



Published: May 2010

They Mention Some, But Not the Rest
Yet *Another* Example of Academic Dishonesty
From the Self-Appointed Vanguard of Salafism

By: Aboo Ishaq Rasheed Gonzales



The praise is for Allah, and it is sufficed. May peace be upon His slaves who He has chosen. As for what follows ...

In his *Iqtidâ' as-Şirât al-Mustaqîm*, Shaikh of Islam Ibn Taimiyyah ? relates that “Abdur-Rahman bin Mahdî and others said [that] the people of knowledge write what is for them and what is against them, while the people of desires do not write except what is for them.”¹

Despite the fact that these people go on about the gravity of hiding knowledge and information from the public,² looking at their behaviour, we find *innumerable* examples that give credence to what Shaikh of Islam ? mentions. I wrote about one such example recently in an article I titled, *Making Moosaa's Mountain Out Of Bilal's Molehill*,³ in which I pointed out the intellectual and academic dishonesty displayed by Moosaa Richardson in his criticism of a supposedly “dangerous mistake” he accused Dr. Bilal Philips of making in one of his published books.⁴

The other week, I came across yet *another* example of academic dishonesty, which these people continually display time and time again. This time, the example comes from a salafitalk.net poster⁵ who posted a couple of links to the sahab.net *Arabic* discussion forum. The poster simply posts the links and provides a brief description before each, both in Arabic and in

¹ Ibn Taimiyyah, Ahmad bin 'Abdil-Halîm bin 'Abdis-Salâm (Ed. Dr. Nâsir bin 'Abdil-Karîm al-'Aql). *Iqtidâ' as-Şirât al-Mustaqîm li-Mukhâlafah Aş-hâb al-Jahîm* (8th ed.). Riyad, Saudi Arabia: Maktabah ar-Rusdh, 2000. vol. 1, pg. 85.

² See TROID's recent diatribes regarding the Rahma conference, “[Re:Regarding Rahma Conference 2010](#)” (accessed May 21, 2010).

³ See [Makng Moosaa's Mountain Out Of Bilal's Molehill](#) on my blog.

⁴ A “dangerous mistake” also made by Moosaa's friends at Salafi Publications and Sunnah Publications, yet left uncensored.

⁵ The same poster I commented about on my blog (see my comment [here](#)) who bumped an old salafitalk.net thread from 2002 containing lies and misinformation about me with a post in which he does the same thing he does in this example: mentions some, but not the rest, in order to paint a certain skewed picture of the reality of the situation for his audience.

English; the first: “The support of ash-Shaykh Muhammad Bazmool for the critique of his brother ash-Shaykh Ahmad on Ali al-Halabee,” and the second: “Ash-Shaykh Muhammad Bazmool: The Refutations of ash-Shaykh Ahmad Bazmool denotes that al-Halabi has deviated from the Manhaj of the Salaf.”¹ Now, given the fact that many of salafitalk.net’s readers are English speakers who don’t know much Arabic—if any at all—there’s a good chance that none of them will actually come to know what’s contained in the two links. Despite that, the poster doesn’t provide his audience with a translation, summarized or otherwise, of what’s mentioned in the two posts. The result, of course, is that the readers are left with the obvious impression he and the previous posters to the thread (e.g., Maaz Qureshi or whoever it is posting under the name “SunnahPublishing.Net”) wishes their audience to get: ‘Alī al-Ḥalabī² is a deviant who has strayed from the Salafī methodology and should be avoided like the plague.

The reality, as it usually does, however, differs quite a bit from how these brothers portray it. First, taking a quick look at both links, one notices right away that both the first link³ and the second⁴ contain the *same* transcript of a conversation between Shaikh Muḥammad bin ‘Umar Bāzmūl and an unnamed questioner regarding the refutations his brother, Shaikh Aḥmad, has written against Shaikh ‘Alī Ḥasan, which largely relate to one of Shaikh ‘Alī Ḥasan’s recent books, *Manhaj as-Salaf aṣ-Ṣāliḥ fi Tarjih al-Maṣāliḥ wa Taṭwīḥ al-Mafāsid wal-Qabā’ih fi Usūl an-Naqd wal-Jarḥ wan-Nasā’ih*.

