



**al-ibaarah**  
Book Publishing

رد الجواب  
على من طلب مني  
عدم طبع الكتاب

---

# Returning a Reply to the one who requested me not to print my book

---

**By Shaikh Ahmad  
bin Yahyaa An-Najmee**

Translated by  
abu maryam isma'eel alarcon

AL-IBAANAH E-Books

© Copyright Al-Ibaanah Book Publishing, USA  
Published On-Line for Free Distribution

**First Edition: April 2003**

**Note:** This document is an on-line book publication of [www.al-ibaanah.com](http://www.al-ibaanah.com). This book was formatted and designed specifically for being placed free on the Internet. Al-Ibaanah Book Publishing allows for this document, in its present form and with no alterations, to be distributed, printed, photocopied, reproduced and/or disbursed by electronic means for the purpose of spreading its content and not for the purpose of gaining a profit, unless a specific request is sent to the publishers and permission is granted. Anyone wishing to quote from this document must give credit to the publisher.

**About the Book:** This is a translation of the small booklet *Radd-ul-Jawaab 'alaa man Talaba Minnee 'Adam Taba'-il-Kitaab* (Returning a Reply to the one who Requested me not to Print my Book) by Shaikh Ahmad bin Yahyaa An-Najmee, may Allaah preserve him. The original source for this booklet was a letter Shaikh Ahmad An-Najmee sent to Shaikh 'Abdullaah bin Jibreen in response to a letter he received from the latter requesting him not to print his book *Mawrid-ul-'Adhb az-Zulaal*, which is a valuable work consisting of about 300 pages and provides an in-depth analysis and refutation of the deviant groups, Jamaa'at at-Tableegh and Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimoon.

This magnificent book was published in 1418H with forewords from Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee Al-Madkhalee. The letter was also later published and distributed, in order to refute those who misuse Shaikh Ibn Jibreen's erroneous stances regarding Hasan Al-Bannaa and the Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimoon as a means to attack the Salafi Da'wah and create disunity amongst its ranks.

May Allaah reward Shaikh Ahmad An-Najmee for the sincere advise, valuable work and exposition of the deviations of Hasan Al-Bannaa that he produces in this treatise.

A Publication of  
**Al-Ibaanah E-Books**

## Returning a Reply

In the Name of Allaah, the Most Merciful, Bestower of Mercy

From Ahmad bin Yahyaa An-Najmee to my brother and loved one for the sake of Allaah, a member of the Committee of Religious Verdicts (*Daar-ul-Iftaa*), Shaikh ‘Abdullaah bin ‘Abdir-Rahmaan Al-Jibreen:

As-Salaamu ‘Alaykum wa Rahmatullaahi wa Barakaatuh. To Proceed:

I am in receipt of your kind letter written on 4/11/1418H as well as your valuable gift, which was copies of your precious books, may Allaah reward you with good, bless you, guide you and me and protect you and me from the evils of our souls. And since I am thanking you for the gift, I also thank you for your advice and for your openness, if only they were put in their proper place, since a Muslim is only obligated to accept the advice if that person’s advice implicates an incorrect understanding or an erroneous statement. So I apologize and ask your forgiveness beforehand if I state something in this discussion that you may interpret as being or having in it that which hurts your feelings. So I say:

You stated in your letter concerning my book “The Pure and Pleasant Spring containing criticisms of the beliefs and actions of some of the Methodologies used in Da’wah”:<sup>1</sup> **“I was delighted by this splendid title ... (up to where you said) ... but when I reached the ninth chapter, I encountered that which I didn’t expect...”**

I felt saddened upon reading your letter that such a thing would emanate from the likes of someone with your standing, in terms of knowledge and status. Why did you not continue reading it in order to find out if what I had written in it was the truth or falsehood? So if it were true you would then support it, acting on the statement of the Prophet (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*), the prophet of guidance and the messenger of mercy, when he said: **“Assist your brother whether he is oppressing or being oppressed.”** It was said: “A person can help him if he is oppressed but how can he assist him if he is oppressing others?” He (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) said: **“Impede him or prevent him from oppressing (others).”**

---

<sup>1</sup> **Translator’s Note:** This tremendous book written by Shaikh Ahmad An-Najmee was written and published in the same year as this letter (1418H). It is about 300 pages long and contains an in depth analysis of the two most popular deviant methodologies in the field of Da’wah today, that of the Jamaa’at at-Tableegh and the Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen. The book has introductory commendations from Shaikh Saalih Al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Rabee’ Al-Madkhalee, may Allaah preserve all of them.

And if what I had written in it were false, you would then assist me by clarifying the truth to me with proofs and evidences. And I would have been ready to accept that from you and to thank you and supplicate for you, because you would have saved me from a sin and a wrong that I would have fallen into. But this is on the condition that this criticism would be detailed with clear proofs and decisive evidences, which would clarify to me my error. But as for you reaching the ninth chapter and then abandoning reading the rest of it and thereafter launching an all-out attack without proofs, then I can never accept this from you or agree with you on it.

As for your saying that the title pleased you and that you decided to read the whole book, stating: **“I was delighted by this splendid title such that I set out to read the entire book. However, in the beginning of it, I found beneficial subjects regarding Calling to Tawheed and the methodologies employed in Da’wah. But when I reached the ninth chapter, I encountered that which I didn’t expect from the likes of you, such as attacks on the personality of Hasan Al-Bannaa. And you unleashed great anger against him”**, then I say:

**First:** Allaah, the All-Knower of what is seen and unseen, knows that I did not intend to attack the honor of anyone, not Hasan Al-Bannaa or anyone else. This is especially since I know that on the Day of Judgement people’s rights will be recompensed with the taking of good deeds (from others’ scales) and the giving of bad deeds (to others’ scales).

**Second:** You know that mentioning the bad qualities a person has in him is permissible if it is done for a beneficial reason, and this is from the allowable forms of backbiting. The proof for this is what the Prophet (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) told Faatimah bint Qays when she came to him seeking advice on who to marry. He (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) said: **“As for Mu’aawiyah, then he is utterly broke, he has no money. And as for Abu Jahm, then he beats his wives. Instead, marry Usaamah.”**

And he (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) consented with Hind bint ‘Utbah’s statement concerning (her husband) Abu Sufyaan that he was: **“A stingy man who doesn’t give me enough money for me and my children.”**

And he (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) said concerning a man who sought permission to enter his home: **“What an evil brother of his family he is.”**

**Third:** You also know that the Scholars of Hadeeth spoke against those narrators who had in them that which necessitated that their reports be rejected and declared weak. So they issued such statements as: “So and so is a liar”, “So and so is a fabricator”,

“He narrates from reliable reporters that which is not found in their narrations”, “So and so has weak memory”, “So and so make many errors”, and “So and so is heedless.”

