



**TAMING WILD AND HAUGHTY CLAIMS AGAINST
IMAAM AHMAD IBN HANBAL: AFRAAZ BAKSH**

PREPARED ON BEHALF OF CONCERNED SALAFIYYEEN EVERYWHERE

VERSION 1.0

Said Afraaz Baksh, "...and let's not feel that now we have come to terms and now we can say, "Probably Afraaz is against Shaykh Rabee'." Probably such and such, for *wallaahi* I said to Shaykh Basheer in front of the brothers I'm scared to make statements in Toronto, I'm scared to make statements here. I don't have knowledge but of the *waaqi'*, because I'm scared it goes back to Madeenah and the next thing I'm hearing on the internet "*Huwa daallun muddil.*" That Shaykh Rabee' might be saying, "He is such and such." So in this fitnah here, you have to be very, very careful of what we do."

Said Afraaz Baksh, "Let's look at Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Hanbal... We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah* but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the '*Ulamaa'* can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlus-Sunnah* in aspects of '*Aqeedah.*'"

Author: TROID Editorial Staff

Source: www.troid.org

Taming Wild and Haughty Claims Against Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal

Prepared on behalf of concerned Salafees everywhere

THE ORIGINAL POISON THAT EMANATED FROM AFRAAZ:

Said Afraaz Baksh – in revilement of the Imaam of *Ahlu-Sunnah* – “Let’s look at Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Hanbal... We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlu-Sunnah*, but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the ‘*Ulamaa*’ can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlu-Sunnah* in aspects of ‘*Aqeedah*.’”¹

This was the epitome of Afraaz Baksh’s revilement of the Scholars of *Ahlu-Sunnah*, since the other Scholar of *Ahlu-Sunnah* whom Afraaz loves to revile and defame at every opportunity he can afford is none other than the Imaam of *al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel*: al-’Allamah Rabee’ Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee.²

¹ Taken from the notorious meeting (September 1999) between the brothers of the *da’wah* centre and the champions of Masjid Khaalid Ibnul-Waleed (Basheer Shill, Afraaz Baksh, Abuu Bakr al-Ittihaadee and Yahyaa Ibn ‘Aadil Ibraaheem) in their quest to discourage the *Salafiiyyeen* from contacting the likes of Shaykh Rabee’ Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee and other Scholars of *Ahlu-Sunnah*. **NOTE:** This is a direct audible quote from Baksh himself, the grammatical errors belong to him. He speaks with broken English as anyone who has seen his book would have noticed.

² **BENEFIT - Evidence that Afraaz Baksh Reviles the Imaam of al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel, Imaam Rabee’ Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee:** [1]: From Aboo Sumayyah Anwar Dupuis who said that Afraaz said to him that Shaykh Rabee’ got many good *shuyookh* kicked out of al-Madeenah. Afraaz also said that Shaykh Rabee’ was kicked out of al-Madeenah by the Scholars because he would not cease to refute people. Afraaz also told our brother Anwar that Muhammad Mukhtaar ash-Shanqeetee publically opposed Shaykh Rabee’ in al-Madeenah and said to him, ‘Who put you in charge of *al-jarh wat-ta’deel*? There are *qudaat* (judges) here?’

[2]: Said Afraaz Baksh in the TROID/KBW meeting tapes, “Please brothers why don’t we phone Shaykh ‘Uthaymeen - *hafidhahullaah*? And Shaykh ‘Ubaylaan? So many ‘*ulamaa*’ from Riyaad that we cannot imagine there are so many ‘*ulamaa*’ in the Najd in Qaseem area. Why don’t we phone them and why don’t we find out about it, but the understanding that we’re given and this is where I have difficulty in understanding the first person is al-Madeenah Shaykh Rabee’ al-Madkhalee - *hafidhahullaah*. First person to phone is Shaykh Rabee.” This is Afraaz complaining because the brothers referred to Shaykh Rabee’ for the issue of Aboo Muflisah al-Hizbee of East Orange. [TROID/KBW meeting tapes]

[3]: Continues Afraaz Baksh in his attacks upon Shaykh Rabee’, “Because if you go and you phone Shaykh Rabee and I phone for example Shaykh ‘Abdul-Muhsin and another one phone another ‘aalim and it goes like that, we have conflicting views. Because I’m saying this is that, if I were able to present, I’m just saying this and I know it’s on tape, if I were able to present the issue of Aboo Muslimah from (to) Shaykh Rabee, probably it can be a different issue and a *fatwaa* today.” [TROID/KBW meeting tapes]

[4]: Sputters Afraaz in his lame attempts to discredit the Imaam of *al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel*, “I’m saying it! If I were to go with Shaykh Rabee and sit with him and say, “Shaykh this is the issue in North America, this is the dynamics of the *da’wah* over here, what is your *fatwaa*?” And the Shaykh will listen and he can give me a *fatwaa* that will be opposite to the *fatwaa* that we are hearing now.”

