

Important Principles of Salafiyah for every Salafi to Know

Shaykh Ahmad Ibn Umar Bāzmool

A transcription of the lecture translated by SunnahPublishing.net

Audio Source: <http://sunnahpublishing.net/audio/salafiprinciples.mp3>

With the name of Allaah, the Most-Gracious, the Most-Merciful

All praise is for Allaah, we praise Him, and we seek His Assistance and His Forgiveness. We seek Refuge in Allaah from the evils of ourselves and our bad deeds. Whoever Allaah guides no one can lead astray and whoever He leads astray no one can guide. I bear witness that none has the right to be worshipped in truth except Allaah (alone), and He has no partners. And Muhammad (sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam) is His slave and Messenger. Verily, the most truthful of speech is the Speech of Allaah. And the best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad. The most evil of affairs are those innovated in the religion, every innovated matter (in the deen) is a going astray, and every going astray is in the Fire.

As to proceed, this talk which I will be going over with my brothers from the students of knowledge who are from different Islaamic countries, as an instructional talk, firstly for myself and secondly for my brothers. And after this in shaa Allaah there will be a number of questions. As for this talk with the permission of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, then it is a completion of what we started yesterday which is titled, "That which is obligatory for the Salafi to know from the principles of the Salaf."

So, from the important matters which will rid the Salafis of many problems is to know an important principle and that is the difference between declaring an individual as an innovator and warning against an individual, and when does each occur. This principle will rid the Salafis from many problems. This is because sometimes when you warn against the person they say you declared him an innovator then everyone starts to stand and speak and differ with you, and quarrel with you. The scholars - may Allaah have mercy on them - and the Salaf us-Saleh - may Allaah be pleased with them - and those who tread their path to this day differentiate between deeming a person to be an innovator and warning against a person.

As for tabdee, this is to rule on a person that he has fallen into Bid'ah (innovation) and the obligation of warning from him. As for warning this is not a ruling that a person has fallen into innovation. However, the person is in an opposing stage and is being given advice. Meaning that he has opposed the Manhaj (methodology) and matters which he may be confused about or has been mistaken in and has persisted on his mistake, and this is in the beginning stages when they are warning from this person. And it may be said be careful of being around so and so, and he has to be stayed away from until he repents and he returns to the truth, and until we hear the detailed statements of the Scholars concerning him. Ok. What is the dangerous matter here? The dangerous matter is from different aspects.

The first is the deferring that occurs between the Salafi youth and having al-wala wal-bara regarding this individual. Some see that you have declared him an innovator and spoke ill of him and from there differing occurs. This is a dangerous matter. The second matter is that some youth, and they are on the other side, they think that this person is still in place and is able to be benefited from, no! For verily this person with the opposition he has is in a stage where we stop and stay away from him, so no one can be affected by him. If he repents and leaves what he is upon, and returns to the truth we then return to him. And if he persists upon falsehood then the Scholars rule upon him to be an innovator or the likes. So the person who was warned against is to be stayed away from, especially from the students of knowledge whose feet have not yet been grounded in knowledge, why? This is because in this stage the

person being warned against is between one of two things. The first is that he returns to the truth - and if he does may Allaah reward him. And the second is that he persists upon his falsehood and does not return. Also during this stage he sends into the hearts and minds of the youth unclear proofs and principles, and he roots into them foundations that make them think that he is not an innovator and they see him not to have left the Manhaj. Due to this if the Scholars declare him an innovator after that they won't be pleased because he already planted into their hearts that which is being said of him is not true. Ok, do they leave him? We say, yes. Leave him and stay away, there is nothing better than being safe and sound, and that your religion is safe. Al-Humdulillaah the scholars are present and the Salafi students are widespread. If they cannot be found the Salafi tapes and books are around. Allaah did not attach the Deen into a specific person and the Deen and truth is ongoing with the permission of Allaah. All-Praise and Thanks are for Allaah. It is not related to personalities. Know the truth and you will know its people! Clear?

So, this is a serious principle you have to be aware of. Some people come and say such and such a person has fallen into this and that. Others say that the Scholars have not yet declared him an innovator. Ok, if they have not yet declared him an innovator this means that he is in a stage that either he will accept the truth or deny it. And you may become deceived by him and fall into his plot. Therefore, islamically it is upon you to stay away from him and wait and see what the Scholars say about him. Is he Ok to be returned to and benefited from or to be left? Is this principle clear now? Ok.