They did this out of sincerity to Allaah, His Messenger and the Muslims, and in order to defend the Sunnah of Allaah’s Messenger from having what isn’t part of it enter into it. This was such that when it was said to one of these scholars: “What will you do when these people – meaning those whom he spoke against and criticized – come to you on the Day of Judgement disputing with you (i.e. seeking their right)?” He responded: “That all of these people be my opponents (on the Day of Judgement) is more beloved to me than that the Messenger of Allaah be my opponent on the Day of Judgement.”

So because of this, they spoke out against the criticized narrators without any hesitancy and they considered that as being the best of their deeds, which they hoped would be stored for them and wished would be rewarded.

**Fourth:** You stated in your book “The Lone (*Ahaad*) Reports in the Prophetic Hadeeth” in the fifth chapter on “Efforts of the Scholars in Preserving the Hadeeth” (pg. 30), and you were correct in what you said that:

“2. Investigating the Conditions of the Reporters and Researching their Status in Hadeeth and their Qualification for conveying it: They took it upon themselves to speak out against them, from the aspect of sincerity to the ummah, since they were entrusted for conveying something from the affairs of the Religion that had a ruling in it. And they distinguished this aspect as being separate from the general forbiddance of backbiting, due to what it contained from overall benefit to the ummah.”

This is the view of all of the people of knowledge from the scholars of Fiqh and Hadeeth, without exception, may Allaah reward them with good. You will see in what follows that I only spoke against Hasan Al-Bannaa and those who follow his group in order to sincerely advise the ummah. And I am not praising myself, as Allaah knows all that we conceal and reveal and nothing is hidden from Him whether it is in the heavens or the earth.

**Fifth:** Please think, what is the reason that caused me to speak against this man who died while I was still in my adolescence?<sup>2</sup> He didn’t shed any of my blood or destroy my honor, nor did he take any of my wealth. So what is it that caused me to speak out against him when he didn’t transgress against me personally in any way? If I had spoken against him without him having previously oppressed me or not due to some

---

<sup>2</sup> **Translator’s Note:** Shaikh Ahmad An-Najmee was born in 1346H and was around 22 years old when Hasan Al-Bannaa was shot and killed in Egypt on 2/12/1949 (1368H).

religious benefit, just speaking against him for the sake of it, then I would be an oppressor and a transgressor and Allaah would take his right from me.

**Sixth:** We are afflicted in this time of ours with methodologies of Da'wah that have come to us from abroad,<sup>3</sup> which turn the eyes away from Major Shirk and allow it to spread. The greatest of these in terms of self-corruption and corrupting of others is the methodology of the Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen for it indeed brainwashes the minds of the youth who are raised upon its way, transforming them into revolutionists, takfeeris, terrorists and khawaarij. The proofs for this are many, the most significant of them being the own acknowledgement of this by those who bombed the upper part of Riyadh – 'Abdul-'Azeez 'Athaam and his cohorts. So this is what caused me to write about him (i.e. Hasan Al-Bannaa) and his group, before the story of this bombing occurred.

**Seventh:** Concerning your saying that when you reached the ninth chapter, you encountered that which you didn't expect from me, such as attacking the personality of Hasan Al-Bannaa, and that I unleashed great anger against him and that I took his words to mean what he didn't intend, my response to this is:

If you had read the entire book with impartiality, you would have known that I made clear what this methodology and its founder have in them from opposition to the Islamic Legislation and the Creed of the Salaf. He is the one, according to his own brother's acknowledgement, who would boastfully say, and this is widely circulated in the books of his party:

*“Allaah raised and scattered (all) the existence and what it contains  
So if you desire to attain His perfection  
Then everything in the universe if you realize it  
is non-existent, specifically and generally.”*

So if you think that I understood from his words that which he didn't intend, then please interpret for me what this statement of his contains religiously and intellectually, other than *wahdat-ul-wujood*.<sup>4</sup>

And **Secondly:** He is the one who would recite the following poetry:

*“May the Divine (Allaah) bless the light (i.e. Muhammad) that appeared  
to the creation and so he surpassed the (light of the) sun and the moon*

---

<sup>3</sup> **Translator's Note:** He means by this outside of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

<sup>4</sup> **Translator's Note:** The belief of *wahdat-ul-wujood* is a deviant Sufi concept that entails the belief that Allaah and His creation are one existence. Thus there is no distinction between Creator and creation.

*This beloved one (i.e. Muhammad) along with his loved ones has attended  
And pardoned everyone of what they did and will do (of sins)."*

Interpret these verses with an interpretation that this wording contains other than that of Major Shirk, as in his statement "*And pardoned everyone of what they did and will do (of sins)*" and other than that of a lie against Allaah's Messenger, as in his statement: "*This beloved one (i.e. Muhammad) along with his loved ones has attended*", as well as what these words contain from affirming the lies of the Sufis who say that the Prophet attends their innovated gathering, which is nothing else but the celebration of the Prophet's Birthday.

**Third:** Explain to me his praise for Al-Mirghanee, who was well known for *wahdat-ul-wujood* with an explanation that would please Allaah and His Messenger and then the believers other than that he was pleased with *wahdat-ul-wujood* and praised those who held that view.

**Fourth:** Explain to me the statement he made to the Associated Press: "There is no religious enmity between us and the Jews" with an explanation pleasing to Allaah and His Messenger and then the believers other than the fact that he was flattering the Jews and Christians by lying on Allaah, His Messenger and the Religion of Islaam.

**Fifth:** Explain to me why he attended the gravesite of Sayyida Zaynab (*radyaAllaahu 'anhaa*) on the occasion of the yearly migration, and why he didn't mention the Shirk that occurred there nor forbid it, even though he saw people making Tawaaf around the grave and asking the one buried in it requests that only should be made to Allaah? Explain that to me in a way that pleases Allaah and His Messenger, and then the believers, other than that it was because he was pleased with Major Shirk and that he permitted it with himself and in his methodology.

**Sixth:** Explain to me why he would walk to the graves of Ad-Dasooqee and Sinjar on foot, 20 kilometers going and (another) 20 kilometers returning, with an explanation pleasing to Allaah and His Messenger and then to the believers other than that it was because he was either performing a polytheistic form of visitation or an innovated form of it.

**Seventh:** Explain to me why he strived to unite the Sunnees and the Raafidees with an explanation pleasing to Allaah and His Messenger and then the believers, other than that it was because he was ignorant of what the Raafidah were upon from innovations and deviations or that he was lenient towards them and their deviations and sacrificed the Islamic Creed for the sake of pleasing them.

**Eighth:** Explain to me how he could combine between opposing factors in the description of his Da'wah (Call), (stating) that it was a "Call to the Salaf, a Path upon the Sunnah and a Sufi Reality." Is it possible that these opposing factors can be united? Is it possible to unite Sufism and Salafiyyah and to unite Sufism and the Sunnah? Trying to combine between these two is like trying to mix water with fire!