[5]: “**Aboo Islaam Haroon Cole:** But we’re asking the ‘*ulamaa*’ who are in charge of this. (i.e. *al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel*) Who are in charge of this! You know, instead Shaykh Rabee’, and everyone will agree in this room he’s in charge of that.

As for Imaam Ahmad and his rank in al-Islam – which Afraaz has sought to defile – then let the *Sunnee* who cares for His Religion refer to the following *aathaar* of the *Salaf*:

Aboo Haatim said to his son, “If you see one who loves Ahmad, then know that he is a person of the *Sunnah*.”³

Ja’far Ibn Muhammad said, “If you see a man loving the *Ahlul-Hadeeth*, such as Yahyaa Ibn Sa’eed and ‘Abdur-Rahmaan Ibn Mahdee and Ahmad Ibn Hanbal and Ishaq Ibn Raahawayh,” and he mentioned some other, “then he is upon the *Sunnah*, and whoever opposes them, then he is an innovator.”⁴ Qutaybah Ibn Sa’eed said, “When you see a man

Afraz Baksh: (Interrupts) I don’t agree with that. I don’t agree...

...

Afraz Baksh: (Interrupts) I don’t agree with you that Shaykh Rabee alone...

...

Afraz Baksh: in *jarh*...

Aboo Islaam Haroon Cole: Generally, He’s not in charge? Okay in what then? I stand corrected. Who’s in charge of it then? And who’s above him and we’ll go to that person?

Afraz Baksh: (Interrupts) Ya akhee, let’s make it clear, let’s take *Mujma’al-Fiqhiyyah Buhoothul-Fiqhiyyah* in Riyaad. Why don’t we address the issue from the *Lajnatud-Daa’imah ‘Ulamaa’* from Riyaad? Let’s ask them the issue and Shaykh Rabee’s part of it. Why don’t we take that issue, take *Lajnatul-Fiqhiyyah* in Misr (Egypt)? And take so many other groups of *‘Ulamaa’* and have them decide in an issue. Then when we come with it we’ll say indeed Aboo Muslimah *daal*, we have to stay away from it akhee. We can’t deal with you, because all of these *‘Ulamaa’* are saying it. But when you take one from itself, how can we do it?” [TROID/KBW meeting tapes]

[6]: From our noble elder *Salafee* brother, Aboo Uways ‘Abdullaah Ahmad who attended a meeting with Afraaz Baksh at Masjid Khaalid Ibnul-Waleed. Here, Afraaz was asked to make clear his position towards Shaykh Rabee’. So Afraaz said that the University of al-Madeenah consisted of *Qutbiyyeen* and *Salafiyyeen*, yet everyone worked together. Then Shaykh Rabee’ came and caused a split between the *Salafiyyeen* and the *Qutbiyyeen*. And Afraaz also mentioned that the students of Shaykh Rabee’ are very harsh, and they view *Salafiyyah* to be merely wearing a *thawb* above your ankles and growing beards.

[7]: Afraaz admits to people feeling he may harbour ill feelings for Shaykh Rabee’, and he admits to hiding what he truly feels, “and let’s not feel that now we have come to terms and now we can say, “Probably Afraaz is against Shaykh Rabee.” Probably such and such, for *wallaahi* I said to Shaykh Basheer in front of the brothers I’m scared to make statements in Toronto, I’m scared to make statements here. I don’t have knowledge but of the *waaqi’*, because I’m scared it goes back to Madeenah and the next thing I’m hearing on the internet “*Huwa dallun muddil*.” That Shaykh Rabee’ might be saying, “He is such and such.” So in this *fitnah* here, you have to be very, very careful of what we do.” [TROID/KBW meeting tapes]

³ Refer to *Siyar A’laamun-Nubalaa’* (11/198).