Also it is incumbent in this principle just as it has preceded yesterday; it is not to be over zealous and not to attach the truth to personalities. What is (Ali Hasan) al-Halabi? Is he Qur'an, Sunnah, the Salaf us-Saleh? He is none of that! As for if he has guided then this is for his own benefit, and if he goes astray then that's on him because the truth is fixed and does not move. As for your attaching the truth just to Halabi, if he says something you say it, and if he refuses you refuse and you don't make your source of return the Qur'an and Sunnah, this is misguidance. How is this, and Halabi for example, just like you all know fell into the error of inter-faith services, calling for all religions to be one and saying that the middle course Islaam, which the Prophet (sallallaahu 'alayhe wa sallam) has come with is that which gathers the people on the foundations that they are all human beings and not to differ between them or split them. This is the epitome of heresy and disbelief. Even though this false statement Halabi fell into, you still find some, many or all follow him from amongst those who love him and defend him. This confirms for you all what has preceded; that the students of knowledge that have been warned from - and Halabi is not a Scholar - the student of knowledge that has been warned from has to be stayed away from so one won't fall prey to his fitan (trials and tribulations).

Due to this Shaykh (Ahmad bin Yahya) An-Najmee - May Allaah have mercy upon him - what did he say? He said, "These individuals from Sham are defending the people of innovation and the knowledge is not taken from the likes of these people." What he means is that you wait and stop regarding these individuals, they will either return to the truth or you leave them (if they don't). Do not attach you religion and do not attach the truth to the following of personalities.

Also, because of this we have the statement of Ibn Mas'ood - may Allaah be pleased with him - this principle is the same principle we are speaking of. He said, "Whoever is following or taking someone as an example let him follow those who have already died, from those who have not been trialled with tribulations, which are the companions - may Allaah be pleased with them all." Ibn Mas'ood said, "For verily you can't be sure that the one who is living won't go through any trials." This is a principle that was said by Ibn Mas'ood and Ibn Umar - may Allaah be pleased with them both. So, where are the Salafis in applying this statement? Some of them are far from it, some of them attach guidance to a particular person, if he is guided they are guided, if he goes astray they go astray! This is an error. And by this you are sinning and you are responsible before Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. Verily Allaah made for the

truth, people and signs. Just as he made for falsehood, people and signs. And he commanded you to follow the true path and forbade you to follow the path of falsehood. **"And say: This is my straight path, so follow it and do not follow the other paths, for verily it will separate you from His path" [Al-An'aam 6:153]**. This is a counsel and advice from Allaah, just as it is known. The second principle, it is something well known but it has to be repeated and reminded of because we find many of the Salafi youth do not apply it or understand it, and fall unaware of it. So we want to remind. **"And remind, for verily the reminder benefits the believers" [Adh-Dhaariyat 51:55]**. The second principle is that speaking ill of the people of Sunnah is in reality speaking ill of the Sunnah which they carry. And those who speak ill of the people of the Sunnah are misguided innovators. Whoever speaks ill of the people of Sunnah intentionally is a misguided innovator. This principle is well known and established amongst us. However, it has some deficiency in its application amongst many of the youth.

How many of the youth hear those who speak ill of some of the Salafi Scholars, from the likes of Shaykh Ahmad an-Najmee, or Shaykh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee, or Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalee, or Shaykh Rabee al-Madkhalee. They hear these attacks and they remain quiet and they do not say anything. Likewise these attacks maybe in secret and not apparent and he remains quiet and does not do anything. Rather he may also start to mention these things although he knows speaking ill of the Scholars of the Sunnah is speaking ill of the Sunnah itself. And whoever speaks ill of the people of Sunnah intentionally they are a misguided innovator.

