, the three types of Tawḥīd, he wouldn’t be able to answer it, think about that, if you were to ask ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb about any of these abstract issues, about the realities of īmān, or the arkān of īmān,** these are not questions that they, even if there is no “Qur’ān created” kalām, this is a fundamental issue of Sunni Islām from which the Mu’tazilites and others basically separated from us, we believe the Qur’ān is not created speech of Allāh. The Ṣaḥābah did not ask this question. The question did not occur to them.

And I firmly believe, this is my belief, take it or leave it, that if you asked ‘Umar ibn al Khaṭṭāb was the Qur’ān created or not, he would have taken the stick and beaten you, ‘How dare you ask this question’. I firmly believe that if a Muslim went around Madīnah saying “Where is Allāh?”, “Where is Allāh?”, “Where is Allāh?”—[BYSQ gestures by pointing his finger and

does this in a mocking way]—‘Umar would have you whipped and flogged in public.

As we said, there is much more in the lecture as a whole, but we want to focus on this issue first.

## COMMENTARY

For the purposes of simplicity and easier reading we will make brief summary points.

**1. BYSQ** is a medley of these four elements:

- the **Orientalist** view of Salafiyyah, that it is a modern movement, with:

- something that resembles the claim of **Muḥammad Sa‘īd Ramaḍān al-Būṭī**, the Syrian Ikhwānī, Ṣūfī that “Salafiyyah” is only a **blessed time period** and not a particular, distinct doctrine and methodology, and

- the ideas of **Ḥasan al-Bannā**, **Yūsuf al-Qaraḍāwī** and **Salmān al-‘Awdah** in moving towards to a “Civic Islām”, and

- his belief that **he is an intellectual leader** and **reviver** for the 21st century. It would not be far-fetched to say that he may even have had thoughts of becoming the leader of all the Muslims in the United States one day, if becoming the President turned out to be beyond his expectations.

2. The only way to achieve these goals of the Orientalists and Ikhwānīs is to undermine Salafiyyah.

Islām is the Sunnah and the Sunnah is Islām. The Sunnah is Salafiyyah and Salafiyyah is the Sunnah. Salafiyyah is Islām and Islām is Salafiyyah. It is the Islām in the time of the Companions absent the Khārijites, Rāfiḍah, Qadariyyah, Murji'ah, Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah, Kullābiyyah, Karrāmiyyah, Ash'ariyyah, Māturīdiyyah, Şūfiyyah and in a modern context, Ikhwāniyyah, Tablīhiyyah, Taḥrīriyyah and so on.

3. The attempt to portray Salafiyyah as a “human extraction” and then to find a common denominator such that all these other groups can be entered into “Sunni Islām” broadly speaking is the first step of many steps that would eventually lead, over many generations, to the undermining of Islām itself, meaning the genuine authentic Islām that the Companions acquired from the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).

4. As it relates to ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ), **BYSQ** makes mention of numerous aspects of creed:

- The Tawḥīd of Allāh and its three aspects
- The ‘Uluww of Allāh
- The Attributes of Allāh
- The Qur’ān being the uncreated speech of Allāh
- The realities and pillars of Īmān

**BYSQ** says that ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb (رضي الله عنه) would fail in every single subject if he was quizzed on it, and that he would whip and flog people in public for asking questions about these affairs, even “Where is Allāh?”

5. There is **a tremendous amount of academic, intellectual and historical deception going on here** and **BYSQ** is playing with the minds of people through such deception.

6. To unravel this deception we first state that:

‘Umar and the Companions (رضي الله عنهم) knew full well that the argument of the Qur’ān was that since Allāh is unique in His actions of creating, owning, providing, giving life, taking life, guiding, misguiding and so on, and since only He is described with the most Beautiful Names and Perfect Attributes, that He alone is worthy of worship and that none shares with Him in any of this. They knew the meaning of all of this as it was elucidated in the Qur’ān so clearly.

They also knew that Allāh, the Lord whom they worshipped, was above His creation, not here on this earth, and nor did they ever understand that affirming His ‘uluww would render Him a jism (body) like the created bodies because this was an alien thought, it was unknown to them.

They also affirmed the attributes of Allāh without it ever occurring to them that such an affirmation would make Allāh to be like His creatures.

They also knew that Allāh spoke the Qurʾān and hence it is uncreated, meaning the words He spoke are His uncreated words.

They also knew that īmān is belief, speech and action. They may not have expressed it in these specific words, but in meaning, this is what they understood because it is what is apparent and clear in the Qurʾān.

In fact all the above are very apparent and clear in the Qurʾān and Sunnah, one cannot understand anything other than it.