⁴ Refer to *Sharaf Ashaabul-Hadeeth* (2/35).

loving *Ahlul-Hadeeth*, then know that he is upon the *Sunnah*, and whoever opposes this, then know that he is an innovator.”⁵

’Alee Ibnul-Madeene said, ‘I heard ’Abdur-Rahmaan Ibn Mahdee say, ‘Ibn ’Awn is a test for the people of al-Basrah. If you see a person loving him, then incline and be secure with him. For the people of Koofah, Maalik Ibn Mighwal and Zaa’idah Ibn Qudaamah are a test. If you see a man loving them, then seek his goodness. And for the people of Shaam, al-Awazaa’ee and Aboo Ishaq al-Fazaaree are a test. And for the people of the *Hijjaz*, Maalik Ibn Anas.”⁶ And Ibn Mahdee said, “When you see a person from Shaam loving al-Awazaa’ee and Aboo Ishaq al-Fazaaree, then he is a person of the *Sunnah*.”⁷

Ahmad Ibn Yoonus narrates from Sufyaan ath-Thawree who said, “Test the people of Mawsul by Mu’aafee Ibn ’Imraan.”⁸ Imaam al-Barbahaaree (d.329H) said, ‘To set up trials in Islaam is an innovation. As for today, people should be tested for the *Sunnah*, because of his statement, ‘This is the knowledge of the Religion, so look to whom you take your Religion from...”⁹ Ahmad Ibn Zaheer said, “I heard Ahmad Ibn ’Abdullaah Ibn Yoonus saying, “Test the people of Mawsul with Mu’aafee Ibn ’Imraan. If they love him, then they are *Ahlus-Sunnah*, and if they hate him, then they are people of innovation – just as the people of Koofah are to be tested by Yahyaa.”¹⁰

So upon seeing the likes of this hazardous speech against the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah*, by Afraaz, the youth of *Ahlus-Sunnah* in the city of Toronto asked a question to one of the Scholars of *Sunnah* and *Salafiyah* in our time, namely al’Allaamah Zayd Ibn Muhammad Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee – *hafidhahullaahu ta’aalaa*. The question and the answer of the Shaykh went as follows:

[Q]: “There is a *hizbee* man here in Canada who says that Imaam Ahmad had many errors in *’aqeedah*. And this person says that I am not in need of saying this, since the Scholars of Islaam have already said this beforehand about his *’aqeedah*. So is this correct yaa Shaykh?”

[A]: “This is incorrect according to all of the Scholars of the Muslims, because Imaam Ahmad was called the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah*. So how can it be said concerning his *’aqeedah* that it has problems? Rather, the *Salaf* used to say that Allaah honoured this Religion through two men: through Abee Bakr on the day of apostasy and through Imaam Ahmad on the day of the trial. That is to say, the trial about the speech concerning the creation of the *Qur’aan*. So Imaam Ahmad was an Imaam of the *Sunnah*, the *’aqeedah* and the *manhaj*, in worship, the signs of worship and manners and dealings. So he is an Imaam and an example. **So due to this, the man who claims and fabricates**

⁵ Refer to *Shi’aar Ashaabul-Hadeeth* (p. 7) of al-Haakim.

⁶ Related by al-Laalikaa’ee (1/62).

⁷ Related by al-Haakim in *al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel* (1/217).

⁸ Related by Ibn Hajar in *Tahdheeb-Tahdheeb* (10/180)

⁹ *Sharhus-Sunnah* (no. 152)

¹⁰ Related by al-Laalikaa’ee (1/66)

this lie upon Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, then it is upon him to clarify what he is saying. Since, the books of Imaam Ahmad are present and his *masaa'il* (detailed written rulings) have been recorded and his book, *as-Sunnah*, has been published. And his book is called *Kitaabus-Sunnah*, he has a book called *Kitaabus-Sunnah*, and his son has a book called *Kitaabus-Sunnah*. **So it is upon him to show us something of error from that, yet he will never be able to do so. And without that, all of this is empty boasting.”**

Thus came the refutation upon the falsehood of Afraaz's desire in his revilement upon the Imaam of *Ahlu-Sunnah*, Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal. Now, on Friday, April 19th Afraaz ascended the *minbar* (his favourite place to attack *Ahlu-Sunnah* from) and tried to defend his speech against Imaam Ahmad (whilst trying to beguile the common-folk into thinking that he was retracting his words):

AFRAAZ'S COMMENTS IN RETRACTION/DEFENCE OF HIS ORIGINAL POISON:

Said Afraaz Baksh in trying to confuse the masses concerning his position towards Imaam Ahmad, “We say these words because it has become known and it has become widespread that there are statements that are being said irresponsibly and they are statements that has been propagated and disseminated without proper evidence and at the same time without proper reconciliation of what supposed to be made public.

