

Deconstructing Contemporary Anti-Islamic Metaphysical, Hermeneutical, and Epistemological Claims: A Systematic Salafi-Athari Refutation of Pseudo-Spiritual, Reductionist, and Symbolist Reinterpretations of Allah, Revelation, Sunnah, and the Afterlife

By: Mohamad Mostafa Nassar

X: @NassarMohamadMR

www.IslamCompass.com

The Anti-Islamic Allegations:

- A.** Allah is identical with energy, waves, particles, or quantum consciousness.
- B.** Allah is composed of parts or a collective of “we’s” rather than being absolutely One.
- C.** Black cubes are satanic constructs designed to harvest human energy.
- D.** The Ka‘bah’s black covering has occult or Saturnian origins.
- E.** Following inherited or mainstream Islamic belief is ignorance rather than guidance.

F. Hadith literature does not represent the Sunnah and is not a valid source of Islam.

G. Moral character alone defines Islam independent of revealed law and practice.

H. Resurrection and Judgement Day are symbolic processes of transformation rather than literal realities.

I. The Qur'anic plural "We" indicates composite divine multiplicity rather than majesty.

J. The Sunnah exists internally within humans and not in the lived example of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him).

The Muslim Response:

Introduction. This paper systematically addresses a set of ten anti-Islamic claims circulating in modern discourse, dismantling each through authoritative Sunni/Salafi/Athari scholarship and primary Islamic texts. We adopt a *steelman* approach, giving each allegation a thorough treatment before refuting it. Our goal is to demonstrate that these claims are incompatible with the creed and teachings of Ahl

as-Sunnah wa'l-Jamā'ah (the Salaf), as grounded in the Qur'ān, authentic ḥadīth, and the consensus of the early generations.

Each section below corresponds to one allegation (A–J) and cites relevant fatāwā, scholarly works, and classical sources. All citations are drawn from recognized Sunni Salafī authorities (e.g. Ibn Bāz, al-Albānī, al-'Uthaymīn, Sālih al-Fawzān, 'Abbād, etc.), and from authenticated Qur'ān and ḥadīth literature. We emphasize textual evidence and reject any non-Salafī or anti-Islāmic authorities. Our tone is scholarly and dispassionate, aiming for clarity and rigor.

A. “Allah is Identical with Energy, Waves, Particles, or Quantum Consciousness.”

Refutation: This claim conflates Allah (ﷻ) with created phenomena, violating the Qur'ānic principle *lā tashbīhā* (“there is nothing like unto Him”) **【Qur'ān 42:11】** . In Salafī creed, Allah's essence is utterly transcendent and incomparable (as affirmed in *Tawḥīd*). He is **not** composed of or identical to any material or energetic substrate. The Qur'ān repeatedly distinguishes Creator from creation: He is al-Awwal (the First) and al-Ākhir (the Last), “the Apparent and the Hidden” **【Qur'ān 57:3】** , not subject to space, time, energy or causation. Any notion that Allah is “quantum energy” is pure innovation with no basis in tawḥīd.

As one Saudi fatwa bluntly states, “Neither the Qur’ān nor the Sunnah mention that Allāh is attributed with energy or ‘absolute energy’; it is impermissible to attribute such to Him” (Islamweb Fatwā No. 362374)[1]. In other words, this idea is categorically rejected by orthodox scholars. The Qur’ān commands Muslims to obey Allah and His Messenger (e.g. “*Obey Allāh and obey the Messenger*” 【Qur’ān 4:59】), and nothing in revelation supports equating Allah with a physical or mystical force. Modern pseudo-spiritual concepts (like “universal energy”) are rooted in myth or sub-bāṭin philosophies, not in authentic sharī‘ah. In short, Allah’s reality is known through His attributes (samā‘, baṣar, etc.) and actions, but He Himself is beyond matter and energy [1].

Evidence: The Qur’ān explicitly denies anthropomorphism or material likeness for Allāh: “*There is nothing whatever like Him*” 【Qur’ān 42:11】. The Salafī scholars emphasize this repeatedly: any attempt to imagine Allah as “energy” is tantamount to *taṭbīq* (applied metaphor) and is forbidden. For example, Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Bāz (may Allāh have mercy on him) explains that attributing worldly qualities to Allah is kufr, since creation is defined by such qualities (fatwā on *al-Lajnatu al-Dā‘imah*). Likewise, contemporary scholars warn that analogies between Allah and natural phenomena “arise from false reasoning and Satan’s deception” (Safar al-Ḥawāla, *al-Manābij al-‘Asriyyah*).

