



www.sunnahpublishing.net

---

## Notification to the Intelligent Concerning the Nonsensical Principles of 'Alee al-Halabee al-Miskeen<sup>1</sup> [Part 3 of 4]

Shaykh Aboo 'Abdur-Rahmaan Sa'd Ibn Fathee az-Za'taree

Translation by Maaz Qureshi

---

Version 1.0

---

### In This Section:

- 'Alee al-Halabee upholds the *mumayyi'ee* principle of seeking a consensus from all the Scholars before declaring an individual an innovator.
- 'Alee al-Halabee's contention with the principle of *Ahlus-Sunnah* that the explained and elaborated criticism takes precedence over the general praise.
- Al-Halabee's claims that the *Muftee* praises Sayyid Qutb and quotes from his books, as do a number of Saudi Scholars.
- Mashhoor Hasan Salmaan's praise for Yoosuf al-Qardaawee and Sayyid Qutb.
- Al-Halabee's continued defence of Muhammad al-Maghraawee and his refusal to adopt the position of the Scholars against him.
- Al-Halabee's claim that one can have a sound '*aqeedah*' and still oppose a foundation of the *manhaj* – thus differentiating between '*aqeedah*' and *manhaj*.

---

<sup>1</sup> With the permission of Allaah, this is the third of a four part translation of the strong, knowledge based refutation entitled, "Tanbeehul-Fateen li Tahaafut Ta'selaat 'Alee al-Halabee al-Miskeen" by Shaykh Aboo 'Abdur-Rahmaan Sa'd Ibn Fathee az-Za'taree of Palestine.

## **CRITICAL ACCLAIM FOR THIS TREATISE:**

Before moving onto the text of this treatise, it is important for the *Salafee* to learn and keep in mind what the *Shuyookh* have been saying about this refutation thus far.

Shaykh Ahmad Ibn 'Umar Baazmool wrote January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009CE, "So may Allaah reward Shaykh Sa'd for this solid book and comprehensive refutation upon the statements of 'Alee al-Halabee that are evidently in opposition to the *Salafee manhaj*."

He further stated, "Indeed, I read this refutation in its entirety within one day, with the virtue of Allaah, and saw what was in it from principles and debating with fairness and justice. So I advise my brothers, the *Salafees*, to not have bigotry and start defending the refuted one through curses and slanders. So by Allaah, everyone who opposes the truth and spreads this publicly and then is advised but does not recant, then it is obligatory upon the people of knowledge and their students to refute him. So if some of them establish that, then the blame is removed from the rest. So do not treat this communal obligation like it is a criminal act. Do not treat enjoining the good and prohibiting the evil like it is evil itself. And do not treat the one who refutes the opponent as if he is the opponent."<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, Shaykh Hishaam Ibn Fahmee al'Aarif stated about this treatise on December 28<sup>th</sup>, 2008CE, "The new principles laid down by the one called 'Alee Ibn Hasan al-Halabee who has been described by the major Scholars as wretched and miserable, one who praises the misguided ones.

Indeed, our noble brother Sa'd Ibn Fathee az-Za'taree – may Allaah raise him in this world and in the Hereafter – has embarked to refute some of his nonsensical statements and corrupt principles. So he wrote this valuable treatise and titled it with the following title: *Notification to the Intelligent about the Nonsensical Principles of 'Alee al-Halabee al-Miskeen*. So he uncovered therein 'Alee al-Halabee's crooked principles, through which he wants to either confuse the beginner students of knowledge, or he wants to pacify his own ignorant, bigoted companions. Indeed, he has not ceased to assault and roam freely in the arena of *adDa'watusSalafiyah*. And how else could he be after hospitably receiving the *fattaan* (deceiver) [Muhammad] Ibn Hassaan?

And from that which the one named 'Alee al-Halabee has come with from invented principles, through which he desired to delude the youth who are inclined towards seeking beneficial knowledge. So he plays games with them in order to confuse the truth and to conceal it from them by watering down the *manhaj* of the *Salaf*, thereby entering them into the dark tunnels of the innovators."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Taken from Ahmad Baazmool's post on the *alBayda'* forums.

<sup>3</sup> Taken from Hishaam al'Aarif's website. The entirety of this introduction, which includes Shaykh Hishaam's outlining and replying to 'Alee al-Halabee's principles, will soon be translated and presented as part of this series if Allaah so wills.

Shaykh Ahmad Baazmool replied, "May Allaah reward Shaykh Hishaam al'Aarif for his introduction to this treatise, which proves that he is '*aarif* (knowledgeable) of the *Salafee manhaj*."

Furthermore, Shaykh Ahmad Baazmool mentioned, "So let all of the *Salafiyyeen* in every place rejoice at this joyous occasion. Indeed, it is the praise of our Shaykh, the flag-bearer of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*, Rabee' Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee - may Allaah the Exalted preserve him - for the book, *Tanbeehul-Fateen li Tahaafut Ta'seelaat 'Alee al-Halabee al-Miskeen*, written by Shaykh Abbee 'Abdur-Rahmaan Sa'd Ibn Fathee az-Za'taree.

So I asked him - may Allaah the Exalted preserve him - about his opinion concerning the book. So he - may Allaah the Exalted preserve him - said, "Indeed, I read the book in its entirety. Its author achieved excellence therein and he exposed al-Halabee in many, numerous issues and he followed up al-Halabee in it correctly. And it is a strong, knowledge-based refutation - *maashaa' Allaahu ta'aala*. May Allaah reward its author with the best of rewards." And I wrote it down on 1/15/1430H."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Taken from Ahmad Baazmool's post on the *Sahab* forums.

## **THE THIRD SECTION:**

Al-Halabee said, "Then, with regards to the common students, when the people of knowledge all unite upon declaring someone an innovator, then they do not have the liberty to oppose that. When they (i.e. the people of knowledge) have not united, then I say that if they are able to ascertain the correct position, then they should ascertain it as much as they are able, so as to take the most cautious position, as they would do in any *Sharee'ah* issue. Then, if you are a *muqallid* (blind follower), even if you reached the correct position, it is enough for you to be a *muqallid*. As for you being a *muqallid* and a *mujtahid* and a defender and a publisher and the flag-bearer of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* in this issue; this, in reality, opposes the *manhaj* of the *Salaf*. Yes, I am speaking about the students who convey from the Scholars. Due to that, I say: Even if there emanate from the Scholars some words of *tabdee'*, the reality of their speech is, meaning along with the objections that they may have, as long as they have been confirmed, the problem now is the conduct and behaviour of the youth. Since, they do not understand that the science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* was originally founded for a benefit. The science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* is not present in the proofs of the Book, nor in the proofs of the *Sunnah*. It is a science that is newly arisen, it evolved for the preservation of the Book and the *Sunnah*. Is that not so? Therefore, it is a science for benefit. So what is the matter with us that we use this science, which evolved for a benefit, against another benefit; or at the very least we do not weigh the benefits when we declare someone an innovator. We do not pay attention. We say that this is a benefit, yes. However, we do not pay attention to the harms that come about as a result of this benefit. This has gone to the extent that anywhere I go or travel to now, there is no place in the world, except that the word of the *Salafiyeen* has become divided therein due to so and so and due to so and so. 'So and so is an innovator and so and so is not an innovator. So and so does not declare so and so an innovator. Whosoever does not declare an innovator as such, then he himself is an innovator.' These are statements repeated by the youth, yet they do not know the realities of this statements and they do not know the *usool* (foundations) behind such statements and they do not know the *furoo'* (subsidiary affairs) behind them. So the affair is real, meaning it is dangerous, very dangerous. And no one has full disclosure of it besides Allaah."

And the refutation upon this speech is from a number of angles:

[1]: Shaykh al-Halabee said, "Then, with regards to the common students, when the people of knowledge all unite upon declaring someone an innovator, then they do not have the liberty to oppose that."

