

# The Muṣā‘fiqah Network Reveals Its Agenda and Its True Colours



As we have already indicated in our previous article<sup>1</sup>, the theatrical diversion of **Muḥammad bin Hādī’s** “Sā‘āfiqah” drama has come to an end. He was unable to complete the job with the prodding and support of the **corporate network** behind him. In fact, he made a sticky mess of it and landed himself in big trouble.

There was nothing in that saga worthy of any response from a **knowledge-based** viewpoint because it was founded on commotion and exaggeration regarding alleged, perceived or actual mistakes of students and shaykhs and involved oppression and transgression. Muḥammad bin Hādī opposed the foundations of Ahl al-Sunnah in his behaviour and treatment of this matter and created turmoil and confusion, similar to the haphazard way of Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī fifteen years earlier. But the real aim behind the Ṣā‘āfiqah theatrical was to attack Shaykh Rabī and Shaykh ‘Ubayd for reasons that are outside the scope of this article to discuss. One of those reasons is that there has been an attempt for about five years at least to push **an alternative scholarship** to replace the senior scholars that we are all familiar with. When

---

<sup>1</sup> “Do You Not Have Any Intelligence O Khālīd al-Miṣrīyy?” which can be read here: <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?omtup>

some members of this network were disciplined by Shaykh ‘Ubayd and Shaykh Rabī for errors, harshness and haste it really grieved and harmed them, and their egos got the better of them. So they took to a range of activities which provided a trajectory for where we are today: The first episode involving Muḥammad bin Hādī, which has just ended in failure.

Now, the shadows behind the curtains are coming out—and this is where we come to the knowledge based issues. This is where **the real battle** takes place. It is here where we will see with whom is actual knowledge, fiqh and adherence to the understanding of the Salaf. Likewise, who is guiding themselves with the guidance of the Imāms of Ahl al-Sunnah through the ages in their interpretation of the Book and the Sunnah.

So here is what has happened so far:

**1. Khālid al-Miṣriyy has openly and explicitly accused an Imām in the Sunnah, ‘Allāmah, Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī of affirming the manhaj of the Khārijites, opposing a foundation of the Sunnah and deviating from the Sunnah.**

This is not a slip or a mistake from Khālid al-Miṣriyy—there is a design and agenda behind this. His argument was based on **the spurious claim** that scholarly gatherings to discuss current affairs such as war, fighting, peace and the likes which take place in private are from the way of the Khārijites. By this, he intended to present the idea that Shaykh Rabī who affirms such consultative gatherings in order to provide advice and direction to people of the Sunnah in various places is affirming the manhaj of the Khārijites. The intent behind this is to make people lose trust in Shaykh Rabī (and Shaykh ‘Ubayd) and their rulings and warnings from some members of this network for some of the things they fell into. This would help to mend and recover their damaged plan of becoming

alternative authority figures for Ahl al-Sunnah so that they have free reign to speak and do as they wish. Muḥammad bin Hādī was part-directed to play a role in this regard, but he messed it all up and landed himself in much bigger trouble.<sup>2</sup> As for those ignoramuses defending Khālid al-Miṣriyy—such as the Muṣāfiqah network in the West—through arguments and claims such as “So and so also declared Shaykh Rabī to be wrong in an issue, so why is that not a revilement, and why are you not attacking him as well.” To see through this smoke and mirrors all you need to know is the nature of the mistake of Khālid al-Miṣriyy. There is no scholar ever who has held the view that scholarly gatherings for mutual consultation and issuing verdicts, when done in private, away from the riff-raff, common-folk and those who lack understanding is from “the secret gatherings of the Khārijites”, such that there are two views in the matter. Upon this **blatant falsehood**, Khālid al-Miṣriyy made a revilement upon Shaykh Rabī. This is unlike those issues in which legitimate differences of view may occur for a reason among the reasons and scholars may declare others to be in error. However, in this case, the claim is based on pure ignorance and falsehood. Khālid al-Miṣriyy knows this because he has statements in the past encouraging people to refer back to Shaykh Rabī and Shaykh ‘Ubayd in the nawāzil.

2. As soon as Khālid al-Miṣriyy revealed what this network is concealing of aims and designs through this revilement, he was pelted from every direction, swiftly and sternly, with shaykhs and students of knowledge exposing his ignorance and oppression. This forced another network member, **Aḥmad Bazmul** to reveal his hand and come out in defence of Khālid al-Miṣriyy in falsehood and with arguments that a child would not accept, **given the facts**

---

<sup>2</sup> The situation is a bit more complex than this, but our intent here is not a full

**of the matter.** Khālid al-Miṣriyy, did not make a mistake or a slip, this is a planned, coordinated attack, and Aḥmad Bazmul exposed himself in the process.