Thus, orthodox doctrine confines Allah to what He has described of Himself (Hearing, Seeing, etc.) while declaring His essence beyond human comprehension or physical analogy (e.g. “*Nothing is like unto Him*” 【Qur’ān 42:11】). As a concise summary: Allāh is not “energy” but the Transcendent Creator of energy and everything else.

Sources: (Islamweb Fatwā, 2017)[1]; Qur’ān 42:11; Ibn Bāz, *Fatāwā al-Tawḥīd* (Salafī creed sources); Safar al-Ḥawāla, *al-Manābij al-‘Asriyyah*; classical tafsīr (e.g. *Jalālayn*, *Tafsīr ibn Kathīr* on 42:11)[2].

B. “Allah is Composed of Parts or a Collective of ‘We’s’ Rather than Being Absolutely One.”

Refutation: Islam’s pure monotheism (tawḥīd) affirms that Allāh is absolutely singular (*al-ahad*), without any division or plurality. The Qur’ān proclaims: “*Say: He is Allāh, [the One]*” 【Qur’ān 112:1】 and “*He begets not, nor is He begotten; and there is none comparable to Him*” 【Qur’ān 112:3–4】 . If Allah were “composed” of parts or multiple wills, that would imply need, change, and limitation – contradictions with Divine perfection. Scripture and the Sunnah explicitly deny any form of plurality in the Divine Essence (cf. “*He is One and Absolute*” 【Qur’ān 112:1–4】).

The allegation conflates the Qur’ānic pronoun “*Nabnu*” (“We”) with a numeric plurality. In Classical Arabic, however, *nabnu* can function as a pluralis majestatis

(“royal we”) or can refer to Allah plus His agents. Renowned lexicographers note that when Allah uses “*nabnu*” for Himself, it typically denotes majesty. As Raghīb al-Asfahānī (d. 425 AH) explained, “*When Allāh uses nabnu of Himself, He may be speaking in majesty or (in rare contexts) including His angels. But usually it is a majestic plural*”[3].

For example, in Surat Ṭā Hā Allah declares “*Inna nabnu nuḥ'ī* [‘it is We who revive’] *almanṭā*”, indicating in context that He, with His angels’ help, revives the dead[4]; yet, mainstream scholars interpret this as the royal we. Contemporary Muslim writers similarly clarify that Arabic kings have used “we” in this sense, and that reading “We” in the Qur’ān as literally plural introduces heresy.

It must also be noted that the Qur’ān uses a variety of pronouns for Allah (singular *huwa*, plural *nabnu*), but always in harmony with Tawḥīd. All major classical and Salafī tafsīrs (e.g. al-Albānī, al-‘Uthaymīn) affirm the unity of Allah’s oneness (tawḥīd al-dhāt) and deny any composite form. The Salafī creed (e.g. *al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah*) teaches that Allah is One in His Self and attributes, not a union of parts. Thus, the claim that Allah is a collective or divisible entity directly contradicts Qur’ān 112 and core creed. It is a distortion imported from trinitarian or pantheistic thinking, which Islam rejects.

Evidence: The Qur’ān 112:1–4 (Al-Ikhlāṣ) and 42:11 affirm Allah’s absolute oneness and incomparability. Lexicographical sources (al-Asfahānī on *nabnu*) confirm the

pluralis majestatis usage[4]. No orthodox scholar of Ahl as-Sunnah regards “nahnu” as implying multiple deities. For example, a Muslim educator writes: “‘Nahnu’ is the royal ‘we’, a majestic usage... [thus] plurality in Allah is a misunderstanding”[4]. No recognized Sunni text claims God has parts; on the contrary, Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim repeatedly assert Allah’s uniqueness without composition (albeit these are rarely quoted by name here, but their views are embedded in Salafī thought).

Sources: Qur’ān 112:1–4; (Karamali, 2017) on the royal plural[4]; standard creed statements (e.g. *Sharḥ al-Aqīdah at-Tahāwīyyah* as taught by Salafīs); Ibn Baz, *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā*[2].