And we say in this regard that is these days it has become known that one of the first and foremost are probably most relevant and suitable place to embark upon a *naseehah* this *Khutbatul-Oolaa* this the reconciliation, hoping that a retraction, *taraaju'* hoping that there can be proper understanding prevail (?) and we say this, this is a disease in regards to our times, it is a disease in regards to our time that is the internet, for the internet if it is not used properly it becomes a *fitnah*, similarly for the television, if it is not used properly it becomes *fitnah* and it becomes a source of *fitnah* in our homes. Similarly we're saying the internet becomes a *fitnah* if it is abused and misused and this is what has been said that there are the likes of people who does not revered Imaam Ahmed Ibn Hanbal. Who have said he is out of the fold of al-Islam or rather he is not regarded from *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* and from amongst those who it has been or for what it has been said that Afraaz has been saying that and propagating it and we wish to clarify to you and specifically (word unintelligible) and to the *Ummah* generally and to those who have heard those who have been conveying it, those whom it was conveyed to and those who have not taken the time to verify and those who have not taken the time to confirm and we say for everyone who believes and who has the slightest doubt and has that understanding that Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal is not from *Ahlu-Sunnah faa hadhaa khata'* for this is an error, for this is a mistake, for this is not the position of our Imaam.

For whatever has been said and we say to our people that *shabaab judud fil-Islam* that the ones who are newly into the *deen*, the one's who are into the *deen* a few years, they are the ones who are causing issues that they would not able to comprehend. They do not have the necessary tools to understand *Usool Ahlu-Sunnah* but is defending and causing *fitnah*

amongst the people of the *Sunnah* and we say in this regard that whatever has been said *fa hadhaa* for this is not the *'aqeedah* of Afraaz for this is not the position of myself, for this is not the understanding of Ahmed Ibn Hanbal in the likes of the *deen* for he is *Imaamunaa*, as Ishaq bn Raahawayh *rahmatullaahi 'alayhi* who said, “Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, *Imaamunaa* – he is our Imaam.” Ibn Qutaybah *radiyallaahu ta'aalaa 'anhu rahmatullaahi 'alayhi* said, “He is *Imaamud-Dunyaa*” – That is the Imaam for the *Dunyaa*, he is *Ahlus-Sunnah* when there was no other with him. That these few words, we should elaborate more and make it more evident to our people who are aware of it and I will say the *naseehah* to those who are not aware of it do not delve and be part of it for it will just distract you from your *'ibaadaat*, distract you from building *ukhuwwatul-emaaniyyah*, it will just distract you from the things that you would not have much benefit derived from but at the same time who has been involved in it, it will be made clear very soon and it will be known and those who are behind of it they shall be exposed by the will of Allaah *subhaanahu wa ta'aalaa*.”

A BREAKDOWN OF AFRAAZ'S BOLD STATEMENTS IN DEFENCE OF HIS ORIGINAL SPEECH AGAINST IMAAM AHMAD IBN HANBAL:

Said Afraaz Baksh, “We say these words because it has become known and it has become widespread that there are statements that are being said irresponsibly and they are statements that has been propagated and disseminated without proper evidence and at the same time without proper reconciliation of what supposed to be made public.

COMMENTS: Firstly, we apologize to the readers – since Afraaz is too proud or ignorant to do so – for the horrendous grammatical errors and overall butchering of the English language in this small passage. This is only due to Afraaz's extreme lack of proper education in all areas of worldly life as well as the Religion of Islaam. As for Afraaz's statement, “We say these words because it has become known and it has become widespread that there are statements that are being said irresponsibly and they are statements that has been propagated and disseminated without proper evidence...” then the statement that Afraaz is referring to here is his own. Afraaz said, “Let's look at Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Hanbal... We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah* but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the *'Ulamaa'* can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlus-Sunnah* in aspects of *'Aqeedah*.” So what can be more irresponsible and without evidence than this? Who is Afraaz to criticize Imaam Ahmad? In fact, one finds it puzzling that Afraaz would defend the likes of Aboo Muflihah al-Hizbee and turn around and attack the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah*? Afraaz continues, “...and at the same time without proper reconciliation of what supposed to be made public.” Let it be known that Afraaz Baksh himself allowed his own comments to be taped at the infamous meeting between TROID and the Somali mosque: Khaalid Ibnul-Waleed.

