

Wahhabis Fitna Exposed

This text is a detailed and well-referenced reply to the booklet “What is Shi’aism?” which has been printed in Nairobi and distributed throughout East Africa by the Wahhabis, in order to spread discord. It has been written not to hurt the feelings of anyone; but to differentiate fact from fiction, and to clear the air against Shiaism.

Author(s): Allamah Sayyid Sa'eed Akhtar Rizvi

Publisher(s): Bilal Muslim Mission of Tanzania

Table of Contents

About The Book	4
Preface	5
Note	6
This is Shi'ism	7
Meaning & Origin Of Shi'ism.....	7
The Meaning of Shi'a.....	7
The Origin of Shi'ism	7
The Origin of the Name	9
The First Shi'ias	10
Hadith Ath-Thaqalayn	10
Fundamental Belief of Shi'a Ithna-'Ashariya.....	13
Tawheed	14
'Adl	14
Nubuwwat	14
Imamat	15
Qiyamat	15
Status Of Muhammad And His Progeny	15
Al-Hashawiyah Wahhabiya	17
Notes	18
A Glance at the Booklet "What is Shi'aism?"	21
Infallibility of the Imams	22
Sunni Belief About The Prophets' Ismat.....	22
Shah Waliullah, Shah 'Abdu'l-'Aziz, Muhyiddin Ibn Al-'Arabi And Others Believe In Ismat Of The 12 Imams.....	24
Finality of Prophethood.....	27
Notes	28
Tahrif	30
Some Examples of the Wahhabi Writer's Crass Ignorance.....	30
The Shi'ah Belief	31
Shi'a View	34
Sunni Traditions	36
Sunnis' View.....	37
Notes	38
Hadith	40
Golden Link.....	41
Notes	44
Bada'	45
The Sacrifice Of Prophet Isma'il	45
Tawrah Given To Prophet Musa	46
Notes	49
Sahaba (Companions)	50
Notes	54
Fatwas.....	55
Notes	55
Taqiyah	57
From the Holy Qur'an	57
From Ahadith	60

Notes	62
Epilogue.....	63
Notes	67

About The Book

The first edition of this book proved very popular and all copies were out in record time. Ayatullah Lutfullah Safi Gulpaygani and other scholars highly appreciated the book. The Muslim Foundation (NJ) reprinted its First USA edition in 1994 from New Jersey, USA, and Ansarian Publications published it in 1996 from Qum, Iran.

It has been also translated in Kiswahili and published by the Mission.

This work is fortunately written by one of the most learned, experienced and authentic authors of our time, Allamah Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi. It has been written not to hurt the feelings of anyone; but to differentiate fact from fiction, and to clear the air against Shiaism. We are reprinting it without prejudice or hatred and without any apologies.

Bilal Muslim Mission of Tanzania

Preface

My attention has been drawn to a booklet “What is Shi’aism?” which has been printed in Nairobi and distributed throughout East Africa by the Wahhabis. The main purpose of such publications is to sow seeds of discord and disunity among the Muslims in East Africa and elsewhere. The Shi’a community is well-aware of this motive; and we had not wanted to glorify such rags by writing their reply.

The Wahhabis take their order from the Saudi family who in their turn are controlled by the White House in Washington; and as everybody knows, it is the declared policy of Washington and its satellites that Islam is their enemy No.1. Naturally they want to destroy Islam by all possible means; and unfortunately, Khalids, Fahds, Mubaraks and their ilk are dancing to their tunes.

We feel that replying to such trash would be playing in the hands of those enemies of Islam. And it was this feeling that had kept us silent for such a long time. But now we have reached a stage where silence is misinterpreted as weakness. Therefore, a few short comments on the said booklet will not be out of order.

Another thing which had prevented us from replying was the blindness of these writers. They never look in the Shi’a books; they just go on lapping what their ancestors have vomited; and then they transfer in on paper, thinking that they have conquered the Everest. Hundreds, if not thousands, of replies have been given to their books, but these writers never look into them. And the fallacy is further compounded when a writer is as ignorant as the author of the booklet under review, a writer of unknown identity and origin. No torture can be greater for a student of religion than to be forced to talk with such an ignorant man. However, with much reluctance I have decided to undergo this torture, and,

“I will only complain of my grief and sorrow to Allah.”¹

The booklet, “What is Shi’aism?” is written in a haphazard manner, and to follow its sequence would have resulted in annoying repetitions.

In this reply, I have tackled all its main points in as much an un-emotional way as possible, ignoring the abusive language which its writer has used for the Shi’as. Only those whose proofs are weak try to compensate for that weakness with abusing their opposite party.