Ok, when the Scholars mention that speaking ill of some of the people of the Sunnah or those who carry the Sunnah and defend it, it is in reality attacking the Sunnah itself and it is an innovation. Is this considered to be over zealous? The answer is no because, for example Shaykh Rabee al-Madkhalee; when we speak ill of those who speak ill of him, do we speak ill of those who speak ill of Shaykh Rabee just due to the eyes of Shaykh Rabee al-Madkhalee or due to the lineage of Shaykh Rabee al-Madkhalee, or due to financial benefit? No! It is just that Shaykh Rabee al-Madkhalee, as it is known is a person who is a carrier of the Sunnah and defends it, and refutes the people of innovation, and stood as a thorn in their throats, may Allaah reward him. This is what we deem him and we do not praise anyone above Allaah. So what is incumbent upon us is that we defend him and love him due to his defence and love for the Sunnah. So, the reason why those who speak against those who speak against the likes of these Salafis is the aforementioned matter, not just due to him being who he is. And you all know that al-Halabi, let's take an example, the Salafi youth used to magnify and respect him. However, when he fell into misguidance and innovation, and all of this is dirt, the true Salafis left him and tossed him to the side, refuted him and clarified his misguidance. Ok, when they loved him they had a position and when they had to hate him they had another position. What is the reason? It is because we love for Allaah and we hate for Allaah's sake. And this is a principle in boycotting.

Some people say al-wala wal-bara (enmity and allegiance) does not have anything to do with boycotting; this statement is ignorance and misguidance. For verily the reason for boycotting the innovator is loving and hating for the sake of Allaah. So you hate him for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, just as we love the Salafis and the Salafi Scholars for Allaah, not for them just being them. So it is incumbent to pay attention to this.

Let us give an example, from the attacks on Shaykh Rabee and other than him from the Salafi Scholars. They attack them by saying they are harsh, or saying they don't comprehend and that they just criticise and that they are dictators. Or they say that they are from the people of harshness and they have harshness. So, these types of attacks are attacks on the people of the Sunnah. So, when you both know that there are some people in al-Madeenah and elsewhere who describe Shaykh Rabee that he is harsh, or that he is not rational, or wise, or balanced. And they described other Scholars that they are rational, wise and balanced. This principle is true but that which is intended by it is false. For verily the Scholars categorise those who speak about Jahr wa Ta'deel into three categories. Those who

are easy going, those who are in the middle, and those who are harsh. What is the exact meaning of those who are in the middle? Ok.

It is that the reason *Jahr wa Ta'deel* be an islamically legislated reason and that it be with truth, proofs, and evidences on that issue and mentioning the reason why and that the *Jahr wa Ta'deel* alike be something which is considerable. As for those who are easy going, it is that they deem those who are unknown and criticised to be trustworthy or the likes of this, this is negligence and watering down the truth. As for those who are harsh it is that they criticise without a valid reason, this is harshness. Ok. Now let's come and apply those principles amongst the well known Salafi Scholars. And we have the most outstanding one in this regard, he is spoken ill of and attacked and is intentionally spoken against and that is Shaykh Rabee. This is known. Halabi, Ma'ribi, Aroor, al-Maghrawi, Ar-Ruhayli, so and so; they all go around wanting to see his downfall, falling into the footsteps of the group *Ihyat-Turath* and other than them. Let's come and look at Shaykh Rabee and this answer to a question that came up and it is Shaykh Rabee is referred to being harsh. Let us look at Shaykh Rabee. Firstly, when Shaykh Rabee goes and criticises someone he criticises them along with mentioning the reason. So you O Maghrawi, Ma'ribi and Aroor; Shaykh Rabee criticised you with your own speech and voice and books. And he mentioned you said this and you did this and your affair is this etc. So did he, Shaykh Rabee, come and say Ma'ribi is disparaged and criticised and then we asked why Shaykh Rabee, because I saw him scratch his head, no! Rather he clarified to you the evidence that Ma'ribi said that the *Ikhwaan ul-Muslimeen* and the misguided groups are amongst *Ahl us-Sunnah*! And that the terminology *Salafiyah* is something spacious and he entered into democracy and many misguided matters which are well known. Also he (Ma'ribi) describes the Scholars of the *Sunnah* that they are a case of tomatoes and things like that! Even the *hizbees* did not attribute this to *Ahl us-Sunnah* and this Ma'ribi is attributing this to *Ahl us-Sunnah*. Shaykh Rabee came with proofs and evidences and clarified therefore their (Shaykh Rabee and the Salafi Scholars) speech is based upon proofs.