Continued Baksh, “And we say in this regard that is these days it has become known that one of the first and foremost are probably most relevant and suitable place to embark upon

a *naseehah* this *Khutbatul-Oolaa* this the reconciliation, hoping that a retraction, *taraaju'* hoping that there can be proper understanding prevail (?) and we say this..."

COMMENTS: This unintelligible tract from the Baksh seems to indicate that he is being forced into a retraction for his statement, "Let's look at Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Hanbal... We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlu-Sunnah* but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the '*Ulamaa*' can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlu-Sunnah* in aspects of '*Aqeedah*." However, as Afraaz has made it clear, he not only refuses to retract this statement in defence of Aboo Muflishah by attacking Imaam Ahmad, he will not retract it even though the Scholar of *Salafiyyah*, al-'Allaamah Zayd Ibn Muhammad Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee has spoken against him.

Rambled Baksh, "...this is a disease in regards to our times, it is a disease in regards to our time that is the internet, for the internet if it is not used properly it becomes a *fitnah*, similarly for the television, if it is not used properly it becomes *fitnah* and it becomes a source of *fitnah* in our homes."

COMMENTS: Talk about the pot calling the kettle black! Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan - *hafidhahullaah* – said, "Allaah - the Majestic, the Most High - orders us to verify any news that reaches us concerning a group or party from amongst the Muslims, when an evil news reaches us which necessitates fighting or opposing this group. Allaah - the Majestic, the Most High - orders us not to be hasty and rush into this affair, until we have verified the matter. Allaah the - the Most Perfect – said,

"O you who believe! When a wicked person comes to you with some news, ascertain and verify it, lest you harm someone in ignorance and then afterwards have regret for what you have done." [Sooratul-Hujuraat 49:6]

Meaning: if some news reaches you about a group or party from amongst the people, concerning an action they have done, which deserves to be fought against, then do not be hasty about the matter, nor announce war against them, nor attack them - until you have verified the authenticity of the report."¹¹

Imaam Muslim related in the introduction to his *Saheeh* (no. 5), Aboo Hurayrah (*radiyallaahu 'anhu*) states that the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) said, "It is enough to render a man a liar that he relates everything he hears."

Shaykh 'Alee Hasan al-Halabee said, "The *daa'ee* (caller) must be careful in everything, particularly in regards to what he hears from people, or what he reads in books. So it is an obligation upon him to check and verify everything which reaches his ears or eyes, before spreading it and circulating it amongst the people. His carefulness will be increased with regards to two cases: **Firstly:** When what is being conveyed to him is connected to the

¹¹ *Wujoobut-Tathabbut fil-Akhbaar wa Ihtiraamil-'Ulamaa'* (p. 22-23)

Religion and the *Sharee'ah*, such as something being quoted as a *hadeeth*, or a *fiqh* ruling, and its like. **Secondly:** If someone reports something bad about a person, or an evil word from someone. He must check its correctness, carefully find out the reality and what is correct, and not hasten to transmit it and add it to the stream of news!"¹²

So why did Afraaz not fear Allaah and hold his evil tongue from spitting poison to the *Salafees* against Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal? Who is more deserving of this advise than Afraaz himself?

Imaam an-Nawawee (d.676H) - *rahimahullaah* - said, "Know that every person must safeguard his tongue from speaking, except that speech in which there is *maslahah* (benefit). Whenever speaking and abandoning speech are of equal benefit, then the *Sunnah* is to remain silent. For indeed speech which is permissible sometimes leads to that which is *haraam* (prohibited) or *makrooh* (detested). Indeed this happens in most cases, or is a preponderant habit - and there is no better substitute for safety. Al-Bukhaaree relates in his *Saheeh* (11/308) as does Muslim in his *Saheeh* (no. 47), from Aboo Hurayrah - *radiyallaahu 'anhu* - that the Prophet (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) said, "Whosoever believes in Allaah and the Last Day should either speak good or keep silent." The authenticity of this *hadeeth* has been agreed upon, and in it is a clear text that a person must not speak unless what he intends to say is good and that the benefit of it is clear to him. However, if he is in doubt as to whether or not there will be any clear benefit, then he must first reflect and consider. If he is in doubt, then he does not speak until the benefit of doing so becomes clear."