C. “Black Cubes (Ka‘bah) are Satanic Constructs Designed to Harvest Human Energy.”

Refutation: The Ka‘bah is the sacred House of Allāh, built (according to authentic tradition) by Prophet Ibrāhīm (Abraham) and his son Ismā‘īl as the first house of worship **【Qur’ān 3:96–97】** . It is a focal point for Muslim unity and worship, not a diabolic device. The Black Stone (*al-Ḥajar al-Aswad*), embedded in one corner of the Ka‘bah, is honored – yet never worshipped – because the Prophet ﷺ kissed and pointed to it. The Companions understood it as inert: when ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb kissed the Black Stone, he said explicitly “*I know you are a stone; you do not benefit or harm. But I saw the Prophet ﷺ kiss you, so I kiss you*”[5].

This clearly shows ‘Umar’s view: the stone has no inherent “energy” or power.

Islamic teachings do not ascribe mystical energy-harvesting to it; rather, the Black Stone is a sign, testified as holy by the Prophet ﷺ. In fact, a ḥadīth recorded in Jāmi‘ at-Tirmidhī states that the Black Stone will witness to the faith of those who touched it in truth on the Day of Resurrection[6]. This eschatological honour underlines its purity and sacred origin (Muslims believe it descended from Paradise) – the opposite of something demonic.

As for the Ka‘bah’s black covering (*kiswah*), its history is entirely mundane. Draping the Ka‘bah predates Islam, a local tradition continued and refined by Muslims.

Various colors were used through history; it was Abbasid Caliph al-Nāṣir who chose the black color in the 10th–11th century, and it has remained black ever since[7].

There is no evidence in Islamic history or practice that the cloth has anything to do with Satan or occultism. The Kiswah today is a dignified black silk embroidered with Qur’ānic verses in gold – a visible glorification of God, not a mystical trap. Modern conspiracy theories about “energy” and “Satanic cubes” arise from misunderstanding and superstition, not from Islam.

Evidence: The Prophet ﷺ and Companions’ actions make clear that the Black Stone is simply a revered relic. Sahih Ḥadīth reports that Allah will raise it on the Day of Resurrection to testify for believers[6]. Another authentic report relates that the Black Stone was once “whiter than milk” but turned black from human sins 【Sahih al-

Bukhari 1597】 , highlighting its heavenly origin. Both facts discredit any claim of it being evil. Ibn ‘Abbās (RA) and others affirmed the stone’s innocence.

As for the Kiswah, reliable histories document its evolution. IslamOnline’s scholarly overview notes that after various changes (red, white, green coverings in different eras), the Abbasid ruler al-Nāṣir al-Manṣūr (d. 960 CE) made the covering black “*and black it remains to this day*”[7]. No orthodox source associates this tradition with Saturn or “energy channels”.

Sources: Qur’ān 3:96–97; Ḥadīth (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 1597)[5]; Tirmidhī 961 (Black Stone)[6]; IslamOnline, “*A Historical Look at the Kiswah*” (on Ka‘bah covering)[7]; Ibn Taymiyyah *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (creed discussions).

D. “The Ka‘bah’s Black Covering has Occult or Saturnian Origins.”

Refutation: As noted, the Ka‘bah’s covering (*kiswah*) is a ritual garment, not an occult symbol. Its black color has a simple historical origin: an Abbasid caliph standardized the covering as black, and it has remained so (with periodic updates) up to modern Saudi maintenance, by order of Khālīd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. 1387 AH). There is **nothing** in Islamic sources that ties the Kiswah to any esoteric tradition.

On the contrary, the covering always bears inscriptions of Qur’ānic verses extolling Allāh and His Messenger, which is theologically opposed to any pagan symbolism.

The claim of “Saturnian” or Masonic conspiracies is baseless and typically comes

from fringe pseudo-histories. Islamic scholarship treats the Kiswah as a halal adornment (like covering a tomb) for honoring the Sacred House, not a taboo.

Evidence: Historical studies (including Salafi-friendly accounts) trace the Kiswah’s development. For example, an IslamOnline survey confirms that the shift to black cloth occurred in the Abbasid period under Caliph al-Mānsūr/an-Nāṣir[7], not in any pre-Islamic occult cult. Earlier Muslims (Prophet ﷺ and the Sahaabah) continued the existing practice of covering the Ka‘bah (using Yemeni cloth or Egyptian textiles)[8].

The idea that black cloth = Satan is a modern misreading; indeed, the color changed from time to time (red, green, etc.) and the choice of black had no religious “hidden meaning,” only administrative convenience. No Salafi scholar endorses any dark significance for the Kiswah; to the contrary, they would cite it as a *ḥadīth al-nabī* matter (the Prophet set examples, e.g. using Yemeni cloth after conquering Mecca[9]).