**3.** What clearly indicates and proves this, is that the corporation has now gone clear and brought out a knowledge-based point of contention (after that of Khālid al-Miṣriyy, regarding shūrā, which he treats as “secret gatherings” and the manhaj of the Khārijites). This issue is the claim that the statement of Allāh, **“those in authority over you”** (4:59) refers only to the rulers and that there is no authentic evidence from the Companions that it refers to **the people of knowledge** as well. The goal behind this shubhah is to support the claim made by Khālid al-Miṣriyy against Shaykh Rabīʿ, that it is not for the scholars to meet and engage in private discussions of affairs of public interest and that doing so is opposition to a foundation from the foundations of the Sunnah, and is from the way of the Khārijites. And this claim is in opposition to all the great Imāms of Salafiyyah throughout the ages who have explained (4:59)<sup>3</sup> and also (4:83)<sup>4</sup> to refer to both **the rulers and the scholars**. As for debating whether there exists a single authentic chain from the Companions about the interpretation that “those in authority” refers to scholars, then that is irrelevant, since this is the overwhelming view of the Salaf and of the Imāms of the Salaf in every age and there are evidences to support this viewpoint. **Imām Ibn al-Qayyim** (d. 751H) said: “The report varies from Imām Aḥmad (رحمه الله تعالى) regarding ‘those in authority’. There are two reports from him (رحمه الله تعالى): The first of them is that they are the scholars. The second is that they are the rulers. And both views are established from the Companions in

<sup>3</sup> Refer to <http://www.thenoblequran.com/q/#/verse/4/59> for its explanation.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to <http://www.thenoblequran.com/q/#/verse/4/83> for its explanation.

the explanation of the verse. What is correct is that the verse applies to both groups together. For the scholars and the rulers are those in authority over the affair with which Allāh sent His Messenger. The scholars are its guardians in terms of preservation, explanation, defence of it and refuting the one who swerved and deviated from it.”<sup>5</sup>

**Imām al-Sa’dī** (d. 1376H) said: “Then He ordered with His obedience and obedience to His Messenger. This occurs by fulfilling their commands, both the obligatory and recommended, and avoiding their prohibitions. And He ordered with obedience to those in authority. And they are those with authority over the people from the leaders (‘umarā), judges (ḥukkām) and scholars who give verdicts (muftīs). For the religious and worldly affairs of the people are not set aright except by obedience to them and compliance with them, out of obedience to Allāh, and out of aspiration for what lies with Him [of reward]. But with the condition that they do not command with disobedience to Allāh.”<sup>6</sup>

**Imām Ibn Bāz** (d. 1420H) said: “And this is the most correct [view] that ‘those in authority’ is general to both the scholars and the rulers, even though it is more apparent in relation to the rulers. However, the people of knowledge are also from those in authority in explaining Allāh’s rulings, and explaining what is permissible, what is unlawful and what is lawful. So they are ‘those in authority’ from the angle of explanation. And the rulers are ‘those in authority’ from the angle of affirmation and [implementing] the rulings.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Badā’i‘ al-Tafsīr (Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1427H) 1/278-279.

<sup>6</sup> Refer to his tafsīr of this verse in Taysīr al-Karīm al-Raḥmān.

<sup>7</sup> Refer to <https://binbaz.org.sa/audios/296/16>

This attempt at defending Khālīd al-Miṣriyy is clear evidence that these people have abandoned the Major scholars and have resorted to shubuhāt in order to pursue the agenda they have. What further establishes this is that there are audios of Khālīd al-Miṣriyy in which he states that Shaykh Rabīʿ is an Imām and that he and Shaykh ‘Ubayd are referred to for fatwā in matters of jihād. Likewise Aḥmad Bazmul, when he denied giving fatwa to the Libyans for fighting, he said he is upon the fatwa of the Shaykh, the Imām Rabīʿ, who prohibited them from fighting.<sup>8</sup> So now, when this network is coming out with this claim that scholarly gatherings discussing affairs affecting Muslims in places like Libya, Algeria, Yemen and so on are “secret gatherings” upon the manhaj of the Khārijites—and they are found defending each other—then there is an agenda behind this. Their contradiction and dishonesty—in their attempt to attack Shaykh Rabīʿ—has been exposed openly for all to see.

Abū ‘Iyaḍ ♦ @abuiyaadsp  
17 Jumādā al-Ākhirah 1440H.

---

<sup>8</sup> You can listen to the audio recordings from Aḥmad Bazmul and Khālīd al-Miṣriyy here: <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/assets/audio/bazmul-khalid-nawazil.mp3>