**Ninth:** Explain to me the ten pillars of his *ba'yah* (pledge of allegiance) with an explanation pleasing to Allaah and His Messenger and then the believers, other than that he brought a new legislation to the Da'wah.

**Tenth:** Explain to me why he took the *bay'ah* (pledge of allegiance) from people who *bay'ah* was binding on other than that it was because he was disobeying Allaah and His Messenger and introducing new laws into Islaam, which neither Allaah nor His Messenger gave permission for.

**Eleventh:** Explain to me why he made obedience to him, which he placed as a condition in his *bay'ah*, as something obligatory to be carried out immediately and without any reservations, even though according to Islaam, obedience is restricted by two things:

1. It must be with regard to something good, and
2. It is dependent upon one's ability.

So isn't this legislating a law into the Religion, which neither Allaah nor His Messenger authorized?!

**Twelfth:** Explain to me why he limited Islaam to just twenty principles or why he gave these principles the ultimate importance with an explanation that Allaah and His Messenger, and then the believers would be pleased with, other than that it was because he introduced a new legislation into Islaam.

**Thirteenth:** Explain to me why he said Tafweed was the *madh-hab* of all of the Salaf without exception, with an explanation pleasing to Allaah and His Messenger and then the believers, other than that it was because he was ignorant of the *madh-hab* of the Salaf regarding Allaah's Attributes or because he forged a lie against them stating that the Salaf would believe in the meaning (of the Attribute) but return knowledge of how the attribute was to Allaah.

Lastly, I say: If you can interpret and explain these statements of his, which I just mentioned, with explanations that do not contradict the Religion and do not leave from the fold of what is contained in the wording, then I rightfully deserve your comment of



me understanding from his words that which they don't contain. And if you are unable to do that, then it becomes clear that you lied on me and slandered me with this statement. And know that I will not seek my right from you, even if your wronging of me becomes manifest, except before Allaah on the Day of Judgement. However I will place between you and I the noble Shaikh, 'Abdul-'Azeez bin 'Abdillaah bin Baaz, Chief Muftee of the Kingdom (of Saudi Arabia), head of the Committee of Senior Scholars, and head of the Committee for Religious Research and Verdicts, as well as his deputy, Shaikh 'Abdul-'Azeez bin 'Abdillaah Aali Shaikh, and Shaikh Saalih bin Fawzaan Al-Fawzaan, Shaikh 'Abdullaah Al-Ghudayyaan and Shaikh Saalih Al-Atram to read the ninth chapter of the book from its beginning to end. So if they find that I have misinterpreted Al-Bannaa's words in a way that they were not intended then they shall pronounce me guilty, and if they find that the one who stated this wronged me and slandered me with this statement, then they will find him guilty.

As for your statement that I took my anger out on him, then Allaah knows that I didn't write what I wrote except to clarify the truth and to advise the people. This is what I hope for and I am not praising myself nor am I purifying my soul from sin:

﴿ وَمَا أُبْرِيْ نَفْسِيْ اِنْ اِنَّ النَّفْسَ لِاَمَّارَةٌ بِالسُّوْءِ اِلَّا مَا رَحِمَ رَبِّيْ اِنَّ رَبِّيْ

عَفُوْرٌ رَّحِيْمٌ ﴿٥٣﴾

**“Verily the soul commands to evil except for those whom my Lord has mercy on. Verily, my Lord is Most Forgiving, Bestower of Mercy.”** [Surah Yoosuf: 53]

And if there was some anger on my part, then Allaah knows that it was only for His sake. This is since, it can hardly be imagined that I would be angry for my own sake towards a man that didn't oppress me in any way, along with there being great distances and time-spans between him and I. And indeed I ask Allaah, may He be Glorified, to make my deed sincerely for His Face, intending to please Him by it, and to not make any part of it for the sake of anyone from His creatures. Verily, he is the All-Hearer, the One who responds to invocations.

As for your saying that you encountered that which you didn't expect from me, then did you find that I disobeyed Allaah and His Messenger and opposed the Religion of Islaam by clarifying the truth that I did? Didn't Allaah take a covenant from the People of the Scripture that they would convey the truth to the people and not conceal it? Isn't this covenant that He took binding upon us? Didn't the Prophet (*sallAllaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) take this covenant from his Companions when giving the *bay'ah* (pledge), as is stated in the agreed upon hadeeth of 'Ubaadah bin Saamit, where he said: **“And (we**

pledge allegiance to you) that we will speak the truth wherever we may be and not fear the blame of the blamers?” Doesn’t Allaah curse those who conceal the truth in His Book, as He states:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ مَا أَنْزَلْنَا مِنَ الْبَيِّنَاتِ وَالْهُدَىٰ مِنْ بَعْدِ  
مَا بَيَّنَّاهُ لِلنَّاسِ فِي الْكِتَابِ أُولَٰئِكَ يَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّهُ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ  
الْمَلَائِكَةُ ۗ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ تَابُوا وَأَصْلَحُوا وَبَيَّنُّوا فَأُولَٰئِكَ أَتُوبُ  
عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنَا التَّوَّابُ الرَّحِيمُ ﴿١٦٠﴾

“Verily, those who conceal what We have revealed from the clear proofs and the guidance after We clarified it to the people in the Book, they are the ones cursed by Allaah and cursed by the cursers. Except for those who repent, rectify matters and clarify. These people, I will accept their repentance, and I am the Acceptor of Repentance, the Bestower of Mercy?” [Surah Al-Baqarah: 159-160]

Isn’t refuting those who oppose the mandates and laws of the Religion an obligation upon the people of knowledge? So if they fall short of this necessary obligation and someone fulfills this task, the obligation is removed from the rest. And from the rights he has over others is that they should supplicate for success for him and thank him after thanking Allaah in a good and nice manner, and not that he be confronted with accusations and bad thoughts about him.

Didn’t the Salaf carry out this order and fulfill this obligation, thus authoring numerous books, the likes of which cannot be counted, refuting the innovators from the time of the Taabi’een to this time of ours, and they still continue to do this?