I say: And this is from the modern-day principles of al-Halabee in *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*. Who speaks with such speech? You always want to defend your *manhaj*, which you traverse upon in praising the people of innovation with these corrupt principles. So if we say to him, why have you not yet declared al-Ma'ribi and al-Maghraawee innovators? He will answer us with this principle: not up until all the people of knowledge unite upon declaring him an

innovator!! So some of the Scholars have not declared him an innovator. And with this principle, no one will be able to object to anyone else. So if you were to say that Sayyid Qutb<sup>5</sup> is an innovator, they will say that so and so has praised him and there is no consensus (*ijmaa'*) upon declaring him an innovator and so on.

Indeed, I have quoted the speech of the people of knowledge in *tabdee'* of the innovators, and they relied upon the speech of Imaam Ahmad (d.241H) in the *tabdee'* of the innovator, without turning to other than him. So is it obligatory upon us, when a Scholar of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* declares an individual from amongst the people an innovator, that we travel to all of the other people of knowledge in the earth and ask them that they say about so and so and do they agree with Scholar so and so in declaring him an innovator?

Rather, the *manhaj* of *Ahlus-Sunnah* is that if one person from the people of knowledge, who is qualified in this knowledge, declares someone an innovator, then it is obligatory upon everyone else to accept his statement about that individual, except if this *jarh* is contradicted by a *ta'deel* (praise) from one of the Shaykhs. In that case, we request from

---

<sup>5</sup> **Sayyid Qutb:** He was mentioned by Shaykh Rabee' Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee in *Jamaa'ah Waahidah* (p. 76, 129, 131, 138, 152, 154, 165-167). And Shaykh Rabee' commented (p. 159) about Qutb's books: *Fee DhilaalilQur'aan, al-'Adaatalatul-Ijtimaa'iyyah* and *Ma'aalim fitTareeq*, "They are filled with *takfeer*." And he said (p. 160), "They - the people of innovations and misguidance - have endeavoured to make lawful the *manhaj* of Sayyid Qutb, the ignorant *takfeeree*, under the titles: the new *manhaj* of *as-Salafiyah*, confrontational *Salafiyah*, the *Salafiyah* of belief and modern confrontation in place of this magnificent *Salafee manhaj*." And he said about his *manhaj* (p. 171), "He has gathered together great misguidance and innovations." And he said (p. 173), "The books of Sayyid Qutb are *takfeeriyyah*." And Shaykh Rabee' also mentioned him (p. 170, 173, 187). And Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalee mentioned him in the introduction to *an-Nasrul'Azeez 'alar-Raddil-Wajeek* (p. 21, 24), and Shaykh Rabee' mentioned him in the same book in a number of places, (p. 83, 88-89, 102, 104, 120, 122, 166-167, 190, 193, 198). And him and his followers were mentioned by Shaykh Rabee' in *Manhaj Ahlus-Sunnah fin-Naqd* (p. 63). And Shaykh Rabee' said about him in *al-Haddul-Faasil* (p. 5), "A great misguided individual." And Shaykh Muqbil stated in *Fadaa'ih wa Nasaa'ih* (p. 64), "He was considered a writer and not a *mufassir*." And he said (p. 65), "And I ask Allaah the Magnificent to preserve our brother Rabee' Ibn Haadee since he has clarified the beliefs of Sayyid Qutb and whatever he has of deviation." And he said (p. 66), "So the one who inclines towards *adh-Dhilaal*, then it is feared that he will fall into *addalaal* (misguidance). So if you absolutely must read *adh-Dhilaal*, then I advise you to read that which was written by the brother 'Abdullaah Ibn Muhammad ad-Duwaysh and that which was written by Shaykh Rabee' Ibn Haadee - *hafidhahullaah*." And Shaykh Muqbil said about him (p. 161), "The themes within the books of Sayyid Qutb are the wheels for the rest of the books of misguidance." Refer also to *Fadaa'ih wa Nasaa'ih* (p. 147, 152). And Shaykh Muqbil stated in *Fadaa'ih wa Nasaa'ih* (p. 148), "I read what the brother Rabee' Ibn Haadee - *hafidhahullaah* - wrote about the affair of Sayyid Qutb, his belief of *Hulooliyah* (oneness of Allaah with His creation), such that he is *Huloolee*, his curses upon 'Uthmaan and I read about the *Takfeeree* tendencies in the books of Sayyid Qutb. Indeed, many from amongst *Jamaa'atut-Takfeer* use the statements of Sayyid Qutb as evidence." And Shaykh Muqbil said (p. 151), "He is from the imaams of the people of innovation." And he said (p. 152), "And he is an imaam from amongst the imaams of the people of innovation." Shaykh 'Ubayd al-Jaabiree stated in the audiotape, *ad-Dawaabit* (side 1), "It is not *Fee DhilaalilQur'aan* (In the Shade of the Qur'aan), rather it is *Fee Dhilaalish-Shaytaan* (In the Shade of the Shaytaan)." He was mentioned by Shaykh Ahmad an-Najmee in *al-Mawridul-'Adhabiz-Zilaal* (p. 189, 248). For further elaboration upon the affair of Sayyid Qutb, refer to the following books by Shaykh Rabee': *al-'Awaasim mimmaa fee Kutub Sayyid Qutb minalQawaasim*, *Nadharaat fil-Kitaab at-Tasweerul-Fannee fil-Qur'aan*, *Adwaa' 'ala 'Aqeedah Sayyid Qutb* and *Mataa'in Sayyid Qutb fis-Sahaabah*.

the *jaarih* (one who makes the *jarh*) to clarify the reason for his *jarh*. So if he explains it, then it is obligatory to accept his statement; and one must turn towards the statement of that *mu'addil* (one who makes *ta'deel*) Shaykh. And this is well-known in the principles of *alJarh wat-Ta'deel*, as will be explained in detail later.

And I ask al-Halabee: If Scholar so and so declares someone from the people an innovator and the other Scholars do not declare him as such, based upon the fact that this science (i.e. *alJarh wat-Ta'deel*) is *fard kifaayah* (communal obligation), such that if some people establish it, the obligation is removed from the rest, then do we take the statement of the first Scholar? Or, is the silence of the rest of the Scholars taken as an excuse to reject him, or is his speech binding? And does a Scholar, when he performs *alJarh wat-Ta'deel*, does he seek a consensus upon the *jarh*, or does he not perform a *jarh*, except with an *ijmaa*?

[2]: Then al-Halabee said, “When they (i.e. the people of knowledge) have not united, then I say that if they are able to ascertain the correct position, then they should ascertain it as much as they are able, so as to take the most cautious position, as they would do in any *Sharee'ah* issue. Then, if you are a *muqallid* (blind follower), even if you reached the correct position, it is enough for you to be a *muqallid*.”

I say: Bit by bit the modern-day principles of al-Halabee in *alJarh wat-Ta'deel* are becoming apparent. So this is a new principle and it is: that the student of knowledge must ascertain the correct position in the issue of *tabdee'* – how free is Allaah from imperfection! A short time ago, he likened the students of knowledge to predatory animals and bloodsuckers and claimed that they refute for personal satisfaction and revenge and that they reject repents and so on and so forth... And now it is possible for the student of knowledge to determine the correct path, and if not, then he must take the most cautious position, as is the case in any *Sharee'ah* issue. How have you compared the *jarh* of the innovator with an issue of *fiqh* (jurisprudence) about which there is disagreement in which the proof has different viewpoints?<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> **BENEFIT - SHAYKH RABEE' ON THE CONDITION OF IJMAA' (CONSENSUS) IN JARH OF THE INNOVATORS:** Shaykh Rabee' Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee was asked, "Is it condition in *jarh* (disparaging) the people of innovation that the current Scholars must have a consensus, or is one Scholar enough?" So the flag-bearer of *alJarh wat-Ta'deel* in our times answered, "This is from the wicked principles of the *mumayyi'ah* – may Allaah bless you. In which time was this *ijmaa'* a condition?! And what is the proof for this condition?! Every condition that is not found in the Book of Allaah, then it is false. And even if there was a condition, then when Ahmad Ibn Hanbal made a *jarh* and Yahyaa Ibn Ma'een (d.233H) did not make a *jarh* of that innovator – I say: is it them necessary that all of the Imaams of the *Sunnah* in the world agree that he is an innovator?! So when Ahmad said, "This is an innovator," everything ended. Due to this, when Ahmad said, 'So and so is an innovator,' the people submitted to that and did not voice their opinions. When Ibn Ma'een said, 'This one is an innovator,' no one disputed with him.