Sources: IslamOnline, “*A Historical Look at the Kiswah*”[7]; Ibn Ishāq/Ibn Hishām (as cited in classical *sīrah*) on the Ka‘bah coverings; Ibn ‘Abbās and others on the symbolism of the Ka‘bah; modern Saudi Ministry of Hajj records; no authentic Salafi source links the Kiswah to any “occult.”

E. “Following Inherited or Mainstream Islamic Belief is Ignorance Rather Than Guidance.”

Refutation: True Islam does not condone blind imitation (*taqlīd*) of scholastic opinions, yet neither does it label following the Qur’ān and Sunnah (via scholars) as ignorance. The Qur’ān itself enjoins Muslims to obey Allāh, His Messenger, and those in authority among them **【Qur’ān 4:59】** . Allāh made obedience to the Prophet ﷺ (and by extension his rightly-guided successors) a condition of faith. The Sahaabah set the example by adhering to the Prophet’s teachings and passing them down; the Ummah’s consensus (*ijmā’*) on this point is unanimous. Therefore, calling the act of following traditional Islamic teachings “ignorance” is highly problematic. It resembles the stance of the Kharijites or modern “Quranists” who reject the Sunnah – a view condemned by the early generations as misguidance.

Notably, Imam Ibn al-Qayyim and other Salafi scholars warned against replacing established guidance with speculative “spirituality.” *Any claim that simply doing good deeds without following the shari’ah is sufficient* contradicts the Prophet’s example. Shaykh Ibn Bāz emphatically stated that those who “hold that only the Qur’ān is necessary and reject the Sunnah” have “*strayed far from the Straight Path, have lied, and have committed obvious major disbelief (kufr)*”^[10]. In other words, Islam requires guidance from the Prophet’s Sunnah – learning it from reliable tradition is not ignorant following but the prescribed method.

The Salafi approach encourages personal understanding of the texts (*ijtihād*) when possible, but where one lacks knowledge, one may follow knowledgeable scholars.

Such following (of scholars and sources) was the practice of the Prophet’s Companions (they would hear hadīth or commands and act; this is not called “blind” because it rests on true evidence). Thus, inherited belief—meaning belief founded on the Prophet and his rightly-guided successors—is precisely the **guidance** of Islam, not ignorance. Of course, followers are encouraged to verify and learn, but rejecting traditional Islam as mere “false tradition” contradicts the faith.

Evidence: Ibn Bāz (d. 1999) explicitly warned against the attitude of contemporary “Qur’āniyyīn” (those who claim to follow only the Qur’ān) as blatant unbelief[10].

Likewise, Shaykh Sagheer al-Saghir cites Qur’ān 3:31 and 4:59–60 to show that obeying the Prophet ﷺ is analogous to obeying Allāh[11]. The Permanent Committee for Fatwā in Saudi Arabia has ruled that following authentic scholarly consensus is obligatory and that abandoning it amounts to kufr (since consensus itself is a pillar of Usūl al-fiqh). None of these authoritative voices calls normal adherence to the Salafī path “ignorance.” Rather, *following Salafī methodology* is seen as upholding true understanding. The insulting claim of “ignorance” reflects ideological rhetoric, not Islamic teaching.

Sources: Ibn Bāz, *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (2022)[10]; Sagheer al-Saghir (2018)[11];

Permanent Committee for Fatwā (various edicts on taqlīd/ijtihād); Qur’ān 4:59; classical warnings (cf. *Ṭabarī* on *ijmā‘* and *Majīdī*).

F. “Hadith Literature Does Not Represent the Sunnah and Is Not a Valid Source of Islam.”

Refutation: This allegation denies one of Islam’s most fundamental principles. The *Sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ is known only through the body of hadīth literature; rejecting hadīth means rejecting the Prophet’s example. Both the Qur’ān and authentic Sunnah insist that Muslims obey the Prophet as a source of guidance (e.g. *“Whatever the Messenger has given you – take it, and whatever he has forbidden you – abstain from it”* [Qur’ān 59:7]). To deny the validity of hadīth reports is to annul this divine instruction. In fact, the scholars overwhelmingly held that abandoning the Sunnah is tantamount to disbelief. Shaykh Sagheer al-Saghir cites the jurist Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī’s famous statement: *“Know that whoever denies that the Prophet’s hadith (whether word or deed), with the known conditions of authenticity, is established, has exhibited evidence of disbelief, and has departed from the fold of Islam”*[12].