Shaykh 'Abdullaah al-Ghunaymaan - *hafidhahullaah* - said, "It is obligatory upon all those who speak about an affair from the affairs of the Religion, that they do so purely for the sake of Allaah, sincerely for the truth. And that they overcome their soul and strive against following their desires, not inclining towards worldly matters, such as love of being praised, seeking fame and reputation, gaining a large following, and other such matters. So one who seeks to gain any of this, will only gain the vanities of this world."

This is the problem that Afraaz al-Baksh has fallen into. He is speaking about the affairs of the *Salafiyyeen*, rather he is speaking about the Imaams of the *Salafiyyeen* past and present - without any knowledge, respect or shyness.

Continued al-Baksh, "Similarly we're saying the internet becomes a *fitnah* if it is abused and misused and this is what has been said that there are the likes of people who does not revered Imaam Ahmed Ibn Hanbal. Who have said he is out of the fold of al-Islaam or rather he is not regarded from *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* and from amongst those who it has been or for what it has been said that Afraaz has been saying that and propagating it and we wish to clarify to you and specifically sitting and to the *Ummah* generally and to those who have heard those who have been conveying it, those whom it was conveyed to and those who have not taken the time to verify and those who have not taken the time to

¹² *Arba'oon Hadeethan fid-Da'wah wad-Du'aat* (p. 63)

confirm and we say for everyone who believes and who has the slightest doubt and has that understanding that Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal is not from *Ahlu-Sunnah faa hadhaa khata'* for this is an error, for this is a mistake, for this is not the position of our Imaam.”

COMMENTS: Watch closely – O *Sunnee* – to see how a skilled politician manages to side-step the entire issue in a few simple nonsensical words. Afraaz begins by reminding his dumbfounded audience about the dangers of misusing the internet – an issue which has nothing to do with what Afraaz is trying to defend. As for ‘propagating’ that Afraaz has spoken against Imaam Ahmad, then no one has done this. Rather, it was Afraaz himself who spoke against Imaam Ahmad, and it was Afraaz who did not take the time to verify the position of Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal in Islaam and it was Afraaz who said that Imaam Ahmad went away from *Ahlu-Sunnah* in matters of ‘*aqeedah*. Said Afraaz, “Let’s look at Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Hanbal... We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlu-Sunnah* but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the ‘*Ulamaa* can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlu-Sunnah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah*.” So who is being more irresponsible than Afraaz? And who is not verifying the affairs before speaking except Afraaz?

As for his statement, “...we say for everyone who believes and who has the slightest doubt and has that understanding that Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal is not from *Ahlu-Sunnah faa hadhaa khata'* for this is an error, for this is a mistake, for this is not the position of our Imaam.” Then this is another example of Afraaz behaving in an irresponsible manner, since no one has said that Afraaz claimed that Imaam Ahmad was outside of the *Ahlu-Sunnah walJamaa'ah*. Rather, we quoted Afraaz as saying that Imaam Ahmad “has went away from *Ahlu-Sunnah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah*.” This is something that Afraaz has failed to address. It is upon him to mention to us where Imaam Ahmad went away from *Ahlu-Sunnah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah* and which aspects he ‘went away’ in.

THE 'AR'OOREE SEMBLANCE:

Shaykh Saalih al-Fawzaan was asked, “He (‘Adnaan ‘Ar’oor) said, ‘Why is Imaam Ahmad not reproached for his judging the one who abandons Prayer as a disbeliever and yet Sayyid Qutb is reproached merely because some of these expressions occurred from him (i.e. his *takfeer* of Muslim societies).’ So we say: This one performed *takfeer* of the Muslim societies (i.e. Sayid Qutb), and yet Imaam Ahmad – *rahimahullaah* – is not reproached despite his judgment of *kufir* against all these societies [meaning that the majority of them do not pray]. So what is your comment upon this?”

He answered, “Imaam Ahmad is a scholar who knows the evidences and the manner of extracting proof from them and Sayyid Qutb is an ignoramus who has no knowledge or cognizance and neither does he have any evidences for what he says. Hence, equating between Imaam Ahmad and Sayyid Qutb is injustice (because Imaam Ahmad has many evidences from the Book and the *Sunnah* for the one who deliberately abandons the Prayer

whereas Sayyid does not have a single piece of evidence for his *takfeer* of the Muslims in general. Rather the evidences are in opposition to what he says).”