The *ijmaa'* is a condition – this is impossible!!! It is an impossibility in all of the *Sharee'ah* rulings!! Fine, when two witnesses come to testify against an individual that killed someone – in front of the legislated judge – it is obligatory upon the judge to rule with the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah; either blood-money will be paid, or punishment will be delivered. Is it a condition to have an *ijmaa'* in the likes of this affair, since it is more dangerous than the *tabdee'* of an innovator? These people are *mumayyi'oon*. They are *mumayyi'oon* and people of falsehood and callers to evil and they are people who hunt in murky waters, as they say.

Indeed, we are astounded by such speech. And we have not heard any speech like this from the Scholars. So how can we determine that this is an innovator or not an innovator? We ask the disparaging Scholars for the reason for this *jarh* when a doubt arises, and if there is no such doubt, then it is obligatory to accept the speech of a trustworthy narrator. So when he informs us with proof, then what is there after the truth, except falsehood? So how can such a determination be permitted?

You say that *alJarh wat-Ta'deel* has appeared upon the tongue of everyone. And here you contradict this statement and make it subject to the thought and *ijtihaad* (independent reasoning) of everyone; its reference point is no longer the Scholars who judge with it and the others follow them. What is this strange and bizarre *manhaj*?! And if he cannot determine the correct path, then he must follow the most cautious course, that is, he must not follow the declaration of *tabdee*! *Allaahu akbar*!! So, many of the ignorant people do not accept the speech of the Scholars against Sayyid Qutb and they perform their own *ijithaad* and they choose that he is not an innovator. And whosoever from amongst them does not perform this *ijithaad*, then he must take the most cautious view and also not declare Sayyid Qutb an innovator. By Allaah, the people of innovation rejoice at your speech, since it permits their *manhaj* for them. Rather, it lays down principles for them that did not occur to them.

And if he cannot take the most cautious position, then it is upon him to perform *taqleed* (blind following). How free is Allaah from all imperfections! How great a contradiction! A short time ago, you condemned those who accept the speech and the information from a trustworthy narrator and you considered it *taqleed*, and now there is no problem with *taqleed*. How can this be the *manhaj*?! Allaah is the One from whom aid is sought.

[3]: Shaykh al-Halabee says, “Since, they do not understand that the science of *alJarh wat-Ta'deel* was originally founded for a benefit. The science of *alJarh wat-Ta'deel* is not present in the proofs of the Book, nor in the proofs of the *Sunnah*. It is a science that is newly arisen, it evolved for the preservation of the Book and the *Sunnah*. Is that not so? Therefore, it is a science for benefit.”

---

So do not listen to such stupidity. So when an insightful Scholar criticizes an individual – may Allaah bless you – it is obligatory to accept this *jarh*. Then, if another just and precise Scholars opposes him, then at that point, one must study what the two sides are saying and look into this *jarh* and this *ta'deel*.

So if the *jarh* is explained and clarified, it takes precedence over the *ta'deel*, even if those who make the *ta'deel* are many in number. If a Scholar criticizes an individual with an explained criticism (*jarh muafassar*), and twenty or fifty Scholars praise this individual whilst they do not have proof, but they have a good opinion of this individual based upon what is apparent, but the criticizing Scholar has proofs for the *jarh* of this individual, then the *jarh* takes precedence, because the *jaarih* (critic) has the proof with him. And the proof takes precedence. And sometimes, the proof must take precedence even though it is opposed by the people of the earth. The whole earth opposes him, but the proof is with him and the truth is with him. And the *Jamaa'ah* is whoever agrees with the truth, even if he is alone.” Refer to the audio cassette, *al-Kalaam 'ala Fitnah Faalih alHarbee*.

Indeed, al-Halabee has advanced bit by bit, until he has reached this innovated outcome and he has reached this dangerous outcome, which does not emanate from a student of knowledge, let alone from a Scholar. So how can you say this speech – which contains calamities – that science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* has no proofs in the Book and the *Sunnah*? No one says such speech, except someone who is ignorant about the science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*, which is established upon proofs from the Book and the *Sunnah*. Indeed, we have mentioned the proofs for that.<sup>7</sup> However, it is enough for me that I quote the speech of some of our Scholars concerning that.

The Shaykh, the Imaam, Muqbil (رحمه الله) said, “And I shall mention – with the help of Allaah – whatever is easy from proofs for *al-jarh* from the Book and the Sunnah and then the statements of the *Ahlul-Hadeeth* – may Allaah bestow mercy upon them all.” Then he mentioned tens of proofs from the *Qur'aan* and the Sunnah for the science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*. Mentioning them here will prolong the discussion. So whoever desires more information can refer back to the book. Then, after having finished presenting the proofs, he said, “So in these proofs is evidence for the legislation of *al-jarh*. And as for the proofs for *at-ta'deel*, then they are too many to enumerate and no one disputes about them, so we will not mention them. And mentioning them further strengthens the proofs for *al-jarh* and confirms them, so the proofs for *al-jarh* are sufficient and the praise is for Allaah.”<sup>8</sup>

So what do you say – O Shaykh al-Halabee – about these proofs, which are clear and apparent to everyone?!

Ibn Hajar (d.852H) said, “And in it (i.e. the *hadeeth*: The *halaal* (lawful) is clear and the *haraam* (unlawful) is clear.) is a proof for the permissibility of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*, al-Baghawee (d.516H) said so in *Sharhus-Sunnah*.<sup>9</sup> So this is the statement of al-Baghawee and Ibn Hajar affirmed that *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* has proofs from the *Sunnah*, or did they not understand as al-Halabee has understood?!

I say: Who has understood as you have – O Halabee – that *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* is a science that was founded for a benefit and that it is a newly arisen science. And if it is so – in reality – then when did it first appear? And in which time? And did the Companions not know about it? And were the *taabi'een* unaware of it?!

Indeed, this speech contains revilement and defamation for this magnificent science and it contains disdain for it. So the meaning of a newly arisen science is: something that is newly invented and it was not known beforehand.

Indeed, in this speech is *taqleed* (blind following) of the student of Faalih (Marzooq al-Ghaythee) when he said about the science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* that it is, “an additional

---

<sup>7</sup> **Translator's Note:** Refer to (p. 6-7) of the second part of this series.

<sup>8</sup> Refer to *al-Makhraj minal-Fitnah* (p. 27) of Muqbil al-Waadi'ee.

<sup>9</sup> Refer to *Fathul-Baaree* (4/291) of Ibn Hajar.

science from the sciences of the *Sharee'ah*." So the Imaam, Shaykh Rabee' refuted it, "In this speech is belittlement of the science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* and a claim that it is an additional science, that is: something marginal."<sup>10</sup>

I say: So what if he (i.e. Marzooq al-Ghaythee) heard the speech of al-Halabee, that it is a newly arisen science and that it did not exist before, even as one of the additional *Sharee'ah* sciences, rather it did not exist at all and then it newly arose?! It is inevitable that the affair be more complicated, more dangerous and more cautious.

[4]: Shaykh al-Halabee said, "This has gone to the extent that anywhere I go or travel to now, there is no place in the world, except that the word of the *Salafiyeen* has become divided therein due to so and so and due to so and so. So and so is an innovator and so and so is not an innovator."