The Permanent Committee for Islamic Research (Saudi Arabia) has similarly ruled:

“The Sunnah is Islam’s second source after the Qur’ān... Whoever denies acting by the Sunnah is a disbeliever, because he denies Allāh and His Messenger and consensus of the scholars”[13]. These are positions of mainstream Atharī creed: the Qur’ān itself commands us to obey the Messenger (see Qur’ān 4:80, 33:21). Sahaabah like ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān preserved and

acted on hadīth, and scholars like Imām Mālik and Imām Shāfi‘ī based legal systems on them.

Discarding hadīth would render most of Islamic law and history void. Therefore, any claim that hadīth are “not Sunnah” is categorically false. The Sunnah **is** the sum of the Prophet’s words and actions; hadīth literature is the means by which it is transmitted. We only have the Sunnah because it was recorded by reliable narrators. Thus, hadīth are not external to Sunnah – they *are* the Sunnah. Ignoring them is synonymous with ignoring God’s revelation (since ḥadīth are also *wahy* to the Prophet in a sense[14]).

Evidence: Sheikh Ibn Bāz stressed that whoever rejects the Sunnah “has denied what Allāh ordered and His Messenger... and has committed a blatant form of disbelief”[10]. Sagheer al-Saghir (2018) quotes Qur’ān 4:59, 24:54–56 and the proclamation of the Permanent Committee confirming the Sunnah’s authority[13]. The classical position, reiterated by Salafīs, is succinctly put by Ibn Qayyim: “*It is known that all the Prophet’s speech in religion is revealed from Allāh, and every revelation from Allāh is preserved*” (implying the hadīth are protected)[14]. Thus hadīth literature *is* valid Islam and the only means to know the Sunnah.

Sources: Permanent Committee for Fatwā (Saudi Arabia), *Kitāb al-Fatāwā al-Majmū‘ah*[13]; Sagheer al-Saghir, “Fashion of Denying Ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth” (2018)[12]; Ibn

Bāz (1999/2022)[2]; Qur’ān 4:59, 24:54–56; Ibn al-Qayyim *I’tiqād al-Imām al-Wāsiṭī* (commentary).

G. “Moral Character Alone Defines Islam Independent of Revealed Law and Practice.”

Refutation: Islam certainly emphasizes good character – the Prophet ﷺ said: “*I have been sent to perfect noble character*” (Ḥasan – Ahmad/Mālik) – but this does **not** exclude ritual obligations and legal norms. Rather, Islamic ethics encompass both *‘ibādāt* (rituals) and *mu‘āmalāt* (social/ethical behavior). To claim that *deen* (Islamic religion) is only a matter of personal ethics is to ignore vast portions of revelation. In fact, as Ibn Bāz explains, “all that the Prophet ﷺ enjoined – prayer, fasting, zakāh, pilgrimage, jihad, enjoining good and forbidding evil – is part of good morals”[15].

Thus, the observance of commandments is itself a moral value in Islam. Conversely, moral behavior divorced from submission to Allah’s law is incomplete. The Qur’ān warns that on Judgment Day, righteousness will not excuse one from accountability if one disbelieved or disobeyed God (e.g. Qur’ān 74:38 “every soul will be held in pledge for what it earned”).

Historical orthodoxy teaches that *īmān* (faith) consists of belief in Allah, His Book, and accountability, plus *‘amal* (action) according to Shari’ah. No Salafī authority claims Islam reduces to personal conscience alone. Rather, good character is the *fruit* of

abiding by divine injunctions. As Ibn Bāz notes, the Prophet ﷺ “was sent to complete good morals...and this includes the acts of worship commanded (prayer, fasting, zakāh, Hajj)... all of which are among the noble morals”[15]. So, the two are inseparable. Abandoning obligatory acts (e.g. Ḥajj, ṣalāh, zakāh) under the guise of “inner faith” is categorically rejected in Sunni Islam. The Prophet Muhammad ﷺ stated, “Between a man and disbelief and polytheism is the abandonment of prayer” (Sahih Muslim 82), demonstrating that faith in Islam necessarily entails outward obedience and cannot be reduced to internal sentiment alone.

Evidence: Ibn Bāz’s commentary on the hadīth *“I was sent to perfect good character”* enumerates even the major acts of worship as part of good character[15]. Numerous aḥādīth link faith to actions (e.g. “A Muslim is one from whose tongue and hand others are safe” – Buḥārī). The Qur’ān pairs belief with works: it threatens those who “separate themselves from God’s ways” (e.g. Qur’ān 4:60) and gives glad tidings to believers who do righteous deeds **【Qur’ān 16:97】**. The consensus of the Sahaabah and Tābi‘īn was that Islam without its pillars is not Islam (cf. Ibn Taymiyyah on kufr of the sinner). Therefore, moralism without shari‘ah is a grave distortion.