Didn’t you, O Shaikh, write two books refuting the people of innovation, the first of which is the book “*Akhbaar-ul-Aahaad*”, in which you refuted the Mu’tazilah and whoever holds their views, and the second of which is your book “*Al-Faa’iq fir-Raddi ‘alaa Mubaddil-il-Haqaa’iq?*”

And, by the One of whom there is no deity that has the right to be worshipped except Him, I truly love a man who defends the religion, protecting it and shielding it, and who refutes those who enter into it that which doesn’t belong to it. However, I don’t know why some of the Mashaayikh, may Allaah guide them, have swerved away from the truth, when they know (better), instead rebuking the one who rises to fulfill this

obligation, calling him a criminal, transgressor and an oppressor! And yet on the other hand if this evil were to affect anyone else, the world would be in an uproar and huge commotion. But when it affects the Religion, violating it and oppressing its right, the whole world is peaceful and forgiving! Would we be giving justice to the Religion and fulfilling its right this way, or would we be violating it, disregarding it and neglecting its characteristics, especially if what was affected from it was its foundations, principles and fundamentals, such as Tawheed when it is demolished by Major Shirk, and the Sunnah when it is destroyed by innovations, and the truth when it is ruined by falsehood? So at this point, do you hold that we should remain silent? No, by Allaah! Unless some of us rise to fulfill this right, since it is a collective obligation. And as for the one who fulfills this obligation (of refuting innovation), he has a huge reward and a grand recompense with Allaah, the Most High, the All-Able, as has been stated just now.

**As for your statement that for the past forty years you received news about him from noble scholars such as Shaikh ‘Abdur-Razzaaq ‘Afeefee, Shaikh ‘Abdur-Rahmaan Ad-Dawsiree, Shaikh ‘Abdullaah bin Humaid and Shaikh ‘Abdul-‘Azeez bin Baaz, and that they praised his Da’wah and mentioned his positive effects and they examined news of him, then I say:**

**First:** As for the Mashaayikh you mentioned, then you probably asked them before they were aware of what is well known today about his condition.

**Second:** Perhaps during that time news about the outer appearance of his Da’wah reached them. Many people are deceived by the outer appearance of his Da’wah even up to today, because they do not know this (Ikhwaanee) methodology well enough since they didn’t read about it during those times.

**Third:** If they didn’t say anything against him, then this was because they weren’t aware of any of the mistakes he made. So they had a right to refrain (from speaking against him) if this was the case.

**Fourth:** But as for now, then it has been made clear and manifest that there are many errors in his Da’wah. And “The one who preserved it is a proof against the one who didn’t preserve it.” This is a principle that is well known amongst the Muhadditheen, and acting on it with regard to this matter is an obligation.

**Fifth:** As for Shaikh ‘Abdul-‘Azeez bin Baaz, who is the only one who remains alive from them,<sup>5</sup> then he knows what they are upon and there is no doubt about this. He

---

<sup>5</sup> This treatise was written during the lifetime of Shaikh Ibn Baaz, may Allaah have mercy on him

responded to a question related to the movement of the Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen founded by Hasan Al-Bannaa, in which the questioner said: "Noble Shaikh, the movement of the Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen entered the Kingdom (of Saudi Arabia) some time ago, and they became active amongst the students of knowledge. What is your opinion with regard to this movement and to what extent do they comply with the methodology of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah?"

He responded by saying: "The movement of Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen has been criticized by specialized scholars because they do not have any enthusiasm with regard to calling to the Tawheed of Allaah and rejecting Shirk and rebuking innovations. And they have specific methods, which are made deficient by their lack of efforts to call to Allaah and their lack of guiding towards the correct Creed, which Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah are upon. So it is upon the Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen to give importance to the Salafee Call to the Tawheed of Allaah, and to reject the worship of graves, the devotion to the deceased and the seeking assistance of those buried in the graves such as Husayn or Badawee and so on. This is what I wanted to convey."<sup>6</sup>

Did you hear, O brother in Islaam, what Shaikh 'Abdul-'Azeez bin Baaz said, may Allaah prolong his life? So why won't you say similar to what he said concerning the Da'wah of the Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen and what it contains from oppositions to the methodology of the Salaf as-Saalih. By this, you would be aiding the truth, removing an evil and advising the ummah.

As for your statement that they would mention his positive effects, then if any of the Mashaayikh you mentioned, with the exception of Shaikh 'Abdul-'Azeez bin Baaz, stated that he had positive effects, then he has been deceived just like you. However, what seems apparent from your words is that you are convinced that he had positive effects, therefore I must ask you the following questions, which I hope you can answer clearly and truthfully. So I say:

1. Is it from his positive effects that he was silent about the polytheistic worship that the people committed at the gravesites and tombs present in Egypt and that he didn't forbid it, as if it had been sent down definitively from the heavens in verses recited?
2. Was from his positive effects the partisanship and division that he left behind amongst the ummah?
3. Is it from his positive effects that he established the Call to the Khilaafah and abandoned the Call to Tawheed, which all the messengers called to?

---

<sup>6</sup> In a magazine Shaikh An-Najmee has.

4. Is it from his positive effects that he caused the youth to hate the leaders and the scholars and prepared them to overthrow the present (Muslim) countries in order to establish a Khilaafah, which they claim will be opposite to them?
5. Is it from his positive effects that he brought about the false ascription of faults and blemishes on the leaders and the scholars, which his followers do, claiming afterward that these leaders are not fit for ruling and that the scholars are only flattering them?
6. Is it from his positive effects that he transformed the youth and placed them in positions in Da'wah while they were ignorant?
7. Is it from his positive effects that he instituted giving *bay'ah* (pledge of allegiance) to common people whilst abandoning those who rightfully deserve the *bay'ah*, such as the rulers?
8. Is it from his positive effects that he called to the coming together of the Shi'ees and the Sunnees? What is meant by coming together, is that each group should refrain from criticizing any of the beliefs of the other groups, so that the first group can come closer to the second group.
9. Is it from his positive effects that he claimed that the Salaf would commit Tafweed, designating the meaning of all of Allaah's attributes (back to Allaah)?
10. Is it from his positive effects that he said: "There is no religious enmity between us and the Jews" which means that the Jews are our brothers?
11. Is it from his positive effects that he said: "We will work with one another in that which we agree on, and overlook from one another that which we differ on" which means that we should nullify the acts of commanding good and forbidding evil, which Allaah described the believers with, while praising them, in His saying:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ  
عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ

**"You were the best nation brought forth for mankind - commanding towards good and forbidding from evil and believing in Allaah" [Surah Aali 'Imraan: 110] and other ayaat?**

12. Is it from his positive effects that he gathered together people whose beliefs differed and whose convictions varied? So this person is a Sunnee and that person is a Shi'ee. This person is a Sufi and that person is a Jahmee. This person is an Ash'aree and that person is a rationalizing Mu'tazilee and so on and so on. And he claimed that they are all brothers because they say *Laa Ilaaha IllaaAllaah Muhammad Rasoolullaah!*

13. Is it from his positive effects that he revived innovations, amongst which was the innovation of celebrating the Prophet's Birthday and his attending a gathering for it?

14. Is it from his positive effects that he claimed that the Messenger (*sallAllaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) attended his gathering, blessed it and forgave the sins of those present?