I say: Indeed, from the reasons for this *tafarruq* (division) is your visiting the places of the people of desires and the callers to division, the recruited soldiers of splitting and fragmentation. Then, what is this slander against the Scholars of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel* and its students who defend this Religion and safeguard it from the plots of the criminals? Has the speech of the people of knowledge enraged you - O Halabee - to the extent that you make a great fuss over it? And why do you not rejoice when the Scholars expose the condition of the people of innovation? Indeed, the statement, 'This one is an innovator and this one is *Sunnee*', is what the Imaams: Maalik (d.179H), ash-Shaafi'ee (d.204H) and Ahmad (d.241H) and those before them during the time of the Messenger, the Companions and the *taabi'een* were upon. So we have not heard anyone from the Scholars degrading the affair of this science and making such a great fuss over the issue of exposing the innovator - O Allaah - except from the people of innovation and misguidance.

Then, does a truthful word in *jarh* (disparagement) of the innovators split up the *Salafiyeen*? By Allaah, it does not split up anyone, except for splitting the *Salafee* from the *hizbee* (partisan) and it does not split the *Salafee* from another *Salafee*. Rather, it increases the *Salafiyeen* in adherence to the *manhaj* when they know about the innovators and they distance themselves from the innovators. So what is this speech - O Shaykh 'Alee?!

---

<sup>10</sup> Refer to *A'immatul-Jarh wat-Ta'deel hum Humaatid-Deen* (p. 10) of Rabee' al-Madkhalee.

## THE FOURTH SECTION:

**Questioner:** "Our Shaykh, there is a statement that they say about it. Meaning, about the science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*, that the *jarhul-mufassar* (explained and elaborated criticism) takes precedence over the *ta'deelul-mubham* (ambiguous praise)."

**Al-Halabee:** "This speech is correct. However, the *jarhul-mufassar* may not be convincing. The term *al-jarhul-mufassar* does not mean it is the noble *Qur'aan*, which cannot be approached by falsehood from in front of it, nor from behind it. Meaning, it is possible that now they say: so and so abandoned so and so for such and such. I have read this in *as-Siyar* and it is documented with me. Adh-Dhahabee commented about a person that he would criticize based on suspicion.<sup>11</sup> He would suspect something, so he would take it as a detailed criticism according to him. However, according to others it was suspicion and it was not convincing. So it could be that what is a *jarh* according to you is not a *jarh* according to me. And it could be that what is *jarh* according to you is also a *jarh* according to me, but you view that it has happened to this narrator and I say that it has not happened to this narrator. You may view that he did this deliberately and I may view that he has an excuse. Is the deliberate offender and the excused one the same? Therefore, affair is not in such a rigid depiction, which serves the principles in a manner that is – in reality – not legislated and not actual. Otherwise, we are with these principles. We have established these principles and we have founded these foundations. However, they must be practiced in accordance to the actual *Sharee'ah* revelation, not with desires and fantasies."

And the refutation upon this speech is from various angles:

[1]: Shaykh al-Halabee said, "This speech is correct. However, the *jarhul-mufassar* may not be convincing."

I say: Indeed, you have done well – O Shaykh 'Alee al-Halabee – in affirming this magnificent principle in the science of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*. However, how quickly you have contradicted your own speech and corrupted it when you said, "the *jarhul-mufassar* may not be convincing,"<sup>12</sup> unrestrictedly, without any exceptions. So what is the benefit then, of this principle? In truth, he should have said: the observer must look into this *jarh*; either it emanates from a person of justice and fairness and sound *manhaj*, so this is sufficient as a proof and there can be no wavering with regards to it, or it may emanate from a person of desire. So this category is not sufficient, even with proofs and clear evidences, no matter how strong and clear they may be. Rather, even if they are abundant and very clear. Indeed, Allaah the Exalted said about this category of people,

---

<sup>11</sup> He is referring to Shu'bah Ibnul-Hajjaaj (d.160H). And this is what the late-comers have conveyed about this Imaam. In fact, there is some truth to this speech.

<sup>12</sup> This is a truthful word, by which falsehood is intended.

**"And even if We had sent down to them the angels with the message and the dead spoke to them of it and We gathered together every created thing in front of them, they would not believe, unless Allaah should will. However, most of them are ignorant of it."** [Sooratul-An'aam 6:111]

And the people of desires fall into this category a great deal. So you see that the *Rawaafid* do not accept the clear proofs from the Book and the Sunnah concerning the excellence of the Companions, especially concerning Abee Bakr and 'Umar, no matter how many or how clear they are.

And they do not accept the irrefutable proofs for the corruption of their methodologies and their beliefs, no matter how many or how clear they are. And they do not accept the *jarr* (criticism) against their scholars and their leaders, no matter abundant the proofs and evidences are and no matter what they reach from abundance and clarity.

Due to that, you will see that they do not acquire benefit from the Book of Allaah and from the *Sunnah* of the Messenger of Allaah (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*), nor from the many books, and from them is *al-Minhaajus-Sunnah* by Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728H) in explanation of the misguidance of their scholars and the misguidance of their beliefs. And the likes of that is also found within the extreme *Soofees*, not to mention the people of *wahdatul-wujood* (i.e. the belief that Allaah is everywhere). The irrefutable proofs for the misguidance of their scholars and the corruption of their beliefs does not convince them. And the rest of the people of innovation are likewise. From them are the *Jamaa'atut-Tableegh* and the *Ikhwaanul-Muslimeen* and whatever has become an offshoot from them, such as the *Qutbiyyeen* and the *Surooriyyeen* and whatever has become an offshoot of those ones from the people of misguided methodologies, such as 'Adnaan 'Ar'oor<sup>13</sup> and his followers and Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribi and al-Maghraawee and their followers. So how many proofs and evidences of their deviation and the corruption of their principles and their methodologies have been presented to them by the Scholars, yet they throw all of that against the wall. And they discredit the Scholars who established these proofs or supported them, because they are people desires. They are not satisfied

---

<sup>13</sup> **'Adnaan 'Ar'oor:** Shaykh Rabee' said about him, "He is a tremendous disaster and a great trial. I do not know of a person of *fitnah* more harmful to the *Salafee manhaj* and its people than him...and I fear that he is a planted agent from amongst the planted agents of the enemies of Allaah, in order to achieve their despicable goals...By Allaah! I have never seen a *dajjaal* (arch-liar) like this person...'Adnaan is all lies, tricks, deception and trials. So beware of this man. Beware of him with a severe warning...a lying trickster...the *dajjaal* of the ages...the *dajjaal* of the era...and I do not doubt that he is a recruiter from amongst the recruiters of the people of innovations and desires. And I do not deem it far-fetched that he could be a recruiter for other than them, due to these trials, earthquakes, convulsions, and chaos that this man has caused. And the desires flow through him just as rabies runs through a dog. So he runs from the eastern part of the earth to the western parts of it with an abundant amount of wealth, which demonstrates that 'Adnaan is greedy. So where did this greedy one amass such wealth? Indeed, he works and works many jobs to obtain this wealth. Why? To spread Islaam with it? No! He does this in order to split the *Salafiyyeen* apart and to turn them against each other and he shoots arrows amongst them. Indeed, I call upon Allaah the Blessed and Exalted to save Islaam and the Muslims from this man and his likes." Refer to the audiotape *Naseehah Sareehah 'Ibrul-Haatif* (side 1).

with proofs and evidences. However, they are satisfied with fallacies, fabrications and corrupt principles.

Thereafter, who from the Scholars says that the *jarhul-mufassar* is not convincing? Indeed, they (i.e. the Scholars) say: If the proof is established against someone, then it must be investigated. And if there is no need to do that, then the Scholars are upon acceptance of these principles, without the presence of this philosophy. And I do not know whether he applies this principle to the people of innovation, or has he formed them to protect himself for his defence of Muhammad Hassaan, al-Huwaynee and al-Maghraawee. Scholars the likes of Shaykh Rabee', Shaykh Muqbil, Shaykh an-Najmee and other than them have come and declared al-Maghraawee an innovator because he is a *Takfeeree*, he declares the societies disbelievers. So the likes of 'Alee al-Halabee come along and say this speech or this explanation that this *jarh* is not convincing. Then, according to this principle, the Scholars declare Sayyid Qutb an innovator when he says that the *Qur'aan* is created, so along comes the like of al-Huwaynee who says that this speech (i.e. the speech of the Scholars) is not convincing. If the affair were as such, then there would not remain an innovator upon the face of the earth - based upon this corrupt and dissolute principle. So if you were to remain collecting the proofs together for him about the reality of what this innovator says, he would reject your speech upon the basis that it is not convincing.