Secondly, what is the position of the Salafi Scholars regarding refutations by Shaykh Rabee? The answer is they have praised them (i.e. they have praised his refutations of *Ahl ul-Bid'ah*) and said this man is a *Mujahid* and he does not criticise anyone except with explaining the reasons, and he verifies that which was said about the individual. And he does not criticise except that the truth has become apparent to him and he advises before he disparages and refutes. And he is also a signpost and sign of *Jahr wa Ta'deel*, just as Shaykh al-Albaanee described him. So, this is the second thing.

Thirdly, is the Shaykh alone regarding those who he disparages and criticises or do the Scholars agree with him? Come to me with one person whom the Shaykh has criticised and not one person agreed with him, you won't find that. Therefore the Shaykh is not alone in his criticising, rather those Scholars who have opposed the Shaykh after some time, you find them returning to the Shaykh's opinion and them most apparent and well known example here is with Shaykh Al-Albaanee. For indeed some of those who Shaykh Rabee criticised; he - meaning Shaykh Al-Albaanee said regarding that: It is apparent that the Scholars of *Al-Madeenah* & those whom he met i.e. Shaykh Rabee, Shaykh Muhammad ibn Haadee, Shaykh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee, also included amongst them Shaykh an-Najmee, and Shaykh Zayd (al-Madkhalee); because they were all the ones setting out and refuting the people of falsehood. Shaykh Al-Albaanee said it appears the Scholars of *al-Madeenah* are upon the truth regarding those whom they have refuted, although he (Al-Albaanee) saw that in the beginning there was some harshness. And here with Al-Albaanee it is said, the principle that we heard yesterday and it is if the Scholars of the *Sunnah* defend the people of innovation the excuse is given that they don't know the actual state of falsehood and if they did know the actual state they would have clarified it. Therefore Shaykh Al-Albaanee agreed with Shaykh Rabee in those things that he (Shaykh Rabee) clarified.

Fourthly, how many people has Shaykh Rabee actually criticised. Five, ten, twenty, I don't think it goes beyond twenty. Look at the Scholars of the Salaf, they have criticised hundreds and thousands of people. So, you come to Shaykh Rabee who hasn't spoke except against a few individuals over a period of time now. And we ask Allaah to give the Shaykh a long life upon obedience and to bless him in that and bestow upon him good health and well being, and make him a thorn in the throat of the people of innovation. The Shaykh, may Allaah preserve him, has passed 80 years old. In 80 years the Shaykh hasn't criticised except around 20 people and if you say one hundred, even if you say one hundred, did he criticise a lot of people? No, he did not criticise a lot of people. Clear? Likewise, regarding those whom the Shaykh was correct when criticising, for verily we do not know that the Shaykh - may Allaah preserve him - declared a person an innovator or refuted him and the Shaykh was in error doing so. We don't know this from the Shaykh. However, if it happened it is known from the character of the Shaykh that he will apologise and return what he said. So, if it happened Shaykh Rabee is known for returning to that which is correct if he falls into error.

So, that which is intended from this is to be aware of this, be aware! Ok. Why do they say Shaykh Rabee is harsh? Up until the point if you clarify their condition and speak against them, the one who is being criticised, his followers say this is being harsh. (They say) our Shaykh so and so is a good person and Shaykh Rabee is Salafi but he has harshness. Brother you should fear Allaah. The Shaykh (Shaykh Rabee) is of middle-course and is just. Clear? Ok. So, one has to pay attention to this point. The next point or principle: differentiating between the Scholars refutation of falsehood and standing by that refutation of falsehood, and between him refuting him due to jealousy or because they are contemporaries, or out of oppression. The origin is that if a Scholar refutes and clarifies his refutation with evidence then we accept his statement. If he refutes out of jealousy or oppression then these are inner intentions that only Allaah knows. So, our position is that if a Scholar refutes falsehood with an acknowledgeable refutation and the scholars have accepted it, then it is accepted from that which appears to us.