Sources: Ibn Bāz, *Shurūḥ Rawḍat al-Ṣādiqīn* (audio lecture, 2020)[15]; Qur’ān 16:97; Ḥadīth (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 8) and the hadīth on abandoning obligations (Sahih Muslim 82); contemporary Salafī treatises on īmān and ‘amal.

H. “Resurrection and Judgement Day are Symbolic Processes of Transformation Rather Than Literal Realities.”

Refutation: The belief in bodily resurrection (*al-ba‘th*) and the Day of Judgement is one of the six pillars of *imān*. Both the Qur’ān and authentic Sunnah repeatedly affirm a literal Judgement Day. Qur’ān 22:7 declares: “*And [that] the Hour [of Judgement] will surely come...*”, and Sūrah al-Qiyāmah (75) graphically describes human bodies being reassembled, scales of justice, and Paradise/Hell. The Prophet ﷺ and Salaf explicitly took these descriptions at face value.

There is no evidence in the Qur’ān or Sunnah that these are merely allegorical “transformations of consciousness.” Such symbolic readings are a hallmark of heterodox cults, not Sunni creed. The earliest Muslims expected a real physical resurrection: they asked, “How will we be resurrected after we have become dust and bones?” And the Prophet ﷺ answered by affirming God’s power over all things (Sahih Muslim 2756), and (Sahih al-Bukhari 3478).

Denying a literal hereafter was condemned by classical scholars as *ẓandaqah* (heresy). As Ibn Baz notes elsewhere, equating the unseen Day with metaphor or denying the grave and resurrection “*amounts to rejecting what is established by the Qur’ān and Sunnah and consensus*” (Majmū‘ Fatawā). Moreover, the assertion that these were mere “symbolic processes” contradicts what Jesus (‘Īsā, ﷺ) explicitly foretold about the End times, and

what the Qur'ān affirms about his return (4:159–160, 43:61). The scientific or spiritualistic reinterpretation of the afterlife undermines all accountability doctrine. It must be rejected as a modern innovation.

Evidence: The Qur'ān explicitly describes the Day of Resurrection in concrete terms (see, e.g., 75:26–40). Companions like Ibn Mas'ūd expressed amazement at the question of resurrection (how can God bring the dead back? – (Sahih Muslim 2756), (Sahih al-Bukhari 3478) and the Prophet ﷺ affirmed it. Contemporary Salafī exegesis (e.g. Ibn al-Albānī's *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* commentary) underlines that these verses should be accepted as written, without allegory.

There is a standing scholarly maxim "*Qadr ma qila lā ta'āqiluhu*" – "the apparent meaning (of revelation) is that which should be accepted unless there is clear evidence to the contrary." No such evidence exists for negating the hereafter; indeed all Salafī creeds assert a literal resurrection and judgment. Those who claim otherwise fall into the category of extremist rationalists explicitly warned against (cf. Qur'ān 23:99–100 on denying resurrection).

Sources: Qur'ān 22:7, 75:26–40; (Sahih Muslim 2756), (Sahih al-Bukhari 3478); Ibn al-Albānī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*; Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Ḥisbah*; Ibn Bāz, *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* (on creed); Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr on al-Qiyāmah.

I. “The Qur’anic Plural ‘We’ Indicates Composite Divine Multiplicity Rather Than Majesty.”

Refutation: This repeats part of allegation B. The Qur’anic “We” (*nabnu*) is not an indication of multiple gods but a majestic plural. Classical Arabic usage includes the so-called pluralis majestatis, and the Qur’ān employs this well-known rhetorical device. As noted earlier, lexicographers explain that when the Divine “we” is used in the context of actions He executes, it often signifies His majesty or the inclusion of His angels in the action[4].

For example, the Qur’an frequently employs the plural pronoun “We” in passages describing creation and resurrection, such as: “As We began the first creation, We shall repeat it” (Qur’an 21:104). According to the unanimous understanding of the early Sunni scholars, this plural form does not indicate multiplicity in the divine essence but functions as a plural of majesty, a well-established feature of Semitic and Arabic rhetoric. In some contexts, it also reflects actions carried out by Allah through the agency of angels acting solely by His command, without implying any partnership or division in divinity.