In the beginning I have included one of my old articles, “Meaning and origin of Shi’aism”, and a few important chapters which describe in short the fundamental belief and faith of the Shi’a Ithna ‘Asharis. It will help the readers to compare the truth with the baseless accusations of the unknown author of the Wahhabi booklet.

Before touching the subjects of the said booklet, let me make it clear that I have written for those who are in search of Truth, with open minds, without any bias or preconceived ideas. I am not writing for those whose logic runs as follows:

1. To curse the Sahabah (companions of the Prophet, s.a.w) is Kufr and anyone indulging in it is Kafir.
2. Amir Mu’awiyah began cursing Amiru ‘l-Mu’mineen ‘Ali (the cousin and son-in-law and companion of the Prophet s.a.w, and the fourth among

the Sunnis' Khulafa al-Rashidin), in the Khutbas of Friday and 'Idayn, and this cursing continued for more than 90 years throughout the Islamic empire from Sindh to Spain and from Africa to Turkistan.

3. Therefore, Mu'awiyah was a sincere believer and a most honoured companion and Khalifah of the Prophet, (S).

Such people should better not read this book.

I pray to Allah Subhanahu wa Ta'ala to make this book a light for the guidance of the Muslim ummah in these dark days.

Bihaqqi Muhammadin wa 'alihi 't-tahireen.

Dar es Salaam

24th September, 1993

Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi

Note

1. Qur'an, 12:86

This is Shi'ism

Meaning & Origin Of Shi'ism

The Shi'a school of thought has been depicted by many non-Muslim writers as a "heretical sect" of Islam as opposed to the "orthodox" Islam. Thus implying that Shi'ism is a later deviation from Islam. Is this really true or just a labelling campaign to discredit Shi'ism? Here is given documented proof from the Sunni sources that Shi'ism is actually the original Islam.

The Meaning of Shi'a

The word "Shi'a - شيعه" is derived from Arabic word at-tashayyu' التشييعا which means "to follow") According to major dictionaries like al-Qamûs and Lisanu 'l-'Arab, the friends and followers of a person are his Shi'a. According to Taju 'l-'urus, a group of persons showing unanimity over an issue may be called "Shi'a". This word is equally used for singular and plural as well as for masculine and feminine genders.

In the Qur'an it has been used for the followers of the Prophets of Allah:

In the story of Musa (a.s) it says:

هَذَا مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ وَهَذَا مِنْ عَدُوِّهِ فَاسْتَعَاثَهُ الَّذِي مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ عَلَى الَّذِي مِنْ عَدُوِّهِ

This was from his (i.e. Musa's) followers (Shi'a) and that from his enemies ('aduww). And he who was of his Shi'a asked him for his help against him who was of his enemies ('aduww).¹

In the story of Nuh (a.s) it says:

وَإِنَّ مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ لِبِرَاهِيمَ

And, verily, of his Shi'a is Ibrahim.²

Arabic dictionaries, after giving the literal meaning of the word, Shi'a, usually add: "This name is generally used for those who love and follow 'Ali and the people of his house, and it has become their proper name".³

Shaykh al-Mufid (d 413 A.H./1022 C.E.) has explained that when the word Shi'a is used with the definite article "al" (al-Shi'a = the Shi'a) it only means "the group which follows 'Ali (blessings of Allah be upon him) with love and the belief that he was the Imam after the Prophet (s.a.w.w) without any gap..."⁴

In short, the Shi'a got this name because they follow 'Ali and his sinless progeny, and reject the claims of others to the office of Imamate (leadership after the Prophet). As will be explained later, it was the Prophet himself who gave this name to the followers of 'Ali.

The Origin of Shi'ism

The origin of Shi'ism is the same as that of Islam.

The main difference between the Sunnis and the Shi'as is about the successor ship of the Prophet of Islam. The Sunnis believe that Abu Bakr was the first successor; the Shi'as believe that 'Ali was the first rightful successor. When a non-biased scholar studies the declarations of the Prophet (s.a.w.w) as recorded by the Sunni scholars in their commentaries of the Qur'an (tafsir), and traditions of the Prophet (ahadith), biographies and

history, he has to admit that it was the Prophet (s.a.w.w) himself who was the originator of Shi'ism.