The next thing one who reads the posts will notice is that while Shaikh Muḥammad’s statement has parts that are definitely for these guys, it also contains statements that are definitely *against* them, particularly what the shaikh mentions near the end. Let’s take a look at what was said in this conversation between the questioner and the shaikh. What follows is a full translation of the transcript posted to sahab.net.

Questioner:

The second question says that you [sincerely] advised your brother, Aḥmad, that he mustn’t refute ‘Alī al-Ḥalabī and that the scholars are undertaking this matter. So one of them posted a download of a recording by you, with your voice, on a site called kulalsalafiyeen.com titled, *Naṣīḥah Muḥammad Bāzmūl li-Akhīh Aḥmad al-Jahūl*—with this wording.⁵

¹ zejd.peqin. “[Shaykh Muhammad Baazmool on 'Alee al-Halabee Refutations](#).” Online posting. May 13, 2010. salafitalk.net (accessed May 21, 2010).

² See my comment on this trait of theirs of intentionally omitting an honorific when mentioning the shaikh in my article, [What’s the Deal with OSS?!](#).

³ Muḥammad Jamīl Ḥamāmī. “[Ta’yīd ash-Shaikh Muhammad Bāzmūl li-Akhīh ash-Shaikh Ahmad fimā Intaqadah ‘alā al-Halabī](#).” Online posting. May 13, 2010. sahab.net (accessed May 21, 2010).

⁴ Abū Muqbil Riḍwān bin Muḥammad. “[ash-Shaikh Muḥammad Bāzmūl: Rudūd ash-Shaikh Aḥmad Bāzmūl Tadull ‘alā an al-Halabī Hasal lah Inhirāf ‘an Manhaj as-Salaf](#).” Online posting. May 13, 2010. sahab.net (accessed May 21, 2010).

⁵ ‘Alī bin Muḥammad Abū Haniyyah. “[Misk al-Khitām: Naṣīḥah ash-Shaikh Muhammad Bāzmūl li-Akhīh Aḥmad al-Jahūl](#).” Online posting. April 25, 2010. kulalsalafiyeen.com (accessed May 21, 2010).

‘Alī Abū Haniyyah, a moderator on kulalsalafiyeen.com, has written a post in response to this conversation between Shaikh Muḥammad and the unknown caller translated here. He discusses six

Shaikh:

Yes, good. So yes, a conversation between some of the brothers from Palestine, may Allah reward them with good, and [myself] took place over the phone. They asked me about the subject of Shaikh 'Alī Ḥasan al-Ḥalabī. This matter was at the beginning of the first pieces of writing, in which refutations from my brother, the esteemed Shaikh Aḥmad 'Umar Sâlim Bâzmûl, were produced. I had given advice to my brother, Aḥmad, to not write and enter this subject, leaving the matter to the scholars. When my brother, Aḥmad, wrote, however, and apprised me of the passages he wrote and such, I supported him in them, because I didn't see him criticize anything that wasn't a place of a mistake and wasn't a place of a criticism.

I give great regard to Shaikh 'Alī and his standing. This is what I mentioned to the brother [who asked me] on that tape. In my words, however, I mentioned words the brother didn't mention from me on kulalsalafiyeen.com. That is that I said Shaikh 'Alī is surely in the status of my shaikhs. He is tremendous in my heart, beloved to my heart. The truth is beloved to my heart. So if the truth and the words of my shaikhs oppose each other, then the truth comes before the words of my shaikhs.

I mentioned to him that we should give great regard to Shaikh Rabî' and that we recognize his worth, that he is from the distinguished scholars—rather, he is from the imams of this time in these subjects that he speaks of.

O Shaikh, I do not recognize [... sound cut ...]. I see that if he differed with the truth, then the truth is more deserved of being followed and I don't see for Shaikh 'Alī except that he maintains good manners with Shaikh Rabî' due to the high-standing that Shaikh Rabî' is upon with me, in my soul and in my heart.

I see that the observations that Shaikh Aḥmad, my little brother, wrote about in criticism of Shaikh 'Alī in these issues are academic observations that indicate that a deviation from the methodology of the Righteous Predecessors has occurred for Shaikh 'Alī; and we ask Allah for guidance and forgiveness for us and for him.