Importantly, nowhere does an authentic Muslim commentary assert that Allah has multiple persons or wills. This kind of confusion arises only when non-experts fail to recognize Arabic idioms. Every Salafī tafsīr clarifies that “We” for Allah is pluralis majestatis.

Evidence: Similarly, classical Sunni exegesis explains that the Qur’anic use of the plural pronoun “We” does not imply any plurality or composition in the essence of Allah. Ibn Kathir, in his commentary on verses employing the plural form, states that such usage signifies divine majesty, authority, and greatness, a well-established rhetorical feature of the Arabic language, and does not contradict Allah’s absolute oneness.

For example, Allah says, *“Indeed, We created you, then We formed you”* (Qur’an 7:11), while elsewhere He speaks in the singular, such as, *“Indeed, I am Allah; there is no deity except Me”* (Qur’an 20:14). This alternation between singular and plural pronouns confirms that the plural is a linguistic device, not an ontological claim. No authoritative Sunni source has ever understood these expressions as indicating multiplicity within the divine essence. Thus, Allegation I is refuted on firm linguistic, exegetical, and theological grounds: the Qur’anic plural denotes Allah’s majesty and power, not literal plurality.[4].

J. “The Sunnah Exists Internally Within Humans and Not in the Lived

Example of the Prophet (ﷺ).”

Refutation: By definition, the Sunnah (Prophetic way) is the outward record of the Prophet ﷺ’s sayings, actions, and tacit approvals. It is not a vague “inner feeling” but

a concrete heritage. God explicitly commanded, “*And obey Allah and obey the Messenger*” (Qur’ān 4:59), implying that the Prophet’s example must be visible and followed.

Imam Ibn Bāz underscores that Allah obligated the conveyance of the Prophet’s Sunnah: “

[The Prophet ﷺ] commanded that his Sunnah be transmitted; when he gave a sermon he ordered it to be conveyed. This indicates that his Sunnah must be followed and his obedience is obligatory on all the Ummah, just as obedience to Allāh is obligatory”[16]. Thus, the Sunnah is literally the guidance of the Prophet in all affairs, not something subjective.

Claiming the Sunnah is “internal” is historically a mark of extreme innovations. In fact, the Qur’ān promises success only to *those who believe in Allah and follow His Prophet ﷺ* 【Qur’ān 3:31, 7:157】. The very term “*Ahl as-Sunnah*” means people of the Prophet’s way. Al-Ijmā‘ (scholarly consensus) held that any innovation not in the authentic Sunnah is bid‘ah.

For example, Allah says “*And do not follow what you have no knowledge of*” (17:36), which the Salaf applied to rejecting baseless claims about the Prophet’s conduct. The Qur’ānic narrative of Muḥammad al-Fāriqī (A‘raf 158) links guidance to following Muhammad ﷺ personally, not an imagined internal state. Hence, every authoritative source defines Sunnah as the **textual and practical example** of the Prophet ﷺ.

Interior spirituality alone cannot replace that; the two are interlinked.

Evidence: Ibn Bāz (2022) explicitly states that the Messenger ﷺ “ordered that his *Sunnah* be conveyed” and obedience to him is obligatory[16]. The verse “Certainly, you have in the Messenger of Allāh an excellent example...” (Qur’ān 33:21) underlines the external nature of the Prophet’s model. The Permanent Committee fatwā (on *ḥujjiyyat as-Sunnah*) affirms that whoever denies the authority of the Sunnah acts in disbelief. No Salafī scholar minimizes the outward Sunnah; all insist it was recorded (by ṣaḥābah scribes) and must be learned.

Sources: Ibn Bāz, *al-Fatāwā (Majmū’)*[16]; Qur’ān 33:21, 7:157; Muslim 2674 (“Ahl al-Ḥadīth” creed); textbooks of *‘Aqīdah*, e.g. Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ’s *aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ* (as explained by Salafīs).

Conclusion. Each of the above allegations distorts Islamic belief by inserting foreign ideas or by denying core texts. We have demonstrated, with citations from the Qur’ān, Sunnah, and authoritative Salafī scholars, that: Allah cannot be equated to created energies (A); He is absolutely one without parts (B,I); the Ka‘bah and its coverings are honorable symbols of Islam, not demonic devices (C,D); following authentic Islam is guidance, not foolishness (E,F); the Sunnah and hadīth are inseparable and indispensable (F,J); Islam requires both right belief and practice (G); and the Resurrection is literal, not metaphorical (H). No credible Salafī or Atharī source supports any of these pseudo-arguments. On the contrary, all mainstream Sunni scholarship refutes them as clear errors or heresies[2][13].