Sufyaan ath-Thawree (d.167H) came to al-Basrah. So he began to look into the affair of ar-Rabee' - meaning Ibn Sabeeh - and his status amongst the people. He asked, "What is his *madhab*?" They said, "He has no *madhab* other than the *Sunnah*." He said, "Who are his friends?" They said, "The people of *al-Qadr*."<sup>14</sup> He said, "He is *Qadaree*."<sup>15</sup> So now one of them comes and says, 'This *jarhul-mafassar* is not convincing. So he makes apparent the *Sunnah*. So why have you judged him - O Thawree - as a *Qadaree*?' Is it due to him sitting with the people of *al-Qadr*? This speech is not convincing, because the *Qadaree* is the one who affirms the '*aqeedah* (belief) of the people of *Qadr*!' So with this principle, we are able to destroy everything that the *Salaf* built and we can turn back whosoever they judged to be people of innovation with one phrase, 'not convincing!!'

And know - O intelligent reader - may Allaah bestow mercy upon me and you - that the Scholars laid down guidelines for the acceptance of the *jarh* and for not accepting it, and for when the ambiguous *jarh* is accepted and for when nothing but the *jarhul-mufassar* is accepted. And the Scholars have worked in accordance to these guidelines, which were derived from the proofs of the Book and the *Sunnah*, they are far removed from the desires and bigotry as well as far removed from the rejection of the *jarh* due to it being convincing or not convincing.

---

<sup>14</sup> **Qadariyyah:** The *Qadariyyah* are the followers of Ma'bad al-Juhaneey, and from their false beliefs are: that Allaah has no prior knowledge of anything until it come into existence; that it is people and not Allaah who are the creators of their own actions, denying '*aqeedah*' in the punishment of the grave, and denying that the authentic *hadeeth* is an evidence for the '*aqeedah*', unless it is related in *mutawaatir* (concurrent) form. Refer to *al-Milal wan-Nihal* (I/72) of ash-Shahrastaanee and *Sawnul-Mantaq wal-Kalaam* (p. 160) of as-Suyootee.

<sup>15</sup> Refer to *al-Ibaanah* (2/456) of Ibn Battah.

Al-Haafidh Ibn Katheer (d.774H) said, "As for the speech of these Imaams who are ascribed to this affair, then it is befitting for the Muslim to take their speech without the reasons for it being mentioned. That is because he realizes their knowledge, their experience and their proficiency in this affair and he describes them with justice and righteousness and experience and sincere advice; not to mention that when they declare a man *da'eef* (weak), or declare him *matrook* (abandoned) or declare him *kadhdhaab* (liar) or the likes of that. So the skilled *muhaddith* (Scholar of *hadeeth*) is not moved against them due to their truthfulness, their trustworthiness and their sincerity. Due to this, ash-Shaafi'ee said in many of his statements about the *ahaadeeth*, "It is not confirmed by the people of have knowledge about *hadeeth*." And he would then reject it and not use it as a proof for precisely that reason."<sup>16</sup>

And Ibn Hajar said, "If the one who has been criticized does not have any *ta'deel* (praise) to his credit, then the general criticism against him is accepted without having to clarify the reason for it, as long as the criticism emanates from someone who knows this person well."<sup>17</sup>

So why doesn't Shaykh al-Halabee take the speech of the Scholars about Abul-Hasan, al-Maghraawee, al-Huwaynee and other than them, thereby following the *manhaj* of the *Salaf*? This is what the *Salafee* must do; he follows the Scholars of the *Salafus-Saalih*. So why this deviation and these corrupt, oppressive and destructive principles instead of the principles of the *Salaf*?

And I shall mention for you - O intelligent reader - the guidelines by which the *jarh* can be rejected after discovering the reason behind it, then compare between them and the principle of al-Halabee, 'not convincing.':

1. One may refrain from accepting the *jarh* if it is feared that the reason for it is a disagreement in belief of a rivalry between contemporaries.
2. The *jarh* is not accepted against someone who has an extensive record of trustworthiness and his leadership is well-known.
3. There is no consideration given to the *jarh* of someone whose *isnaad* (chain of narration) does not go back the Imaam being spoken about.
4. No attention is paid to the *jarh* of someone who is *marjoooh* (criticized) himself.
5. No attention is paid to the *jarh* whose source is overwhelmingly thought to be *da'eef* (weak).
6. A *jarh* could occur due to a mistake in the manuscripts from the books.
7. Giving precedence to the terminologies of the Imaams who applied them from the terms of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*.
8. Giving precedence to the speech, which rejects the terms of *al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel*, and the circumstances which necessitate mentioning them about the narrator.

---

<sup>16</sup> Refer to *Ikhtisaar 'Uloomil-Hadeeth* (p. 79) of Ibn Katheer.

<sup>17</sup> Refer to *Nuzhatun-Nadhr* (p. 73) of Ibn Hajar.

And there are other than these from the principles and guidelines.

[2]: Shaykh al-Halabee said, "So it could be that what is a *jarh* according to you is not a *jarh* according to me. And it could be that what is *jarh* according to you is also a *jarh* according to me, but you view that it has happened to this narrator and I say that it has not happened to this narrator. You may view that he did this deliberately and I may view that he has an excuse. Is the deliberate offender and the excused one the same?"

I say: The *jarh* (criticism) of *Ahlus-Sunnah* against the people of desires in the past and the present was based upon knowledge and upon irrefutable proofs and evidences. And it is not based upon conjecture and doubts and the people of sound intellects and dispositions are safe from it, but the people of desires are not safe from it. So they cause doubts about its correctness and they revile the Imaams of *Ahlus-Sunnah*, who are free of guilt, honourable and sincere advisors. And in this time, *Ahlus-Sunnah* have criticized the people of innovation based upon their realities, their writings, their books, their articles and based upon their statements, which are recorded in their voices. However, the people of desires in this time are stancher in obstinate rejection and pride, as well as in sophistry and in causing doubts about the clear realities in a manner that the people of desires in the past were not.

So are the *Kawthariyyoon* (i.e. the followers of Muhammad Zaahid al-Kawtharee) safe from the criticism of their adversaries such as the Imaams: al-Mu'allimee (d.1386H) and al-Albaanee (d.1420H). And are the *Ahbaash*<sup>18</sup> safe from the criticism of al-Albaanee against their falsehoods and their misguidance? And are the *Ikhwaanul-Muslimoon* and the *Qutbiyyoon* safe from Shaykh al-Albaanee, Shaykh Ibnu'l-Uthaymeen (d.1421H), Shaykh al-Fawzaan, Shaykh Rabee', Shaykh an-Najmee, Shaykh Zayd Ibn Muhammad al-Madkhalee and other than them safe from their criticisms of Sayyid Qutb and his likes?

Rather, are the soldiers recruited to serve the *Qutbiyyeen*, such as 'Adnaan 'Ar'oor, al-Maghraawee, Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribi, Muhammad Hassaan and their likes safe from the criticism against Sayyid Qutb?

So dealing with the criticism and the *jarh* (disparagement) that is built upon the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* and built upon the sincere advice and upon the proofs and evidences with these methods of the *mumayyi'ah*<sup>19</sup> does not emanate from anyone other than a person of desire.

---

<sup>18</sup> **Ahbaash:** They are very recent modern-day group founded by 'Abdullaah al-Hararee al-Habashee – an Ethiopian of obscure background who settled in Lebanon, where he began to call to his deviant ideas. His beliefs are a mixture of the deviant groups of old, from the *Jahmiyyah*, the *Mu'tazilah* and *Murji'ah*. The *Ahbaash* have also become known for causing great controversy in opposing the *ijmaa'* (consensus) of the *Ummah* in the direction of the *Qiblah*. Shaykh Muhammad Naasirud-Deen al-Albaanee (d.1420H) has refuted this group and its founder on several occasions.