**7.** Once the above is clear, the true and correct thing to ask would be to say:

If ʿUmar (رضي الله عنه) was somehow made to be present in the time of Ibn Sīrīn, al-Zuhrī, al-Thawrī, Mālik al-Shāfiʿī and others in the 2nd century hijrah, would he—upon his understanding of the meanings of the Qurʾān and Sunnah—have explained these subjects in the same way as they did in order to clarify the falsehood of the various sects that emerged? Namely, that Allāh has names and attributes, that He is above His creation, that His speech is uncreated and that īmān is belief, speech and action, it increases and decreases?

This would be the correct way to speak because it accords with factual realities. And the answer would be yes, because that is what the Salaf themselves inherited from the Companions who are at the head of the Salaf.

However, from his deception—and this is what happens when you get too clever for yourself—he

presented a different scenario and made two false claims.

The first is that ‘Umar would have failed and would not have been able to speak and clarify the truth in these “abstract issues” that arose. This is a revilement upon this great Companion, in his understanding and his intelligence as it relates to these foundational matters of creed, even if **BYSQ** praises him with respect to everything else.

The second is that ‘Umar would have whipped and flogged those who raised questions about Allāh’s ‘uluww and His speech and His attributes and so on, with our knowledge that these issues would only have arisen because the deviant sects appeared.

So he presents ‘Umar as one who would vilify and punish those who speak the truth within such a context, and accommodate those who speak with falsehood, rather, that which is kufr, such as denial of Allāh’s ‘uluww and the claim that His speech is created.

This is a tremendous crime. In other words, if ‘Umar was alive in the 2nd and 3rd century hijrah, he would flog and whip those who clarified the truth and spoke with these issues.

Notice the way **BYSQ** is speaking and you can clearly observe the deviation in his heart. What he should have said, if his heart was rightly-guided, was that if ‘Umar was alive in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th centuries, he would have flogged the Jahmites, he would have flogged the Mu‘tazilah, he would have flogged Ibn Kullāb

and al-Muḥāsibī and others after whom schools appeared in which they opposed the Qurʾān and the Sunnah in various aspects of creed. That is what **BYSQ** should be saying if his heart was guided. But instead he reverses the realities to make Ahl al-Sunnah the target, for those who speak the truth to be target of ‘Umar’s displeasure and anger in a hypothetical scenario.

From another angle, the honest way to speak would be to say the following:

“Had ‘Umar (رضي الله عنه) been present in the time of al-Awzāʿī, al-Thawrī and others and in the circumstances which arose in their time, **would he have had the knowledge and understanding to define faith (īmān) in a way to outline its reality as intended in the Qurʾān in opposition to incorrect statements regarding it**—[actions are not from faith and it does not increase and decrease and all believers are equal in faith]—**exactly as they did or not?**” And the answer would be yes, of course he would.

But he did not come from that angle He is coming instead from that **Bannāwite, Yale-Orientalist, Swaggerite Qadhi** angle in which the way of the Companions is undermined, and they are made to look like incapable blind-followers who would have been unable to grasp, extract and present the truth from the Qurʾān and the Sunnah had foreign, alien creeds and philosophies been presented to them.

He reversed things back to front and invented an imaginary and impossible scenario, that if any person

today, or even the likes of al-Awzā'ī and al-Thawrī and all the great imāms of the Salaf were alive in the time of 'Umar (رضي الله عنه) and gave him a quiz on the pillars of faith (arkān of īmān)<sup>4</sup>, he would not have been able to answer it. This is a complete distortion of reality because you would have to replicate the same circumstances present in the time of al-Awzā'ī, al-Thawrī and others in the time of 'Umar (رضي الله عنه) for the underlying need to ask such questions to have arisen in the first place, in which case 'Umar would have answered in the same way from his knowledge and understanding as did those after him, who were upon his way. And this would have become the saying of Ahl al-Sunnah as the actual intended Qur'ānic truth and not a mere “human extraction” as **BYSQ** deceitfully claims. So this is academic dishonesty and this is playing with people's minds and twisting realities.

**8. BYSQ** claims that 'Umar bin al-Khattāb (رضي الله عنه) would not have been able to answer the arkān of īmān— meaning, that it is speech and action, and that it increases and decreases? Let us see:

First, he is the very one who related the famous ḥadīth of Jibrīl about Islām, Īmān and Īḥsan. This includes outward speech and actions (islām, including

---

<sup>4</sup> This is what Qadhi actually said, but he means here not the six pillars of faith, but that faith is belief, speech and action, it increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience.

shahādah), inward beliefs (īmān)—and this ḥadīth is from the great foundations of the religion. ‘Umar bin al-Khattāb (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) would not have understood from it what was just mentioned? He would have failed in a comprehension test on this ḥadīth? In other words, if you asked ‘Umar about īmān, he would not have been able to figure out from this ḥadīth which he reported that īmān is belief, speech and action.