15. Is it from his positive effects that he was immersed in Sufism, having passion and affection for it?

16. Is it from his positive effects that he limited Islaam to twenty principles, making that binding upon his followers?

17. Is it from his positive effects that he made the conditions of *bay'ah* ten and that he obligated conditions that are not found in the Book of Allaah or in the Sunnah of His Messenger?

18. Is it from his positive effects that he made blind obedience a condition for the *bay'ah*, where he said: "By obedience I mean that the command should be carried out and executed immediately in times of hardship and in times of ease, in things pleasing and in things detested. This is because the levels of this (Ikhwaanee) Da'wah are three...(up to where he said about the second level, which is the level of Formation)...Organizing the da'wah in this level is to be carried out purely in a Sufi way from the spiritual standpoint and militarily from the practical standpoint."<sup>7</sup>

Hearing and obeying is obligatory to the one in authority. However it is constrained by two restrictions:

**First:** It must be obedience with regard to something good. So there is no obedience to be given if it entails disobedience to Allaah.

---

<sup>7</sup> From *Majmoo'at Rasaa'il* (Collection of Essays) of Al-Bannaa; *Risaalah at-Ta'aaleem* (pg. 268)

**Second:** It must be in those things that a person is able to do, therefore he is not required to do what he is unable to. The Prophet (*sallAllaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) would instruct his Companions to only obey in what they were able to.

19. Is it from his positive effects that he attended the gravesite of Sayyidah Zaynab (*radyyAllaahu 'anhaa*) on the occasion of the annual gathering, and did not reject one word of the Shirk that took place there? On the contrary, he would advise and encourage the attendees to purify their souls and hearts from spite and malice!

20. Is it from his positive effects that he allowed Coptic Christians to enter his organization, making them supporters of his Call? Did any of the callers ever do this?

21. Is it from his positive effects that he established an assembly for Muhammad 'Uthmaan Al-Mirghanee, who is well know for his belief in *wahdat-ul-wujood*, praising him and saying in this gathering: "Indeed, we the gathering of Ikhwaan owe the Mirganee leaders pure affection and a warm welcome?"

22. Is it from his positive effects that he would go to public assemblies from the first night of Rabee'-ul-Awwal to the 12<sup>th</sup> of Rabee'-ul-Awwal in which he would recite a chant that consists of Major Shirk:

*"May the Divine (Allaah) bless the light (i.e. Muhammad) that appeared to the creation and so he surpassed the (light of the) sun and the moon  
This beloved one (i.e. Muhammad) along with his loved ones has attended  
And pardoned everyone of what they did and will do (of sins)."*

23. Is it from his positive effects that he and his associates would travel three hours on foot going and three hours returning in order to visit the graves of the elite among the Husaafee Shaadhilee Order? But if it is said that his intention behind visiting was for purposes related to the Sunnah (i.e. to remind himself of death), then we say that it is not permissible to set out on a journey to them.

24. Is it from his positive effects that he would chant the following verses, which clearly indicate *wahdat-ul-wujood*:

*"Allaah raised and scattered (all) the existence and what it contains  
So if you desire to attain His perfection  
Then everything in the universe if you realize it  
is non-existent, specifically and generally."*

25. Is it from his positive effects that he claimed that Tawassul, which is the greatest of ways that people fall into Shirk, is from the subsidiary issues, which should not be given importance?

Lastly, I ask you, by Allaah, are these things that I have just listed above in these numbers in agreement with the Religion or in contradiction to it?

And I ask you, by Allaah, a third time: Is the one who clarifies the truth to the people and defends the Creed considered erroneous and a criminal who deserves to be censured, reprimanded, incriminated and told that your books should not be printed?

**As for your statement that they excused him from the errors he committed, then I say:**

**First:** What are the errors that should be excused – aren't they those that are made in subsidiary issues, which stem from Ijtihad? So are the errors committed by Al-Bannaa on subsidiary issues, such that they can be excused? And is Al-Bannaa from the people of Ijtihad whose status should be preserved? Who are his teachers whom he studied religious knowledge under?

**Second:** Errors made in matters of Creed are not excused based on the unanimous agreement of the scholars from Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah. And the books that they wrote refuting the innovators during every era and every location, which are too many to be counted, from the time of the Taabi'een to our present time, bears witness to this.

**Third:** The Mashaayikh you mentioned are from Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, and if they knew of Al-Bannaa's contradictions against the Religion in fundamental issues and matters of Creed, they would not make excuses for him.

**Fourth:** As for your saying that they excused him, then this is an allegation on your part. So if you have with you something that confirms this, then present it. This only applies to you with respect to those who have passed away. But as for Shaikh 'Abdul-'Azeez<sup>8</sup> then he is still alive and his stance regarding them (i.e. Ikhwaan-ul-Muslimeen) is well known. And he is our Imaam and our role model, and we know from the Shaikh that he refutes every error that he hears or learns of even if the one who commits it may be far away and even if the error is in relation to subsidiary issues. So how many errors has he refuted – they are too many to be taken into account. And if they were to be counted, then it would be long. And if it is possible, I will write to him asking:

---

<sup>8</sup> He is referring to Shaikh 'Abdul-'Azeez bin Baaz, may Allaah have mercy on him.



“There is a person that claims that you have excused Hasan Al-Bannaa for the errors in Creed that he made, so is this correct?”

**Fifth:** Even if we assume that someone from Ahlus-Sunnah excused him for what he committed from errors in Creed, then his opinion of excusing him is to be considered as irregular and in contradiction to what Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah are upon.

Sixth: As for the one who excused him, did he say that he can’t be refuted? If he said that he can’t be refuted, then he has aided the innovators and troublemakers who seek to deviate others by it.

**As for your saying: “And they found in his words that which makes it known that he is a *Mukhlis* (sincere), *Muwahhid* (affirmer of Tawheed)”**, then I say:

As for his being sincere (*mukhlis*), then no one can know this except Allaah because sincerity is something hidden, which only Allaah has knowledge of. It is stated in the authentic hadeeth: **“Actions are only base don’t heir intentions, and indeed every person will have only that which he intends.”**<sup>9</sup>

And in the hadeeth of Abu Moosaa: **“Whoever fights so that the Word of Allaah could be the highest, then it (his fighting) was for the sake of Allaah.”**

And in the hadeeth of Ibn Mas’ood reported by Ahmad: **“Perhaps a person may be killed between two groups and Allaah only knows his intention.”**

And in the hadeeth of ‘Ubaadah: **“Whoever fights not intending anything except recognition, then he will have what he intends.”**

And in the story of the (brave) man who would follow and kill with his sword every pagan he encountered (during a battle), and the Companions were amazed by him and said: “No one amongst us has profited today like so and so has profited.” So the Prophet (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) said: **“He is from the inhabitants of the Hellfire.”** So a man followed him the next day (while the battle continued), and found him fighting (with polytheists). When he had suffered many wounds, the man placed the tip of his sword on his upper chest and fell on it, thrusting it in him and thus killing himself. The man (who followed him) then went to the Prophet (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) and said: “I bear witness that you are the Messenger of Allaah.” He (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) said: **“Why is that?”** He said: “That man about whom who said what you said yesterday killed himself.” So the Prophet (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*)

---

<sup>9</sup> An “agreed upon” hadeeth from the narration of the Commander of the Believers, ‘Abu Hafsa, ‘Umar bin Al-Khattaab, may Allaah be pleased with him.

said: **“Rise, O Bilaal, and announce to the people that no one shall enter Paradise except a believing soul, and that Allaah will indeed aid this religion by an evil man.”**

The important point here is that sincerity is something hidden, which no one has knowledge of except Allaah.