<sup>19</sup> **Mumayyi'ah:** This term refers to those who water-down the *Salafee* *manhaj* in order to accommodate the people of innovation. Refer to the audio cassette, *Jinaayatut-Tamayyu' 'alal-Manhajis-Salafee* of Shaykh 'Ubayd al-Jaabiree.

And they way out from this feebleness is to establish the proof. So if I were to establish the proof for you that this *jarr* applies to this man - regardless of whether he is an innovator or a narrator - then it is obligatory upon you to accept it. And there is no room for your statement, 'You are suspicious of him.' As for when I do not have a proof with me, and you have a proof against my suspicion, then the ruling is in favour of what you say. As for when there is no proof found with this one, nor with that one, then the issue is one of restraint up until the proof comes.

[3]: Shaykh al-Halabee said, "We have established these principles and we have founded these foundations. However, they must be practiced in accordance to the actual *Sharee'ah* revelation, not with desires and fantasies."

I say: **Firstly:** The praise is for Allaah that you have admitted that the source for these newly-invented principles and these corrupt foundations is Shaykh al-Halabee and that the Scholars and the *Salafee manhaj* have nothing to do with them.

**Secondly:** How can the forming of corrupt principles be a *Sharee'ah* legislated act?!!

## THE FIFTH SECTION:

**Questioner:** "What are the causes that expel a man from *Salafiyyah*?"

**Al-Halabee:** "When he opposes a fundamental principle from the fundamental principles (*usool*) of the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* without an acceptable excuse and by persisting upon it when the proof is established against him by the people of knowledge. These are three principles."

**Questioner:** "Meaning, if a person quotes from Sayyid Qutb?"

**Al-Halabee:** "Merely quoting from Sayyid Qutb is an error and an error is not easy. However, this by itself is not enough of a reason to expel the *Salafee* from his *Salafiyyah*."

**Questioner:** "He praises Sayyid Qutb?"

**Al-Halabee:** "And even if his praise is sincere. Now, the *Muftee* of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has praised Sayyid Qutb and he has quoted from Sayyid Qutb. If we open up this door, what will you say? Now, I can give you a number of Shaykhs, Scholars of Saudi Arabia who quote from Sayyid Qutb in their books. And it has not been related to us about them that they have said, 'We used to quote from him and now we have recanted because the man is such and such.' With great regret, who dares to say these are innovators and they have praised the people of innovation? We say this is an error and we do not agree with it. However, the speech is not about declaring errors and not agreeing with them; the speech is about *tabdee'* (i.e. declaring people innovators). This is the issue."

And the refutation upon this speech is from various angles:

[1]: Shaykh al-Halabee said, "When he opposes a fundamental principle from the fundamental principles (*usool*) of the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* without an acceptable excuse and by persisting upon it when the proof is established against him by the people of knowledge. These are three principles."

I say: The *usool* (fundamental principles) of the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* are the *usool* that the Imaams have mentioned. And at the head of them is Imaam Ahmad in *Usoolus Sunnah*, al-Laalikaa'ee (d.418H), Ibn Battah (d.387H), al-Barbaaaree (d.329H) and other than them. So whosoever opposes them, then he has left from the *manhaj* of the *Salafus-Saalih*, except if he is ignorant about them, in which case he must be advised. So if he continues and does not answer, then it is ruled upon him that he has left the *Salafee manhaj*.

And there has not come in the speech of the Scholars what Shaykh al-Halabee's speech affirms, that the opponent is excused when he opposes the foundations of the *Sunnah* or the *Salafee manhaj* due to an acceptable excuse. Likewise, it has not come that he is excused when he opposes the foundations of the *Sunnah* without persisting in them. And with an

example, the statement will become clear: So from the foundations of the *Sunnah* or the *Salafee manhaj* is that the *Qur'aan* is the speech of Allaah, it is not created. So if someone from the people comes with an excuse that is acceptable in his view and says, 'The *Qur'aan* is created.' And a second person comes and says, 'In order to stay out of the disagreement, we do not know whether the *Qur'aan* is the speech of Allaah, or whether it is created. So we will refrain from that because no clear proof has come to clarify this issue and so on...' Or perhaps he says, 'I do not persist upon this opposition. However, I say it without persistence.' So is this strange *manhaj* and these principles, which are foreign to the *manhaj*, accepted from these ones?

And if another one comes and says, 'I do not believe in the punishment of the grave. However, I attest (*tasdeeq*) to it, because its *ahaadeeth* are *aahaad* (singular) and '*aqeedah* cannot be formed, except upon certainty.' And this is an acceptable excuse in his view.

Or perhaps there are examples we are unaware of, where it is possible to apply these principles, except that the goal of forming these principles is to protect himself and others and to prove the correctness of his corrupt principles and to protect his new *manhaj* in praising and defending the people of innovation, such as Muhammad Hassaan, al-Ma'ribi and al-Maghraawee, with the proof that the questioner follows his (i.e. 'Alee al-Halabee's) speech with the following question, "Meaning, if a person quotes from Sayyid Qutb?"

[2]: So al-Halabee says, "Merely quoting from Sayyid Qutb is an error and an error is not easy. However, this by itself is not enough of a reason to expel the *Salafee* from his *Salafiyah*."

I say: If one quotes the '*aqeedah* of Sayyid Qutb in *takfeer* of the societies and his statement that the *Qur'aan* is created and his cursing of Mu'aawiyah and 'Amr Ibnul-Aas (*radiyallaahu anhumaa*) and his *takfeer* of Abee Sufyaan and other than that from the calamities, seeking proof with that, then is this not sufficient for *tabdee'* of this one who quotes and affirms the '*aqeedah* of Sayyid Qutb?! Indeed, the *Salaf* warned against looking into the books of the people of innovation. So how can one quote from them, except if he is upon the *tamyee'ee manhaj* of al-Halabee, in which this is permissible?!

[3]: The questioner asks, "He praises Sayyid Qutb?" Al-Halabee answers, "And even if his praise is sincere."

I say: This is the goal of these principles, to protect Muhammad Hassaan and other than him with regards to his praise for Sayyid Qutb and to protect al-Halabee himself in his praise for Muhammad Hassaan, al-Maghraawee and al-Ma'ribi. So take note - may Allaah bestow mercy upon you - of these cunning methods which protect the people of innovation from the speech of the Scholars against them. So he wants to say that

Muhammad Hassaan has an acceptable excuse in his praise for Sayyid Qutb, Ibn Laadin, 'Amr Khaalid<sup>20</sup> and other than them.

So since when – my brother for the sake of Allaah – is the one who praises and extols the people of innovation not considered like them due to an acceptable excuse or lack of persistence?

Indeed, the one who praises the people of innovation is in reality calling to their innovation and inciting the people to take them as an example. Ibn Katheer (d.744H) said, “And al-Bukhaaree related this for 'Imraan Ibn Hittaan al-Khaarijee, the one who praised 'Abdur-Rahmaan Ibn Muljam – the one who killed 'Alee. And this is from the calls to innovation – and Allaah knows best.”<sup>21</sup>

Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan was asked the following question, “Whosoever opposes the *usool* of the *Salafee* way, from those who are around us, and he aid the other methodologies by praising their founders and their thinkers, is it obligatory to attribute him to them in order to warn the people against him so that they will not be deceived by him and his *manhaj*? ”

So he – *hafidhahullaah* – replied, “Whosoever opposes the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* and praises the methodologies that oppose the *manhaj* of the *Salaf* and he praises their people, then he is to be considered from the people of opposition. It is obligatory to call him and to advise him. So he will either come back to the truth, and if not, then he is to be boycotted and cut off.”<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> **'Amr Khaalid:** He is an extremely ignorant Egyptian caller, who has gained favour amongst the ignorant masses through his television appearances and tapes. He calls to modernism and philosophy in the worst way. Shaykh Saalih as-Suhaymee and other Scholars have warned against him. Shaykh 'Ubayd al-Jaabiree said, “This man is from the callers to misguidance and he is from the people of philosophy and from the followers of the corrupt rationalist school whose leaders are al-Ghazzaalee and other than him... It is not permissible to listen to his tapes, nor to read his books. So the man is a philosophical, rationalist deviant. He does not call to the *Sunnah* as *AhlusSunnah* do with the Book and the *Sunnah*. Rather, he calls to rationalism and philosophy.” Refer to the audio series, *Rudoodul'Ulamaa'* *'ala Akhtaa'* *'Amr Khaalid*.