Questioner:

O Shaikh, if I spread it, I'll spread it completely, with His permission, exalted is He. May Allah, who there is no god but He, witness that I'll do this and I only say this as a defence of you and the Sunnah and so that the truth will prevail—by Allah, who there is no god except He.

observations he's made regarding its contents, a couple of which will be mentioned in this article, Allah willing. One observation, ironically enough, is regarding the caller shortening the title of 'Alī Abū Haniyyah's post when conveying it to Shaikh Muḥammad, claiming it was the actual wording 'Alī Abū Haniyyah used. See *Tanwîr al-'Uqûl* (full reference to come).

Shaikh:

May Allah reward you with good, because some of the people mention truth—they don't lie—but they don't mention the entire reality.

Questioner:

By Allah, I'll mention it completely, with His permission, exalted is He.

Shaikh:

This brother who is on kulalsalafiyeen.com, due to his virtue and due to my good assumption of him, I answered him with an answer containing a statement that if Shaikh 'Alî recently erred and differed, we are not pleased with this, nor do we agree with it

Questioner:

May Allah bless you, O Shaikh, and may Allah reward you with good.

Shaikh:

... he did not convey these words of mine, but only conveyed my first words.

Questioner:

By Allah, O Shaikh, with His permission, exalted is He, we'll spread it completely, that you're from those who say that Shaikh 'Alî is from our shaikhs and surely, if the truth were with him, we are with him and if he differs with the truth

Shaikh:

... he is from the category of our shaikhs and we see that he has a great virtue over Salafism. I say, however, that in recent times things have emanated from him that differ from the sunnî, salafî methodology. From that are the subjects that the esteemed Shaikh Aḥmad 'Umar Bâzmûl criticized him in

Questioner:

May Allah reward you with the good. May Allah reward you with the good.

Shaikh:

... and I see that it is upon Shaikh 'Alî to maintain good manners with Shaikh Rabî'; and before that, that he maintains good manners with the truth; and before that, that he maintains good manners with the religion and with Allah U; that he is godly to Allah with regards to himself; that he does not

distress us regarding it ... that he does not distress us regarding it. We ask Allah to beautifully return him to the truth.

Questioner:

O Allah, amîn. May Allah reward you with good, O Shaikh, and may Allah heal you. You must forgive us, O Shaikh. By Allah, we are regretful about these words, but by Allah, this only so that the truth will prevail.

Shaikh:

May Allah reward you with good, because, O Shaikh, I say to you that sometimes brothers call me taking part of my words and leaving the other part.

Questioner:

May Allah witness that I only desire to aid the truth [... words not clear ...] for your statement, O Shaikh.

Shaikh:

The praise is Allah's; may Allah grant you success.

Questioner:

May Allah reward you with the good. Thanks, O Shaikh.

Shaikh:

And may He rectify our intents and yours..

Questioner:

O Allah, amîn. May peace be upon you.

While the conversation between the shaikh and this unnamed caller clearly shows what the posters on salafitalk.net want their readers to know, i.e., that Shaikh Muḥammad Bâzmûl agrees with the criticisms his brother, Shaikh Aḥmad, has written against Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan, it's also quite clear that the conversation also contains some pretty relevant things they don't want you to know about. I find it quite ironic and, in a sense, rather amusing, that by virtue of not conveying what's contained in the links posted to their audience, these people do exactly what the shaikh was criticizing the kulalsalafiyeen.com poster (i.e., 'Alî Abū Haniyyah) for, i.e., mentioning some of the shaikh's words, but not mentioning the rest.

What is quite obvious from the shaikh's words is that he holds Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan in high-regard, saying that Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan is beloved to his heart, that he is considered to be among his shaikhs, and that he has done a tremendous service to Salafism.¹ Looking at what the shaikh

¹ 'Alî Abū Haniyyah commented on this saying, "I fear that the exaggerators will consider this counterbalancing (Ar. muwâzanât) from Shaikh Muḥammad, since how can he praise the shaikh [i.e.,

mentions in the conversation, one can easily see that the shaikh has a great amount of love, respect, and concern for Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan. Now, contrast this with these people's belittlement of Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan, omitting the honorific of "shaikh" whenever mentioning his name¹ despite the fact that Shaikh Muḥammad continually refers to him as such. While this in and of itself isn't really a big deal, when one considers the fact that these people will use honorifics while mentioning every other scholar still in their favour, as well as the fact that some have even gone as far as to add honorifics like "the student of knowledge" before names of certain (rather undeserving) individuals,² the slight becomes rather blatant and deliberate.³ And that's without even looking at the fact that some have even gone as far as to spread the ridiculous claim that Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan wasn't a student of Shaikh al-Albânî's,⁴ although the late shaikh, himself?, not only considered him a pupil of his, but also a close friend and companion.⁵