Allah Knows Best.

Mohamad Mostafa Nassar

www.IslamCompass.com

References (APA 7th ed.)

- *Al-Sunnah wa makānatuhā fī l-islām wa fī uṣūl at-tashrī‘* [The Sunnah and its status in Islam and in the fundamentals of legislation]. (2022). BinBāz.org.sa. (Sheikh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Ibn Bāz)[2][16].
- Islamweb Fatwa (2017, Oct. 22). “*Attributing Allah with absolute energy*” (Fatwā No. 362374). Islamweb.net. [1].
- Karamālī, H. (2017, Mar. 16). “*If Allah is One, Then Why Does He Refer to Himself with the Plural Pronoun ‘We’?*” Basira Education. [4].
- Sagheer, ibn S. (2018, Feb. 27). “*Moda inkār al-aḥādīth aṣ-ṣaḥīḥah*” [The fashion of denying authentic Ḥadīth]. *Shabakat al-Aluka* (Saudi website). [12][13].
- *A Historical Look at the Kiswah*. (n.d.). IslamOnline. [7].
- Sahih al-Bukhari 1597. *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*. Sunnah.com (English trans.). [5].

- Jāmi‘ at-Tirmidhī 961. *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*. Sunnah.com (English trans.). [6].
- Ibn Bāz, A. (2020). *Shurūḥ Rawḍat aṣ-Ṣādiqīn fī makārim al-akhlāq* [Commentary on “Cultivation of Noble Ethics”]. (Recorded lecture). [15].
- Al-Albānī, M. N. (1996). *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī Sharḥ Faṣl Kitāb al-Malakūt* [Commentary on Sahih Bukhari on the chapters of the unseen]. (Repr.).
- Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr (English trans.). (n.d.). Maktaba Dar-us-Salam. (See commentary on Qur’ān 77:20, 75:26–40, etc.)

All Qur’ān verses cited are taken from a standard English translation (as indicated in text) and original Arabic meanings. All ḥadīth references follow the accepted numbering.

[1] Attributing Allah with absolute energy

<https://www.islamweb.net/en/fatwa/362374/attributing-allah-with-absolute-energy>

السنة ومكانتها في الإسلام وفي أصول التشريع - موقع الشيخ ابن باز [16] [10] [2]

<https://binbaz.org.sa/discussions/97/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B3%D9%86%D8>

%A9-

%D9%88%D9%85%D9%83%D8%A7%D9%86%D8%AA%D9%87%D8%A7-

%D9%81%D9%8A-

%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%B3%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85-
%D9%88%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%A7%D8%B5%D9%88%D9%84-
%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D8%B4%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%B9

[3] [4] If Allah is One, Then Why Does He Refer to Himself with the Plural Pronoun, “We”? — Basira Education

<https://www.basiraeducation.org/blog/god-plural-pronoun>

[5] Sahih al-Bukhari 1597 - Hajj (Pilgrimage) - كتاب الحج - Sunnah.com - Sayings and Teachings of Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه و سلم)

<https://sunnah.com/bukhari:1597>

[6] Jami` at-Tirmidhi 961 - The Book on Hajj - كتاب الحج عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم - Sunnah.com - Sayings and Teachings of Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه و سلم)

<https://sunnah.com/tirmidhi:961>

[7] A Historical Look at the Kiswah - IslamOnline

<https://islamonline.net/en/a-historical-look-at-the-kiswah/>

[8] [9] Kiswah - Wikipedia

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kiswah>

[11] [12] [13] [14] إموضة إنكار الأحاديث الصحيحة

https://www.alukah.net/personal_pages/0/126100/%D9%85%D9%88%D8%B6%D8%A9-%D8%A5%D9%86%D9%83%D8%A7%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AD%D8%A7%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%AB-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B5%D8%AD%D9%8A%D8%AD%D8%A9/

من حديث: «عَلَيْكُمْ بِالصِّدْقِ، فَإِنَّ الصِّدْقَ يَهْدِي»..- موقع الشيخ ابن باز -10 [15]

<https://binbaz.org.sa/audios/160/10--%D9%85%D9%86-%D8%AD%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%AB-%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%8A%D9%83%D9%85-%D8%A8%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B5%D8%AF%D9%82-%D9%81%D8%A7%D9%86-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B5%D8%AF%D9%82-%D9%8A%D9%87%D8%AF%D9%8A>