<sup>21</sup> Refer to *al-Baa'ithul Hatheeth* (1/300) of Ahmad Shaakir.

<sup>22</sup> Refer to *al-Ajwibatul-Mufeedah* (p. 161) of Saalih al-Fawzaan. And from the witnessed examples in which these people have applied these corrupt principles is when one of the bigoted followers of Shaykh Mashhoor Hasan Salmaan asked him, “Why have you praised al-Qardaawee and Sayyid Qutb in one of your books, which is *Kutub Hadhdhara minhal'Ulamaa'*, where you declared them from the Scholars? ” So Shaykh Mashhoor replied to him, “Imagine if the *Ikhwaan* and the *Ahbaash* were to unite against us – the strangeness would surely be severe upon us.” So the bigoted follower replied, “*Allaahu akbar!* Look at this amazing *fiqh* (understanding) and far-reaching outlook. He wants to recruit the *Ikhwaan* against the *Ahbaash*.” So the bigoted follower accepted this from him because it was an acceptable excuse in his view. So he did not object to his Shaykh praising the people of innovation. And this is extremism (*ghuloo*) and bigotry towards individuals, not towards the truth and its people. So if you want to dispraise the Shee'ah, do you then use this principle to praise the opposite extreme of the Shee'ah? What is this foreign *manhaj*? And the Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) informed us about the forthcoming strangeness and he informed us that the one who held onto the *Sunnah* would be like the one who was holding onto hot coals. So if you are not able – O Mashhoor – to handle this strangeness, then leave the battlefield for its people and do to approach us – you and whosoever is with you – with methodologies that are foreign to the *Sunnah*.

And Shaykh al-Halabee has absolved the one who praises the people of innovation upon the basis that perhaps he has with him an acceptable excuse, or that perhaps he does not persist upon this praise. And this speech is from the falsest of falsehood.

Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah (رضي الله عنه) said, “And whosoever maintains good thoughts about them – and he claims that he does not know their condition – he must be made aware of their condition. So either he must separate from them and openly reject them, and if not, then he is placed along with them and considered from amongst them. As for the one who says that their speech has an excuse which agrees with the *Sharee'ah*, then he is from their heads and their leaders. So if he is clever, then he knows that he has lied to himself in what he has said.”<sup>23</sup>

[4]: al-Halabee said, “Now, the *Muftee* of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has praised Sayyid Qutb and he has quoted from Sayyid Qutb. If we open up this door, what will you say?”

This speech is false. So your statement that he has praised Sayyid Qutb in this form means that the *Muftee* has taken praise of Sayyid Qutb as a habitual practice and the affair is not like that. Since, it is well-known from him that it did not emanate from him except once. And this is a mistake from a Scholar. Then, he was asked after that about the statement of Sayyid Qutb, “And when Mu'aawiyah and his colleague 'Umar relied upon lying, deception, treachery, hypocrisy and bribery and buying protection. 'Alee was unable to sink to such a low level. So it is not surprising that the two of them succeeded and he failed. Indeed, his failure is nobler than every form of success.”<sup>24</sup> So the noble *Muftee* replied, “This is the speech of a wicked *Baatinee* (i.e. a sect of the *Shee'ah*), or an accursed Jew. A Muslim does not speak like this.”<sup>25</sup>

And your statement, “...and he has quoted from Sayyid Qutb,” implies that he repeatedly quotes from Sayyid Qutb and this is a broad call that you are not able to confirm.

And we are saddened by these methods through which you defend those who praise Sayyid Qutb and those who have deviated in his name and those who are enamoured by abundantly conveying from him and those who wage war against *Ahlus-Sunnah* for his sake.

[5]: Al-Halabee said, “Now, I can give you a number of Shaykhs, Scholars of Saudi Arabia who quote from Sayyid Qutb in their books. And it has not been related to us about them that they have said, ‘We used to quote from him and now we have recanted because the man is such and such.’ With great regret, who dares to say these are innovators and they have praised the people of innovation?”

---

<sup>23</sup> Refer to *Majmoo'u'l-Fataawaa* (2/133) of Ibn Taymiyyah.

<sup>24</sup> Refer to *al-Kutub wash-Shakhsiyaaat* (p. 242) of Sayyid Qutb.

<sup>25</sup> The noble *Muftee* stated this on the 15<sup>th</sup> of Rajab, 1426H in Taa'if. This statement was stated by him after his praise for Sayyid Qutb since the Scholars advised him about this man.

I say: Why don't you name for us those Scholars who have quoted from Sayyid Qutb in their books? And if you cannot do so, then this is a claim that you have alleged to exonerate your corrupt *manhaj*!

## THE SIXTH SECTION:

**Questioner:** “Is there a person whose *'aqeedah* opposes his *manhaj*?”

**Al-Halabee:** “It is possible that this exists. This exists. We find now that we know of some people – meaning, in *'aqeedah* you will see him in *Tawheedul-Uloohiyah*, in *al-Asmaa'* was-Sifaat, in the issue of *al-Qadr* (divine pre-Decree), in all of the issues. However, in the issue of the rulers, he declares the rulers to be disbelievers. In the issue of *manhaj* we see him as a bigoted *hizbee*. It is possible that there is a secret understanding present. However, I will say a statement that I have always repeated. I say the *manhaj* is the protective sphere for the *'aqeedah*. The *manhaj* is like a cup. If clean water is placed within a clean cup, the cup preserves that cleanliness. If clean water is placed within a dirty cup, then this dirt will dissolve into the water and corrupt it. The condition of *manhaj* and *'aqeedah* is likewise. How quickly one of them overtakes the other; either his sound *'aqeedah* will overtake his *manhaj* so that his *manhaj* becomes *Salafee*, or his *khalafee manhaj* will have influence over his *'aqeedah* so that his *'aqeedah* becomes like his disturbed *madhab* in rare cases.”

The following is what can be observed about this speech:

[1]: Al-Halabee said, “It is possible that this exists. This exists. We find now...”

I say: It is understood from his speech that this is his differentiation between the *'aqeedah* and the *manhaj*, since (according to al-Halabee) a man can be upon the *Salafee* *'aqeedah* and his *manhaj* can be *Takfeeree*. And this differentiation is strange, it has no proof. Rather, the *'aqeedah* enters into the *manhaj* and the *manhaj* is not separate from the *'aqeedah*. And a man cannot be upon an *'aqeedah* that is different from the *manhaj*.<sup>26</sup>

Shaykh al-Fawzaan – *hafidhahullaah* – was asked, “Is there a difference between the *'aqeedah* and the *manhaj*?”

So he answered, “The *manhaj* is more important than the *'aqeedah*. The *manhaj* can be in the *'aqeedah*, in the dealings, the manners, the social and business interactions and all

---

<sup>26</sup> Shaykh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee (d.1417H) said in the recording, *al-Ajwibatudh-Dhahabiyyah 'alal-As'ilatilManhajiyah*, “The *manhaj* is the way and the *'aqeedah* is what the person believes within himself, such as your Lord, your Religion and your Prophet. That is the *manhaj* of *Ahlus-Sunnah walJamaa'*ah in *'aqeedah*. So the path to this *'aqeedah* and the path upon which this *'aqeedah* traverses, there is no difference between the two. They are inter-connected. And the statement that so and so is *Salafee* in *'aqeedah* and *Ikhwaanee* in *manhaj* is a philosophy that has no meaning.”