Ok, when it is said that a particular refutation is that of jealousy or because they are contemporaries, or out of oppression? The answer is that the refutation done out of oppression is that a person refutes without a reason and speaks about a person without a reason. So no doubt this is oppression. Ok, for example, a person who speaks ill about a person and warns from him, you ask why? They say, "Just because" or "I'm not feeling him." You're not feeling him! Allaah did not make things evil just based on your intellect. This is oppression. Fear Allaah within yourselves because when it comes to the people's honour if you don't have proofs and evidences that warrant speaking about them then their honour is poison. You can't go near it (i.e. their honour) and you will be responsible for that. So how about the honour of the Scholars? What about the strong students of knowledge? For example, a person comes to us against Shaykh Abdullaah al-Bukhari. Why are you warning from him, what is the reason (we ask)? He does not have a reason (thus) this is oppression. Shaykh al-Bukhari is well known, the Salafi Scholars whom he has sought knowledge from are well known, the praise from the Scholars of him are well known, his books, lectures, classes, and his da'wah to the true Salafi Manhaj is clear. We don't know that he has any opposition to the truth, so speaking ill of him is oppression and some people warn from the Salafis like this! Ok. As for if a person is refuted due to jealousy and envy this becomes clear when the refuter goes overboard in the reasons of criticism. In reality there is no criticism, however a person is just merely speaking. In this case the Scholars reject this type of criticism and say fear Allaah; it appears that you have something against this person. Notice that they clarified that he fell into envy or oppression with proof. Some of the youth when you say to them Shaykh Rabee or Shaykh so and so warned from such and such Shaykh they say to you this is only envy without even hearing what was said and what the proofs are, and they did not hear the Shaykh's words. This is an error!

First of all, if you are from the common folk what is upon you, is to return to the major Scholars. And if you are a student of knowledge it is upon you to ask for proofs and not to reject from the beginning. Is that clear? Ok. The third is the situation with being contemporaries, meaning they are close in age and knowledge. On top of this the Scholar

did not clarify his reasons for the refutation, he is just merely refuting, and here they say they are contemporaries. Look at their closeness in age and knowledge and in addition that there are no proofs along with the refutation. Clear? However, that you come to me with Shaykh Ahmad an-Najmee (may Allaah have mercy on him) who is in his eighties (the Shaykh has now passed away) then you come with al-Halabi and Mashoor, and the Jordanians and you say they are peers are contemporaries! This statement is false. He rejects the truth and does not want it. Where does being contemporaries come in play with these two? When we talk about contemporaries this is what occurs between those who are close in age and in knowledge. Is this clear? Okay. If a major Scholar refutes a small student wrongfully what is this called? Is this called the refutation that occurs between contemporaries? No, this is called oppression and the likes. But you don't say this is due to being contemporaries. So pay attention to this. Someone called me and said, "What is your opinion regarding the differing occurring between the "Scholars" of Jordan and the Scholars of the Kingdom?" I said to him brother you should fear Allaah! The Jordanians are not described as being Scholars. However, they are only described as being students of knowledge. As for the Scholars of the Kingdom (of Saudi Arabia) from the likes of Shaykh Rabee, Shaykh an-Najmee, and Shaykh Zayd (al-Madkhalee) and other than them, they are described as being Scholars due to their age, knowledge and being firmly grounded in it. As for you to come with students of knowledge and say that they are Scholars and compare between them, then this is oppression. Let alone that these individuals (the Jordanians) fell into matters that opposed the Salafi Manhaj. Even if they were major Scholars they are not considered in front of these Scholars to be Scholars. Clear? So you have to be aware of this.

The next principle is that the Scholars are of different levels, ranks, and degrees. What does this principle mean? From the Scholars are those who are exclusively occupied with Fiqh and Hadeeth along with him still being Salafi. And from the Scholars are those who are exclusively occupied with refuting the people of innovations and desires. And from the Scholars are those who busy themselves with the Arabic grammar and laws of inheritance and other things. Ok. So it is incumbent that you know the Scholars and their levels. What do we benefit from this? The answer is that which we benefit from this is that you can't come and oppose between the statement of the Scholar who specialises in Jahr wa Ta'deel and the refutation of the people of innovation, you can't come and reject this Scholar because the other Scholars remain quiet, saying Shaykh Ibn Baaz didn't speak against him, Shaykh Fawzaan did not speak against him, Shaykh Abdul-Azeez Aal us-Shaykh did not speak against so and so. Brother, all of these Scholars are Salafis and there is no doubt about it and they are well known, however these Scholars did not turn their attention to this fitnah. And just because they are quiet does not mean they are in agreement.