As for you saying that he is a Muwahhid,<sup>10</sup> then this is a testimony and a commendation for him on your part that Allaah will question you about. It is obligatory for you to think carefully before sending out such commendations – where they put in their proper place or not? I don’t know if perhaps this is due to ignorance on your part of what Al-Bannaa fell into from Shirk, his disregard for those who committed it, as well as their polytheistic rituals, and his accepting them as members in his methodology. He is the one who said during the innovation of the Prophet’s Birthday:

*“This beloved one (i.e. Muhammad) along his loved ones has attended  
And pardoned everyone of what they did and will do (of sins).”*

This means that the Messenger of Allaah attends their gathering, blesses it and pardons and forgives them! So I ask is this Shirk or not, O Shaikh?! And is the one who says such a statement and chants it a Muwahhid?! Is the one who takes the *bay’ah* (pledge of allegiance) in accordance with the Husaafee Shadhilee (Sufi) order a Muwahhid?! Have you come to know that the Sufis are Muwahhids and that they call to Tawheed, or that they commit Shirk and call to polytheism and innovation? Are you aware that Sufism is built upon Shirk and that it weaves its thread and fabric from polytheism and innovations?! Did you know that Hasan Al-Bannaa used to walk by foot, 20 kilometers going and the same distance returning, every Friday, to visit the graves of the (deceased) high members of Sufism, like Ad-Dasooqee, Sinjar and their likes? Is the one who does this a Muwahhid? O Shaikh, fear Allaah and know that you have severely damaged and violated your Tawheed by testifying that those upon Shirk (polytheism) and Bid’ah (innovation) are Muwahhideen. So repent to Allaah and turn to Him before time runs out.

Indeed, the true Caller who was a Muwahhid was Shaikh Muhammad bin ‘Abdil-Wahhaab, may Allaah have mercy on him, as well as those who treaded upon his methodology and followed his way from the scholars and the leaders from his time and the time of the Ameer, Muhammad bin Sa’ood up to this day of ours. May Allaah have

---

<sup>10</sup> **Translator’s Note:** The word Muwahhid comes from Tawheed. Consequently it means someone who abides by the mandates of Tawheed, which means worshipping Allaah alone without any partners, and shunning all forms of Shirk.

mercy on those of them who passed away and preserve those of them who remain living.

And also the Shaikh, ‘Abdullaah bin Muhammad Al-Qar’aawee, who spread Tawheed throughout the southern areas (of Saudi Arabia) with the help of the late king, who went by the nickname of “The Falcon of Arabia”<sup>11</sup> and who brought most of the areas of the (Arab) peninsula together under his sovereignty, uniting them under his rule, and cleansing them of aspects of polytheism and innovation. And he was followed in this by his noble children, may Allaah have mercy on those of them who passed away and may He preserve those of them still living.

I ask you, by Allaah, O Shaikh, if a person were to ask you: “What do you say concerning an individual who participated in a procession from the first of Rabee’-ul-Awwal to the twelfth of Rabee’-ul-Awwal and happily chanted verses of poetry, which I mentioned previously, amongst which was:

*“This beloved one (i.e. Muhammad) along with his loved ones has attended  
And pardoned everyone of what they did and will do (of sins)?”*

Will you make a ruling on him, that he is upon Shirk or Tawheed? What would be your answer?

And if you were asked about a man who endured the hardship of traveling by foot every week the distance of twenty kilometers to the Sufi gravesites and then the same distance returning, how would you judge this individual? Would you say that he is a Sunnee or an innovator, and would you say that he is a Muwahhid or a Mushrik?

So fear Allaah man and return to the truth, and repent to Allaah for indeed He accepts the repentance. Do not misguide the people, especially the students of knowledge, by defending the innovators. This traveling that Hasan Al-Bannaa and his associates would do every week is not free from three possibilities:

1. Either they intended to supplicate to those buried in the graves, which is Major Shirk and takes one out of the Religion, or
2. They intended to supplicate to Allaah while at these gravesites, which is an innovation, or

---

<sup>11</sup> The “Falcon of Arabia” was King ‘Abdul-‘Azeez bin ‘Abdir-Rahmaan Aali Su’ood, may Allaah have mercy on him.

3. They intended to visit the graves as part of the Sunnah (i.e. to be reminded of death). However this couldn't be achieved except by setting out on a journey, and setting out on a journey to make the lawful visitation of the graves, is an innovation. So based on this, the one who does it is either a polytheist or an innovator.

**As for your statement: “Allaah granted benefit through his Da’wah and guided many people”, then:**

What benefit came about for them? Is having disregard for Major Shirk and being silent about those who perform it, such as the deviants and the innovators considered a benefit? Is keeping silent about evil and not forbidding it – which stems from the principle that Hasan Al-Bannaa instituted: “We will work together in that which we agree on and pardon one another in that which we disagree on” – is this a benefit. Are those who are calling to the Khilaafah and who have abandoned calling to Tawheed, which was the way of all the messengers, a benefit?!

Is intending to destroy the present (Muslim) states and revolting against them, even if those who govern them are Muslims and rule by Allaah’s Legislation, establishing the penal laws, a benefit?

Rather, the Da’wah (Call) of the Ikhwaan (Al-Muslimoon) only destroys the youth and doesn’t benefit them, and it only corrupts them and doesn’t rectify them.

**As for your statement that you didn’t stop hearing him being praised in gatherings and his books being read until about seven years ago when the brothers turned against him and degraded his rank, then I say:**

Is this a proof for him? If someone praises his methodology or praises him, who doesn’t know what is in his methodology from destructive ideologies and what he had from vile errors, this is not a proof for him or a scale determining the correctness of his methodology.

You know as well, deep down inside, that this is not a proof, and that they only praised him when they were misled by the general outer appearance of his methodology. But when they came to realize what he was upon, they rebuked it and censured him. and they had every right to do what they did.