Second, and further, ‘Umar bin al-Khattāb is related to have said, (هلموا نزيدا إيمانا) “Come, let us increase in faith”, as is related by al-Bayḥaqī in Shu‘ab al-Īmān and others and similar statements are related from other Companions. So ‘Umar did not know that faith increases and would not have been able to answer? A person really needs to know and understand how ignorant, misguided and deceptive Qadhi is and what revilement he is making of ‘Umar here with his pseudo-intellectual babble.

**9. Abū al-Dardā** (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) said, “Īmān increases and decreases” and **Abu Hurayrah** (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) said, “Īmān increases and decreases” and **Ibn ‘Abbās** (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) said, “Īmān increases and decreases”—all related by al-Bayḥaqī. And there is the statement of **Jundub** (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) that they would learn the Qur’ān from the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and it would “increase them in īmān”. So is this a “human extraction” as **BYSQ** claims or is it an actual reality indicated in the texts themselves?

Now, when a Māturīdī or Ash‘arī comes along and blatantly, knowingly opposes the Companions, and misguides others and says actions are not from faith and it does not increase and decrease, it is as if **BYSQ** wants to tie the hands and lips of Abū al-Dardā, Abu Hurayrah, Ibn ‘Abbās and all those who followed them till this day because these are “abstract issues of creed”. How is this an abstract issue of creed when it is explicitly mentioned in the Qur’ān, meaning the increase of faith, and that faith comprises actions such as the prayer?

He wants to tie the lips of all those Companions who are related by ‘Amr bin Dīnār al-Makkī (d. 126H) to have said that the Qur’ān is not created: “I reached the people (Companions) since seventy years (ago) (i.e. 56H), all of them saying: Allāh, lofty be His name, is the Creator, and whatever is besides Him is created, **except the Qur’ān, for it is the speech of Allāh, the Exalted**. From Him did it emanate and to Him shall it return.”<sup>5</sup> And likewise, of anyone who follows them in this till this day.

He treats these statements of creed as “later formulations” and “human extractions” aimed at reaching an “abstract ideal” and he does not see them as actual intended realities and truths which represent a criterion between truth and falsehood. This is a truly audacious affront to the truth and this type of speech is

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ al-Qur’ān Bi ‘Awdihī ilā al-Raḥīm al-Raḥmān* of al-Ḥāfidh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wāhid al-Maqdisī (d. 634H)

a war against the aqīdah of Islām—whether he admits it or not and whether he subscribes to this creed or not.

**10.** The ideas Qadhi is presenting actually undermine this very ‘aqīdah—even though he believes it himself—and this shows what misguidance does to an individual. He is trying to present this as a “human extraction”, leading to the notion that we should accept a common denominator of all of these “human extractions” and unite upon them and we should not be opposing each other with the “human extractions” that we are all following.

Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) says to the Māturīdī—the one who expels actions from the reality of īmān—and the Jahmite Ash‘arī who claims īmān is only taṣdīq and it does not increase and decrease:

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ  
الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ

**“And whoever contends with the Messenger after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him and chooses a path other than the path of the Believers (the Companions), we shall leave him in the Path...”**  
(4:115).

But Qadhi comes along and says in effect:

“Leave that aside, you don’t need to listen to that and the humanly extracted formulas pertaining to īmān (faith). Just adhere to *Generic Sunnism* with a bit of sincerity in your worship and you will be fine. Don’t

listen to what the Companions said, they just made a *human extraction* from the Qurʾān, the same as what al-Ashʿarī himself did and al-Māturīdī himself did. These are just abstract issues of theology. If you want to believe in these formulas, yes, you can do so, as I do, I do believe that they are closest to the truth and the best “human extraction” available, but as for all of this ‘bidʿah’ and ‘ḍalālah’, and ‘straight path’ stuff, leave that. Don’t listen to those verses in the Qurʾān which warn and threaten this ummah for following misguidance and following the ways of past nations who were sent Books and Messengers. Likewise, those ḥadīths which warn against deviating from the right path. Stick to *Generic Sunnism*, ignore those verses and ḥadīths and concentrate only on other texts, such as those on the virtues of the kalimah, and how the one who says the kalimah will enter Paradise and so on.”

That is what Qadhi is calling to, he is a caller at the gates of Hellfire, a pseudo-intellectual swindler, a distorter of realities, he wants to blur the distinction between truth and falsehood.

And what we have said here is nothing compared to what ʿUmar bin al-Khattāb (رضي الله عنه) would have done to this misguided innovator had he reached him.

Abu ʿIyaaḍ—@abuiyaadsp

13 Dhū al-Qaʿdah 1441 / 4 July 2020—v.1.02