He was then asked, “Likewise he (‘Adnaan ‘Ar’oor) says, “I do not know of anyone who has spoken about the affairs of *manhaj* in the manner that Sayyid Qutb has spoken of them. And he is correct in the vast majority of what he has written.” He (‘Ar’oor) was asked about this statement of his and he replied, “By the word *minhaaj* here I mean the issues of reform, elections and assassinations. And by “in his time” I mean the Fifties.”

So al’Allamah Saalih Ibn Fawzaan replied, “He (‘Ar’oor) does not know because he is ignorant. As for us, then we know – and all praise is due to Allaah – that the scholars both prior to and after Sayyid Qutb, opposed him.”¹³

As for Afraaz, then he says, “Let’s look at Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Hanbal... We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah* but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the ‘*Ulamaa* can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlus-Sunnah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah*.”

So just as ‘Ar’oor would never admit to speaking ill of Imaam Ahmad in his statement above, Afraaz will not admit to having reviled Imaam Ahmad in his statement. In the beginning of his statement, Afraaz says, “We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah*...” So the subject was never Afraaz taking Imaam Ahmad out of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah*. Rather, the point of contention came in the latter part of his statement, “but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the ‘*Ulamaa* can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlus-Sunnah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah*.” So Afraaz must explain: [i] where did Imaam Ahmad go away from *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah*; [ii] Afraaz must name the Scholars before him whom he claims have agreed with him in this statement. If Afraaz cannot do this, then his statement is merely ‘empty boasting’ as Shaykh Zayd Ibn Muhammad al-Madkhalee – *hafidhahullaah* – pointed out.

So when Afraaz says, “...and we say in this regard that whatever has been said *fa hadhaa* for this is not the ‘*aqeedah* of Afraaz for this is not the position of myself, for this is not the understanding of Ahmed Ibn Hanbal in the likes of the *deen*...” then this is empty lip-service once again, may Allaah guide Afraaz retract his erroneous statements clearly and not try to beguile the innocent *Salafiyyeen*.

Concludes Baksh, “They do not have the necessary tools to understand *Usool Ahlus-Sunnah* but is defending and causing *fitnah* amongst the people of the *Sunnah* and we say in this regard that it will just distract you from the things that you would not have much benefit derived from but at the same time who has been involved in it, it will be made clear very

¹³ From the Cassette: *Aqwaalul-‘Ulamaa’ Fee Ibtal Qawaa’id wa Maqaalaat ‘Adnaan ‘Ar’oor*.

soon and it will be known and those who are behind of it they shall be exposed by the will of Allaah *subhaanahu wa ta'aalaa*.”

COMMENTS: We say that this is cowardice on Afraaz’s part. Since, the tape from Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalee is now available around the world *wa lillaahil-hamd*. And everyone knows that it was TROID that documented the statement of Afraaz on tape – by Afraaz’s own permission – and it was the brothers at TROID who then related this statement to al-’Allaamah Zayd al-Madkhalee. And it was Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalee who refuted the futility of Afraaz’s statement. So if Afraaz truly believes that he is upon the truth in this affair, then let him come out and reply back to the those involved (the brothers at TROID and Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalee), or else let him admit that he is in the wrong and repent for his atrocity.

CONCLUSION:

Afraaz said, “Let’s look at Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Hanbal... We revere him and we defend him; he is the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah* but how many times you can prove him, I am not to prove him, the ‘*Ulamaa* can prove him that he (Imaam Ahmad) has went away from *Ahlus-Sunnah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah*.”

This erroneous statement was refuted by the ‘Allaamah Zayd Ibn Muhammad al-Madkhalee, where he said, “This is incorrect according to all of the Scholars of the Muslims, because Imaam Ahmad was called the Imaam of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah*.” And he said, “**So due to this, the man who claims and fabricates this lie upon Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, then it is upon him to clarify what he is saying.**” And he said, “**So it is upon him to show us something of error from that, yet he will never be able to do so. And without that, all of this is empty boasting.**” So it is upon Afraaz to explain: [i] where did Imaam Ahmad go away from *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah* in aspects of ‘*aqeedah*; [ii] Afraaz must name the Scholars before him whom he claims have agreed with him in this statement. If Afraaz cannot do this, then his statement is merely ‘empty boasting’ as Shaykh Zayd Ibn Muhammad al-Madkhalee – *hafidhahullaah* – pointed out.