Also, we have a well known principle that you cannot attribute something to someone who has not spoken. And another principle and it is that Fardh Kifayah is something which if people undertake that matter the sin falls off the rest of the people. So, the Scholars who have refuted the people of falsehood have sufficed the other Scholars from doing so. And this is based on another principle and the Salafis should remember it, which is that if one Scholar clarifies the mistake of an individual this is sufficient. It is not a condition that two or three or all of the Scholars refute, if his refutation is in truth this is sufficient even if all the Scholars remain quiet. Clear? But you now say but brother such and such a Scholar has not said anything and so and so has not said anything. This is just as if you were saying there is a need for a group of Scholars in order to refute someone, and this statement is false. And this is a khalafee Manhaj, not a Salafi Manhaj. Clear? So this is one scenario that one specialised scholar refutes and the rest remain quiet.

The second scenario is that a specialised, learned Scholar refutes and criticises, however another Scholar not specialising in criticism praises that person or they haven't heard the refutation. Here these two are not opposed or contradicted. If this Scholars' praise occurs without knowing the criticism of the other Scholar; here there is no contradiction because the one who praises did it because what he knows from praiseworthy matters. And the one

who criticises did that because what he knows from blameworthy matters. So don't then come and say I am with such and such Shaykh who praises such and such and I'm not with such and such Shaykh, like Shaykh Rabee because this one praises him and this one criticises him, so I am with the other Shaykh. No! It is incumbent that you know the levels of the Scholars because this one specialises in that field and the others are known among the common folk who are not students of knowledge. So, if a doctor came who specialises in heart surgery and spoke about a particular cure and then another doctor came who was a general practitioner and spoke about curing the heart in another way, the common folk, even the common folk who do not have any knowledge or any Salafiyyah as far as knowing its principles, what will they say? The speech of the doctor who specialises in that will be given precedence. In matter of fact let's leave the common folk; this is the statement of the Scholars. They have a principle which is that the one who is specialised in a particular field his statement is returned to and taken especially when differing occurs.

The third scenario is that a Scholar criticises and another praises and says the statement of the one who criticises us not considered. He says, "Yes, I know so and so criticises however this person is a person of Sunnah." This is what is known as confliction between Jarh and Ta'deel. Ok. And the second scenario includes this, however this is more specific. This is called confliction between Jarh and Ta'deel. What is the Manhaj of the Salaf concerning this? The Manhaj of the Salaf in this is that we look at the criticism as a detailed criticism. It is obligatory upon us that we take the statement and obligatory that we return to it and make it a judge in our affair. Also the Scholar who praised him made a mistake, he is not spoken ill of but he made ijtihaad and was mistaken because of course this Scholar did not praise him out of vain desires. There is some speech of, for example, Shaykh Abdul-Muhsin al-Abaad who came along and praised a person and Shaykh Ahmad an-Najmee and Shaykh Rabee criticised the person. And Shaykh al-Abaad said he is a person of the Sunnah even if so and so criticised them. We look to the two statements, where is the true proofs? Where are the true statements? And then we follow it. Then is Shaykh al-Abaad criticised? No. Shaykh Al-Abaad is an acknowledged Salafi Scholar. It might be then said, Ok was it when Halabi praised Ma'ribi and Shaykh Rabee refuted him and Halabi was spoken against. There is a difference. One day Shaykh al-Abaad praised al-Maghrawi and so did Halabi. Shaykh al-Abaad one day praised him based on what has become clear to him from his own ijtihaad, and he (al-Abaad) is upon the truth and not upon desires. So, the faults that Maghrawi had did not become apparent to Shaykh al-Abaad. However, Halabi knows that Maghrawi makes Takfir and knows the inner things Maghrawi holds (certain deviated opinions) and he participates with al-Maghrawi. And he (Halabi) said I am the most knowledgeable of people concerning him. Therefore the proof has been established against him (Halabi) and the truth has become plain and clear to him. However, he (Halabi) is persistent upon falsehood.