With respect to the deviation that Shaikh Muḥammad alleges has occurred with Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan, one immediately sees that his claim, in and of itself, is pretty broad and leaves one asking a number of important questions due to the fact that he doesn't elaborate with any details. Such general remarks lead one to wonder: what are these things that have come from Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan in recent times and how severe is this supposed deviation that's occurred with him? Do these things fall within the boundaries of permitted deliberation and differing?⁶ If not, are they

Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan] saying, 'we see that he has a great virtue over Salafism,' and at the same time say, 'things have emanated from him that differ from the sunnî, salafî methodology?!' See *Tanwîr al-'Uqûl*.

¹ I previously commented on this known trait of theirs in [What's the Deal with QSS?!](#) on my blog.

² See the various pretentious posts by "yasin3683" on salafitalk.net.

³ The slight is magnified when one considers some of the tremendous praise that some scholars have given Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan, such as Shaikh 'Abdullah al-'Ubailân's referring to him with an even greater honorific: 'Allâmah (see [Shaikh al-'Ubailân On What's Going On Between Shaikhs 'Alî al-Halabî & Ahmad Bâzmûl](#) on my blog), and such as the late Shaikh Ibn 'Uthaimîn's referring to him as an "ocean", i.e., of knowledge.

⁴ abuaaliyah. "[Is Ali Hasan Really a Student of Al-Albnai??](#)" Online posting. March 21, 2010. salafitalk.net (accessed May 21, 2010).

⁵ One of Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan's students named Abū Ṭalḥah 'Umar bin Ibrâhîm bin Ḥasan has written a book answering these claims titled, *al-Jawâb al-'Ilânî 'alâ Man Nafâ Talmadhah Faḍîlah ash-Shaikh 'Alî al-Ḥalabî 'alal-Imâm al-Albânî*, in which he quotes several statements from Shaikh al-Albânî himself, along with many other quotes from scholars in praise of Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan's knowledge, methodology, and creed.

In reality, whether Shaikh 'Alî Ḥasan was a student of Shaikh al-Albânî's or not is of no real consequence as it doesn't really prove anything for or against the shaikh and the correctness of his statements and opinions. All this really serves as is a distraction from the issues of real importance.

⁶ When asked about the differing between Shaikhs 'Alî Ḥasan and Aḥmad, Shaikh 'Abdullah al-'Ubailân said that he hopes "the differing between them falls within the frame of the permissible deliberation with the People of the Sunnah." (See [Shaikh al-'Ubailân On What's Going On Between Shaikhs 'Alî al-Halabî & Ahmad Bâzmûl](#)).

enough to expel him from Salafism and render him a heretic?¹ In addition to these, there are a number of other questions one can ask and comments one can make regarding what the shaikh said, just as 'Alī Abū Haniyyah has done in his response to this conversation, *Tanwīr al-'Uqūl bi Munâqashah Faḍīlah ash-Shaikh Muḥammad Bâzmūl bi Khuṣūṣ Kalâmih al-Maqūl fī "Mukâmalah ma' Majhūl"*.² Out of fear of straying too far away from the point behind this article of mine, I won't expand on those here.

The last thing I want to touch on here is with specific respect to the issue of conveying knowledge and information itself. Out of fairness to 'Alī Abū Haniyyah, who was accused in the conversation of this very thing, it should be mentioned that this only truly becomes blameworthy when the information being left out or hidden is relevant information that is being left out because it's against the one conveying it. In his response, 'Alī Abū Haniyyah comments on the accusation saying,

Firstly, I thank the esteemed shaikh for mentioning me in a good [way], supplicating for me, and defending me against [accusations of] lying; and Allah does not thank anyone who does not thank the people. I do not think that these exaggerators will be pleased with this matter from the shaikh, because of the sparseness of their fairness and the excess of their straying.