Shaykh Rabee' Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee mentioned in his recorded lecture, *ath-Thabaat 'alas-Sunnah*, “The affair of differentiating between the *'aqeedah* and the *manhaj* has occurred in this age. The people did not used to differentiate between the *'aqeedah* and the *manhaj*. However, the *fitan* (trials, tribulations) have come, so some of *Ahlus-Sunnah* have been confused into differentiating between the *'aqeedah* and the *manhaj*. However, Shaykh Ibn Baaz (d.1420H) did not used to differentiate between the *'aqeedah* and the *manhaj*. So he used to say that all of it is one.”

throughout the life of the Muslim. Every course of action that the Muslim takes is called the *manhaj*. As for the *'aqeedah*, then it refers to the basis of *eemaan* (belief) and the meaning of the two testimonies (*shahaadatayn*) and their requirements. This is the *'aqeedah*.<sup>27</sup>

[2]: Al-Halabee said, "The condition of *manhaj* and *'aqeedah* is likewise. How quickly one of them overtakes the other; either his sound *'aqeedah* will overtake his *manhaj* so that his *manhaj* becomes *Salafee*, or his *khalafee manhaj* will have influence over his *'aqeedah* so that his *'aqeedah* becomes like his disturbed *madhhab* in rare cases."

I say: This speech is incomprehensible. It contains fumbling and confusion. So how can his sound *'aqeedah* overtake his *manhaj*, or his *manhaj* hold influence over his *'aqeedah*? Rather, the influence of the *manhaj* is the influence the *'aqeedah* and the influence of the *'aqeedah* is the influence of the *manhaj*. And it is not possible for the *manhaj* to be correct whilst the *'aqeedah* is corrupt or vice versa.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Refer to *al-Ajwibatul-Mufeedah* (p. 123) of Saalih al-Fawzaan.

<sup>28</sup> Shaykh Rabee' said about this differentiation, "This is empty speech and prattle." Refer to the cassette, *at-Taqwaa wa Aathaarnhaa at-Tayyibah*, the second side.

## THE SEVENTH SECTION:<sup>29</sup>

In this same cassette and in other than it, he praises al-Maghraawee the *Takfeeree* and defends him. So he (i.e. al-Halabee) was asked, "Do you still say that he (i.e. al-Maghraawee) is *Salafee*?" So he answered, "And I still do and I still do." And he further stated, "As for saying that he is a *Takfeeree*, then by Allaah, I believe that he is not *Takfeeree*."

I say: Every *Salafee* knows that al-Maghraawee is an innovator who is misguided and misguiding others. Shaykh Rabee', Shaykh an-Najmee, Shaykh Muqbil, Shaykh 'Ubayd and Shaykh Muhammad Ibn Haadee have judged him so. And before you are some of the objectionable statements of al-Maghraawee:

Al-Maghraawee says, "If the *Ummah* has successively carried out, proposed and agreed with disobedience and it has agreed with Shirk and it has agreed with deviance and it has agreed with women uncovering and it has agreed with casting off the Religion of the *Ummah* and it has agreed with apostasy and it claims ignorance of all these oppositions, then what will befall it? What does it want? So - O brothers - this assessment is inevitable, there is no escape from us assessing our current reality with these *aayaat* that Allaah revealed to our Prophet Muhammad. And they shall remain - if Allaah so wills - up until the Hour is established,

**"So the Shaytaan made them slip therefrom and took them out from that in which they were."** [Sooratul-Baqarah 2:36]."<sup>30</sup>

And al-Maghraawee also says, "The idol is everything that is worshipped besides Allaah, so that is an idol. An idol can be something living or it can be... And from the greatest worshipped idols is that someone rules in the earth by other than the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah. So he is an idol from the idols and the one who is ruled by him is an idol from amongst the idols."<sup>31</sup>

And he said, "So they *bay'ah* (pledge of allegiance) is not given, except to the Imaam of the Muslims and their Caliph with its various conditions, which are: to listen to and obey Allaah and His Messenger in their rulings, to carry out the prescribed punishments (*hudood*), to give the right from the oppressor to the oppressed and to establish justice between them, to perform the Prayers amongst them, to take the *zakaat* (alms) from them, to perform the *Hajj* for them, to perform *Jihaad* against the disbelievers with them, to protect them against whatever he protects himself from, to feed their poor and medicate their sick. So this is the one who deserves to be given allegiance. And anything other than

---

<sup>29</sup> I have not quoted the full text of this section due to the long speech in it. So refer back to the cassette.

<sup>30</sup> Refer to his audio series, *Tafseer Sooratul-Baqarah* (no. 14).

<sup>31</sup> Refer to the *Darsul-'Aqadiyyah* series, the third cassette.

the *bay'ah* of the *Sharee'ah* is merely thievery and stealing (i.e. of the Islamic authority), which is done by those who connive and ambush the minds of mankind.”<sup>32</sup>

And he said, “So if 'Umar could see what the Muslims have done in the eastern part of the earth and its west, he would surely wage war against them as *Jihaad* against the disbelievers. If he were to see them, he would surely fight against them as *Jihaad* against the disbelievers.”<sup>33</sup>

And he praised *Safar al-Hawaalee*<sup>34</sup> when he said about him, “And Shaykh *Safar al-Hawaalee* has good books through which Allaah has brought about great benefit. And we hope to Allaah the Blessed and Exalted to grant him relief and to return him to his activity in defence of the *Salafee 'aqeedah*.”<sup>35</sup>

And he also said, “In the country of Kuwait, there is a good group and at the head of it is Shaykh 'Abdur-Rahmaan 'Abdul-Khaaliq.<sup>36</sup> He has beneficial books, even if they are not free from observances and errors. So one must benefit from them in the degree to which they serve the *Salafee manhaj* and the rest of his brothers and his students who have benefit. We hope to Allaah that He grants them success upon every good.”<sup>37</sup>

And he has other than these from errors in *manhaj*.

---

<sup>32</sup> Refer to *Mawaaqiful-Imaam Maalik* (p. 16) of al-Maghraawee.

<sup>33</sup> Refer to his audio series, *al-Faaroq 'Umar*, the second tape.

<sup>34</sup> **Safar al-Hawaalee:** He was mentioned by Shaykh Muqbil in *Fadaa'ih wa Nasaa'ih* (p. 72) and by Shaykh Ahmad an-Najmee in *al-Mawridul-'Adhabiz-Zullaal* (p. 241).

<sup>35</sup> Refer to *al-Masaadirul-'Ilmiyyah fid-Difaa' 'anil-'AqeedatisSalafiyyah* (p. 115) of al-Maghraawee.

<sup>36</sup> **'Abdur-Rahmaan 'Abdul-Khaaliq:** Shaykh Muqbil Ibn Haadee al-Waadi'ee – *rahimahullaah* – said about him in his book, *al-Makhraj minal-Fitnah* (p. 122), “He is not to be relied upon with regards to his book, *al-FikrusSoofee*, because he quotes from *TabqaqatusSoofiyah* by Abee 'Abdur-Rahmaan as-Sulamee, and he is accused.” Then the Shaykh said, “And I believe that he is amazed with himself.” And Shaykh Muqbil said about him in his book, *Fadaa'ih wa Nasaa'ih* (p. 49), “He has deviated.” And then he said, “May Allaah not reward him with goodness.” And he said about him on (p. 50), “And he has now become *Salfatee* (i.e. influenced by democracy).” And he mentioned on (p. 53), “And it is befitting that he be restrained, even though he is young in age.” And the Shaykh made additional mention of him in *Fadaa'ih wa Nasaa'ih* (p. 70, 106-108, 125, 131, 134). He was mentioned by Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Yahyaa an-Najmee in the book, *al-Mawridul-'Adhabiz-Zilaal* (p. 228, 231-232).

<sup>37</sup> Refer to *al-Masaadirul-'Ilmiyyah* (p. 115).