O Allaah, You indeed know that we do not intend to disparage anyone nor to speak out against anyone, rather we only intend to clarify the truth and to warn the youth and the students of knowledge from the methodologies that consist of innovations and deviations. And we are only pointing out to them the errors in them so that they may

not be deluded by them, entering into them and missing the path of truth, thus being misguided and misleading those who come after them.

As for them having degraded his rank, then this is not correct. Rather they said about him what was conveyed to them with statements established in their sources, mentioning the names of the books and their page numbers. So are they degrading his rank when they relate these quotes to convince the youth that this methodology is erroneous because it contains truth and falsehood and mixes that which is correct with that which is wrong? This is like someone who drinks from water with impurities and dirtiness, and next to him is a person who drinks from water that is pure and free from pollution. Which of these two would you love most to drink from? So by doing this are they degrading or destroying his status?

I say: No, then again no. Rather, the heavens and the earth were not established nor were the messengers sent nor were the divine books revealed except to establish the truth and suppress the falsehood and to command the good and forbid the evil. So if the universe is void, or more appropriately, if the earth is void of one who will establish the truth for the sake of Allaah and those who command good and forbid evil, the earth will earn Allaah's wrath and His punishment will descend. What indicates this is Allaah's statement:

❖ وَإِذَا وَقَعَ الْقَوْلُ عَلَيْهِمْ أَخْرَجْنَا لَهُمْ دَابَّةً مِّنَ الْأَرْضِ تُكَلِّمُهُمْ أَنَّ  
النَّاسَ كَانُوا بِآيَاتِنَا لَا يُوقِنُونَ ﴿٨٢﴾

**“And when the Word is fulfilled against them, we shall bring out from the earth a Beast for them to speak to them because mankind believed not with certainty in our ayaat (signs).”** [Surah An-Naml: 82]

Ibn ‘Umar and Abu Sa’eed Al-Khudree, may Allaah be pleased with them, said: “When they stop commanding good and forbidding evil, (Allaah’s) Discontentment becomes binding upon them.”

Concerning the part **“when the word is fulfilled”**, ‘Abdullaah bin Mas’ood said: “It will be when the scholars die, knowledge goes away and the Qur’aan is raised up (to Allaah).”

I say: It is clear from this that commanding good and forbidding evil prevent torment from descending and Allaah’s Displeasure of His servants from being mandated.

And what falls into commanding good and forbidding evil is refuting the errors in Creed made by those who pronounce that, whoever they may be and wherever they may be. Would you like that the people of truth remain silent about clarifying it (i.e. the truth) and hold back from purifying it from that which is not part of it mixing and entering into it? Never! This will never be, by the Will of Allaah, so long as there are men to carry the Hadeeth and there is room for speech and there is force and strength for the truth and its people, who in doing this hope for Allaah's Contentment.

**As for your saying: "And they imposed themselves over him without there being anything mandating that he be specified (apart from others), for there were other more famous books that were worse than his books. And there are other leading figures, both dead and alive, that are more deviant than him", then I say:**

**First:** All praise be to Allaah who caused you to speak the truth even though you weren't aware of it, for you have acknowledged that there is evil in his books, as well as deviation in his methodology and history. How close in resemblance is your statement O Shaikh to the speech of the people of innovation in terms of contradiction, so reflect!!

**Second:** The obligation on the scholars is to clarify to the people, according to the extent of their ability, what they are unaware of and to distinguish the truth from falsehood.

**Third:** We have been afflicted by this methodology in our very own lands and so it has corrupted the minds of our children. So now they reject the compassionate father, the affectionate friend and the educating teacher. And they do not take the advice of the advisor or the criticism of the critic unless he is a member of their party. So they resemble those who Allaah spoke about in His saying:

وَلَا تُؤْمِنُوا إِلَّا لِمَنْ تَبِعَ دِينَكُمْ

**"And do not believe (in anyone) except he who follows your religion." [Surah Aali 'Imraan: 73]**

And they say: "Do not believe anyone except the people of your group." So this makes it necessary that one speak out against this methodology and its founder, as well as its offshoots, such as the Suroorees and the Qutubees. This is the reason that caused it (i.e. Ikhwaanee Manhaj) to be specified because it has spread amongst us and extended throughout our lands and regions. And it has corrupted the minds of our youth turning them into revolutionaries, takfeeris and terrorists.

So there is nothing strange if the Salafee students of knowledge rebuke this methodology and spread the errors it has in it, in order to uphold the truth, advise the people, seek nearness to Allaah and make Jihaad in His Cause:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ إِنَّا لَا نُضِيعُ أَجْرَ مَنْ أَحْسَنَ عَمَلًا

**“Verily We will not cause the reward of one who does a good deed to be lost.”**  
[Surah Al-Kahf: 30]

**As for your saying: “They have specifically chosen him and his books out of other well known books that are far worse than his books and callers, dead and alive, that are more deviant than him”, then I say:**

I have already explained to you the reason for this. Also, along with this is the fact that the Salafees, all praise be to Allaah, do not remain silent with falsehood for they have refuted all of the deviant sects, past and present, old and new, as much as they were able to.

In this time, I specifically mean our noble teacher and our unique great intellectual and our sincere and dignified scholar, Shaikh ‘Abdul-‘Azeez bin ‘Abdillaah bin Baaz, may Allaah preserve him, grant him success and aid him, then the Committee of Senior Scholars after him, may Allaah grant all of them success, assist them with every good and aid them against every evil. So whoever flips through the fataawaa of Shaikh ‘Abdul-‘Azeez bin Baaz, whose number has reached seven volumes, will realize that he has written many refutations against the people of falsehood, with all of its components and all of their factions.

And this goes as well for what has been written from verdicts and refutations in the magazine of Islamic Research of the Committee of Senior Scholars, may Allaah reward them with good and bless their time

The point is that your statement: **“Many of the brothers have imposed themselves over him without there being anything mandating that he be specified (apart from others), for there are other more famous books that were worse than his books. And there are other leading figures, both dead and alive, that are more deviant than him”** means that they should not be refuted. This is a statement that is not put in its proper place. May Allaah forgive you and us and rectify our affairs and yours. This, O Shaikh, isn’t the way the arguments of the scholars are. On the contrary, their proofs were in affirming what the texts of the Book and the Sunnah,

according to the understanding of the Salaf of the ummah, affirmed and negating what they negated.