Because of that this is based on another principle. And it is to differentiate between the one who falls into falsehood by mistake and the one who falls into falsehood intentionally. So the one who falls into falsehood by mistake is not criticised. Rather it is clarified to him and he is remained patient upon. But the one who falls into falsehood intentionally and persists after it has been made clear, then he is criticised without making excuses for him. Clear? So here the criticism takes precedence. This is based on a principle which is incumbent to take note of along with that which has preceded. And that is: it is not correct and not permissible in the Salafi Manhaj to make the differing of the Scholars in praising and criticism an excuse to follow falsehood for the one the truth has become clear to. And the application of this principle is that we find some of the Salafi youth follow Ma'ribi and follow those who praise him. You then come and say to him, "O Brother fear Allaah, Ma'ribi was declared to be innovator by the Scholars." He then said, "However, Shaykh so and so said he is a person of the Sunnah and Salafi." Then you say, "Brother Ma'ribi said such and such, is this falsehood or not?" He says, "That is falsehood." Then you say to him, "Were the proofs established against Ma'ribi, and the Scholars refuted him, is this not correct?" So then he says, "Yes, they refuted him." Then you say to him, "It is upon you to leave him." He says, "No, I am following such and such a Scholar who has praised him, this is my excuse." No! So long as you know the truth from falsehood it is not permissible for you to make the differing of the Scholars as your proof as an excuse to follow falsehood, for verily you are sinning if you

follow falsehood while knowing. Is this principle clear now? And it is important and many times it is used by the Salafi youth. One comes to them putting himself forth, so they come to him and ask him so and so is an innovator and so and so praised him. So the person says, "So long as you follow so and so this is your excuse!" You see how he whispers to them. However, with the Salafi Manhaj, no (it is not like this). Did the truth become clear to you? Did you know who the truth was with? Did you search for the truth? Did you return to the Scholars who specialise in that area? Did the one who criticise do it with detail? The affair does not relate to that which is general.

Due to this from the principles of people of falsehood, just as he mentioned confusing the people by making general statements, this is from the principles of the people of falsehood. You have to be aware of them. By making general and unrestricted statements they pass falsehood by you. Is this clear? So, it is incumbent upon the Salafi youth that they pay attention to this principle and to be aware so they do not oppose the Salafi Manhaj that they are treading upon.

The last issue is giving importance to knowledge, learning and returning to the Scholars. The beginner student of knowledge and the one who is not qualified does not put himself forward to make Jahr and Ta'deel. He should not put himself forward in the matters of Jarh and Ta'deel and should not declare people innovators or misguided individuals. This matter is for the Scholars and those students of knowledge who are qualified. Ok, what is my position then? Do I remain quiet? Do I remain silent about Ma'ribi? Do I remain silent about so and so? We say there is a difference. If the Scholars criticise someone and you criticise them by quoting their statements, for example Ma'ribi was criticised by Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalee, Shaykh an-Najmee, Shaykh Rabee, Shaykh Abdullah al-Bukhari and Shaykh Muhammad ibn Haadee; quote their statements but do not start to debate while you are just a student of knowledge. Clarify to them the statements of the Scholars of the Scholars. If they don't accept the statements of the Scholars they won't accept your statements! And that which is dangerous here is that you are a student of knowledge and you may not have all the proofs and evidences and your opponent comes with proofs and confuses you. Where is the justice and where is the fairness? Where is the piety? Where is the fear of Allaah? They will cause you to slip and error and cause the information you have to slip and then you become confused. No, do not enter into debating and this is the reason why the Scholars warn the Salafi youth from talking about Jahr and Ta'deel. It is not that they are warning the youth from relaying the statements of the Scholars regarding criticised individuals. Some people reprimand the Salafi youth due to them relaying the statements of Shaykh Rabee and Shaykh An-Najmee or so and so concerning Ma'ribi, Halabi and this one and that one, and they say, "Brother the Salafi Scholars warn from this." No! They did not warn from conveying the truth and they did not warn from warning against falsehood. However, they warned you O beginner seeker of knowledge and the one who is not qualified to enter into Jahr and ta'deel before you are qualified. They also warn that you precede the Scholars in these affairs and the difference between these two is important and with this I will end this Talk.

May Allaah send peace and salutations on our Prophet Muhammad, his family and all of his companions.