Secondly, surely what I didn't mention from the shaikh's words doesn't conflict with what I did mention, at all; it is a fixed matter with every salafī endowed with reason. Is there a salafī who says if the truth conflicts with my shaikh, I give priority to my shaikh?! I don't think this exists except with a group bigotted to some shaikhs, from those who were rendered blind by imitation, found to be helpers of falsehood, and are not pleased with recognizing the mistakes of their shaikhs! So to Allah is the complaint. And when has anyone seen us claiming infallibility for our shaikhs?!

The other matter that I didn't mention, which the esteemed shaikh alluded to, is that Shaikh Rabī is from the scholars of our time. This is repeating a fixed matter not in need of the likes of myself to repeat. The scholar's shaikhs, his peers, his contemporaries, his knowledge, his virtue, and his fruits testify for him and has nothing to do with what I restricted my mention of the conversation to—[a conversation] whose duration was 15 minutes. Certainly, I was only concerned with

¹ See what I mentioned in [Salafism, Do You Really Get It?](#) (pgs. 8-11) regarding someone who has errors that fall outside the boundaries of what the People of the Sunnah consider acceptable despite being upon the correct methodology for the most part.

It's interesting to note that salafitalk.net poster sajid_chauhan_81 has posted a link to the Arabic text (and just like zejdp.peqin, he does so without a translation, summarized or otherwise) of the full statement from Shaikh Muḥammad 'Alī Farkūs that I quoted part of on pg. 10 of *Salafism, Do You Really Get It?* thinking it supports the understanding they're trying to push regarding the difference between creed and methodology, when in reality, what the shaikh says is actually against them. For the full statement from the shaikh, please refer to [More on the Difference Between Creed & Methodology](#) on my blog.

² 'Alī bin Muḥammad Abū Haniyyah. [Tanwīr al-'Uqūl bi Munâqashah Faḍīlah ash-Shaikh Muḥammad Bâzmūl bi Khuṣūṣ Kalâmih al-Maqūl fī "Mukâmalah ma' Majhūl"](#) (accessed May 22, 2010).

the case in point only, i.e., establishing that Shaikh Muḥammad advised his brother, Aḥmad, without a refutation. It was a matter the exaggerators accused me of lying about more than a year ago and I was patient with them and with their accusing [me of] lying—until now at the time of clarification!

Thirdly, it escaped Shaikh Muḥammad, may Allah keep him safe, to also mention that from what I didn't mention from the conversation is that I informed him of 'Addūnah's conversation with Shaikh Rabī', in which the shaikh spoke with non-academic words built upon speculation and delusions from the insignificant ignorant people and the transmission of the bankrupt wretched people, those previously convicted of lying and swindling.¹ They are words that are not accepted, nor bearable regarding the right of our shaikhs. I said to him, "O Shaikh, if you would come upon this conversation and give Shaikh Rabī' advice about these words, which stirs up turmoil and excites the youth." He said to me, "I am not able to give Shaikh Rabī' advice; I take advice from him. We learn from him and we see him as an imam at this time in these issues." Shaikh of Islam had said,

The religion of Islam, however, is certainly completed with two matters. The first of the two is recognition of the virtue of the imams, their rights and their measures, and the leaving of everything that discredits them. The second is [sincere] advice to Allah, glorified is He, to His book, to His messenger, to the imams of the Muslims and their common folk and illustration of what Allah, glorified is He, revealed of the clear evidences and the guidance. There is no inconsistency that Allah, glorified is He, clarified the two categories to whoever's chest was opened by Allah.

And certainly, one of two men are restrained from that: a man ignorant of their measures and their excuses or a man ignorant of the Divine Law and the origins of the rulings.²

So glorified is Allah!³

... and Allah is the one from whom aid is sought. And with that, we'll end here ... for now.

¹ Ar. *tadlīs* – deceit, fraud; swindle.

² *al-Fatāwā al-Kubrā*, vol. 6, pg. 92.

³ *Tanwīr al-'Uqūl bi Munāqashah Faḍīlah ash-Shaikh Muḥammad Bāzmūl bi Khusūṣ Kalāmih al-Maqūl fī "Mukāmalah ma' Majhūl"*.