Therefore, O brother in Islaam, if you hold that refuting Hasan Al-Bannaa and the people of his group from those who wallowed in Sufism and idolatry, entered innovations into the Religion and legislated into it that which Allaah and His Messenger didn't legislate. If you consider that refuting these people and clarifying what their methodology consists of from falsehood and deviation – if you consider that to be a violation against the members of this methodology and its founder, then we have no control over guiding others, however it is upon us to supplicate to Allaah to remove from you this strange ideology and this false understanding that has deprived you and confused matters for you. And at the same time we fear that this ideology causes you to enter into the ranks of those whom Allaah spoke of when He said:

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

الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُؤَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصَلِّهِ ۗ جَهَنَّمَ ۗ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا ﴿١١٥﴾

**“And whoever opposes the Messenger after the guidance was made clear to him and follows a way other than the Way of the Believers, We will turn him to what he has chosen and land him in Hell – what an evil destination.”** [Surah An-Nisaa: 115]

Know that supporting the people of falsehood and defending them is not from the Way of the Believers, especially if they are polytheists or innovators, whose innovation leads to disbelief or sin. So I advise you and ask Allaah for you, O brother in Islaam, that you return to the truth and to supporting it. And I ask Allaah that He allow you to see it (i.e. the truth) and that he remove the veil that is before your eyes.

This is my advice to you, and it is the advice of every Salafee that loves good for you and fears for you the consequences of this foreign ideology and erroneous understanding. And with Allaah lies the success, to him I place my reliance and to Him I repent.

**As for your statement: “Therefore I advise you O Shaikh to withhold your tongue and your pen from attacking this Caller, whom Allaah granted benefit by”, I say:**

What a great advice this is, if only it were put in its proper place. This is a valuable gift for the one who wishes to preserve his Religion by it. However, you advised me not to advise, so is this a proper advice? So in reality it is only preventing good and hindering



from the Path of Allaah. So fear Allaah, O Shaikh ‘Abdullaah<sup>12</sup>, and return to the truth. By Allaah, of whom there is no deity worthy of worship except Him, there is not one percent of doubt in my heart that would lead me to undo what I have done. Rather, I hold that this is obligatory on me, since I have come to know about this man and his methodology that which entitles me to advise others and to clarify the observations made against this methodology, out of sincerity for the students of knowledge who have been deceived by them, in order to fulfill Allaah’s right over me that I defend the Religion of Islaam and to protect the Tawheed and preserve its honor as the Prophet (*sallAllaahu ‘alayhi wa sallam*) did.

**As for your statement where you advised me to not attack the honor of this Caller, I say:**

In your opinion, what has more right to be defended and protected – Tawheed and the authentic Creed, the Creed of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah or the honor of Hasan Al-Bannaa? Didn’t Allaah order us to fight the polytheists and the disbelievers for the sake of the Creed? Allaah says:

وَقَاتِلُوهُمْ حَتَّى لَا تَكُونَ فِئْتَةً وَيَكُونَ الدِّينُ لِلَّهِ

**“And fight them until there is no more *fitnah* and the Religion is for Allaah.”**  
[Surah Al-Baqarah: 193]

The word *fitnah* has been interpreted here as Shirk. Didn’t Allaah permit the termination of the lives of the disbelievers and the polytheists, the imprisonment of their women and children and the taking of their wealth as booty for the Muslims due to the Creed? Shouldn’t this be permitted for one who commits Major Shirk, agrees with those who perform it, and introduces innovations into the Religion as well as laws that have not been legislated?

Shouldn’t this be permitted against his honor, for the purpose of clarifying the truth to those who have been deceived by this man and his methodology?

Rather, by Allaah of whom there is no deity worthy of worship except Him, the obligation upon me and you and all of the seekers of knowledge is that aiding the Religion and exposing the truth must take precedence over everything in this world, out of obedience to Allaah, establishing His right, aiding his Religion and defending the beliefs of the Muslims from deceptions. And with Allaah lies the success.

---

<sup>12</sup> He is referring to Shaikh ‘Abdullaah bin Jibreen.

**As for your statement in which you advised me to not print my book, then:**

**First:** I consider this to be hindering from the Way of Allaah on your part. This is because I hold this book as being one of the best of my good deeds since I aided the truth by it, preserved the honor of Tawheed with it and defended the authentic Creed through it. I hope that I have done this sincerely for Allaah's sake, establishing His right and defending the sanctuary of His Religion, but I am not freeing myself from shortcomings and errors. And I ask Allaah to forgive me, for indeed whatever deed an individual performs, he is prone to deficiencies and shortcomings.

**Second:** I consider this to be an abandonment of the truth from you, a siding with the people of falsehood on your part and support for them. This is enough as an offense against the Religion and then against those who carry it, those about whom Allaah said:

وَمَنْ أَحْسَنُ قَوْلًا مِّمَّنْ دَعَا إِلَى اللَّهِ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا  
وَقَالَ إِنِّي مِنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ ﴿٣٣﴾

**“And who is better in speech than he who calls to Allaah and does righteous deeds and says: ‘I am from the Muslims.’”** [Surah Fussilat: 33]

**Third:** I heard that some of the hizbees (partisans) buy the books that criticize and speak against their party in large amounts and then burn them. So what is the difference between one who burns my book after it's printed and one who tells me not to print it?

**Fourth:** I consider this to be from interfering in other people's affairs in order to prevent the spread of good. And it states in the hadeeth: **“From the goodness of a person's Islaam is that he abandons what doesn't concern him.”**

**Fifth:** If I printed it and the people disseminated it, then I would be printing a book that affirms Tawheed and censures Shirk, that affirms the Sunnah and censures Innovation, and that affirms the truth and censures falsehood. So it would be an obligation on you to request the expeditious printing of the book, in order to aid Tawheed, the truth and the Sunnah. However, you have done the opposite and instead requested me not to print the book. And by doing this, you are supporting the people of innovations and partisanship wrongfully against the people of Tawheed and the Sunnah, the followers of the way of the Salaf.

So seek forgiveness from Allaah and repent to Him before your life passes and comes to an end. For by Allaah, neither this person nor that person will be able to benefit you before Allaah (on the Day of Judgement). Rather, the only thing that will benefit you is your standing up for the truth and your support for it and its people. And Allaah is the only One whom we ask that He guide us and you to the truth and to supporting it and its people. And He is the only One whom we seek refuge in from vain desires and misguidance.

**As for your warning me against printing the book out of fear for me that it will ruin my reputation, then I say to you:**

Know that the ruining of one's reputation comes only due to supporting falsehood and speaking it or doing it. And I, thanks to my Lord, have not committed any falsehood and nor have I supported the people of falsehood in order that my reputation would be ruined in front of the believers, who are Allaah's witnesses on His earth. Rather, I have performed the truth and supported the truth, which I hope I will be rewarded for by Allaah and due to which I will be considered honest amidst the people.

As for the people of falsehood, then I am not concerned about my reputation with them. I ask Allaah the Most Great, Lord of the Noble Throne, to protect me from their evil and to save me from their plots. And I will continue to pursue my printing and distribution of the book, if Allaah wills, relying upon Allaah in whose Hand lies the forelock of all His slaves.

Was-Salaam 'Alaikum wa Rahmatullaahi wa Barakaatuh.