The first open declaration of the prophethood was the very occasion when the first declaration of the caliphate of 'Ali (a.s) was made. The occasion is known as the "Feast of the Clan". The relevant paragraphs are quoted here from the Ta'rikh of at-Tabari:

'Ali said: "When the verse 'And warn thy clan of near kindred'⁵ was revealed to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.w), he called me and ordered me to prepare one sa' (about 3 kg.) of food and invite the descendants of 'Abdu 'l-Muttalib, so that he could talk to them. They were about forty persons, among them his uncles Abu Talib, Hamzah, 'Abbas and Abu Lahab. Then the Messenger of Allah delivered a lecture saying:

'O Sons of 'Abdu 'l-Muttalib! I know no man in all Arabia who ever brought to his people anything better than which I have brought to you. I have brought to you the good of this world and the hereafter. And Allah (may He be exalted) has commanded me to call you to it. Who, therefore, among you will help me in this matter, on the condition that he would be my brother, my Wasiy (heir) and my Khalifah (successor) among you?'"

'Ali continues the narration: "Nobody came forward; so I said (though I was the youngest in age):

'I, O Prophet of Allah! shall be your helper in this (task).' So the Prophet put his hand on my neck and said: 'Verily, he is my brother, my Wasiy (heir) and my Khalifah (successor) among you. Listen to him and obey him.' The assembly stood up laughing and telling Abu Talib that Muhammad has ordered him to listen to his son and obey him".⁶

This was in the beginning.

In the last months of his life, the Prophet (s.a.w.w) declared at a place called Khumm, between Mecca and Medinah, that 'Ali was his successor and master of the Muslims. This event has been recorded by numerous Sunni scholars. Imam Ahmad bin Shu'ayb an-Nasa'i (d. 303 A.H./915-16 CE.) has narrated this event through several chains of narrators in his al-Khasa'is, one of which is as follows:

Abu't-Tufayl said that Zayd bin Aqram said, "When the Prophet returned from the last pilgrimage, and stayed at the pond (Ghadir) of Khumm, he ordered the place to be swept. Then he said: 'It is as though I have been called (back by God, meaning that death is soon approaching) and I have accepted that call. And I am leaving among you two weighty, precious things, one of them is greater than the other: the Book of Allah and my descendants, my family-members. So look out how you deal with them after me because they will not separate from each other until they come to me at the fountain (of kawthar, on the Day of Judgement). I am the master (wali) of every believer'. Saying this, he took the hand of 'Ali (Allah be pleased with him) and said, 'Whomsoever's master I am, this ('Ali) is his master. O Allah! Love the person who loves 'Ali, and be the enemy of one who has enmity towards him".

Abu't-Tufayl says, "I asked Zayd, 'Did you hear it from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.w)?' He said, 'There was no one in the oasis but saw him

with his eyes and heard him with his ears,””⁷ This tradition is known as “the tradition of two precious things”.

In the same book, Imam an-Nasa’i quotes another similar hadith from Zayd bin Aqram which contains these words from the Prophet: “Don’t I have more authority on every believer than his own self?” They replied, “Surely, we bear witness that thou hast more authority upon every believer than his own self”. The Prophet then said, “So, verily, he whose master (mawla) I am, this is his Master (mawla).” Saying this he took the hand of ‘Ali.⁸ This tradition is known as “the tradition of mastership”.

The traditions of “two precious things” and “mastership” are jointly and severally narrated by hundreds of traditionalists. The famous Wahabi scholar,

Nawwab Siddiq Hasan Khan of Bhopal, says:

“Hakim Abu Sa’id says that the traditions of ‘two precious things’ and ‘whose master I am, ‘Ali is his master’ are Mutawatir⁹ because a great number of companions of the Prophet have narrated them. So much so that Muhammad bin Jarir has written these two traditions by seventy-five different chains of narrators (asnad).”¹⁰

‘Abdu ’l-Husayn Ahmad al-Amini has classified the narrators of this tradition and has found that among them are one hundred and twenty sahabah (companions of the Prophet) and eighty-four tabi’in (disciples of the companions). The number of Sunni muhaddithin (traditionalists) who have narrated it reaches upto three hundred and sixty. Two hundred and sixty special books (several of them in many volumes) have been compiled by Shi’a and Sunni scholars on this tradition only.¹¹

The Origin of the Name

When we see that between these two events, the Prophet repeatedly referred to the followers of ‘Ali as “Shi’a”, we have to admit that not only the faith of Shi’ism, but even the name was originated by the Prophet himself. The following ahadith are quoted from Sunni sources:

Ibn ‘Asakir narrates from Jabir bin ‘Abdullah that he said: “We were with the Prophet (s.a.w.w) when ‘Ali came (to us). The Prophet (s.a.w.w) said, ‘I swear by Him in whose hand is my soul, verily this (‘Ali) and his Shi’a are successful on the Day of Resurrection’. Then the following verse was revealed,

‘Verily those who believe and do good deeds, it is they who are the best of creatures [Qur’an 96:7]””¹²

At-Tabarani says that the Prophet told ‘Ali: “O ‘Ali, verily you will come before Allah, you and your Shi’as well-pleased (with Allah) and well-pleasing (to Him).”¹³

There are so many ahadith from so many narrators that Sunni scholars could not reject them. So they tried to fit these ahadith on their own group. After quoting these traditions, Ibn Hajar al-Makki writes, “And the Shi’a of Ahlu ’l-Bayt are Ahlu ’s-Sunnah wa ’l-Jama’ah (i.e, the Sunnis), because it is they who loved the Ahlu ’l-Bayt as was ordered by Allah and His Messenger. So far as others are concerned, they are in fact the enemies (of Ahlu ’l-Bayt).”¹⁴

This claim was repeated by Shah ‘Abdu ‘l-Aziz Dehlawi who says, “It should be known that the first Shi‘as (who are the Sunnis and the Tafdiliyyah) in old days were known as Shi‘as. When the Ghulat and the Rawafid Zaydiyyah and Isma‘iliyyah took the name for themselves..... the Sunnis and Tafdiliyyah did not like this name for themselves and so they took the name of Ahlu ‘s- Sunnah wa ‘l-Jama‘ah.”¹⁵

Such claims should not be dignified by reply. But seeing that an abridged Arabic translation of Tuhfah has recently been published in Egypt, I quote here the comment of another Sunni scholar, ‘Ubaydullah Amritsari, who after quoting the above claim in his book Arjahu ‘l-Matalib, says: “To say that Sunnis in the beginning were known as Shi‘as is merely a claim for which no proof can be found. Had the Sunnis been called Shi‘a, then at least some of the Sunni elders should have been known by this name before the event of Zaydiyyah (in 120 A.H.). Moreover, had the Sunnis been known by this name, the Zaydiyyah and Isma‘iliyyah would have not tolerated this name for themselves (because of the enmity) and would have selected some other name for themselves.”¹⁶

The First Shi‘ias

During the life-time of the Prophet (s.a.w.w) the word, Shi‘a, was used as a name first of all for four highly respected companions of the Prophet: Salman al-Farsi, Abu Dharr Jundab bin Junadah al-Ghifari, Miqdad bin Aswad al-Kindi and ‘Ammar bin Yasir.

Kashfu ‘z-Zunun, Vol.III, quotes from Kitabu ‘z-Zinah of Abu Hatim Sahal (sic) bin Muhammad Sajastani (sic), (d.205 A.H.):

“In the days of the Holy Prophet (may peace be upon him) the word Shi‘a was mentioned with reference to four persons: Salman al-Farsi, Abu Dharr Ghaffari (sic), Miqdad bin Aswad al-Kindi and ‘Ammar bin Yasir.”¹⁷

Those were the first Shi‘as and that was the beginning of the Shi‘a faith under the kind guidance and patronage of the Prophet of Islam himself.

Hadith Ath-Thaqalayn

In the preceding chapter mention has been made of two important traditions of “Two precious things” (ath-thaqalayn) and “whose master am I, ‘Ali is his master” (al-Wilayah). As for the latter, sufficient details have been given in my book, Imamate (from page 62 to page 81). As for the former, some references are quoted here (with adaptation) from “The Right Path”, the English translation of al-Muraja‘at.

The Holy Prophet said:

“Oh you people, I leave amongst you two things which if you follow, you will never go astray after me, and they are the Book of Allah and my Ahlu ‘l-Bayt.”¹⁸

He also said:

“I have left among you certain things and if you will love them you will never go astray. They are the Book of Allah, which is like a rope extending from the heaven to the earth, and my children, that is my Ahlu ‘l-Bayt. These two shall never part from each other until they come to me at the pool of Kawthar (in Paradise). So, take care how you treat them.”¹⁹

He also said:

“I leave among you two Weighty Things, the Book of Allah and my Ahlu ‘l- Bayt; and these two shall never separate from each other until they come to me at the Pool.”²⁰

He also said:

“I will soon be called away and will have to depart from you, but I leave among you Two Weighty Things, the Book of the High and Mighty Allah and my descendants. The Book of Allah is like a rope which extends from the heavens to the earth, and my descendants who are my Ahlu ‘l-Bayt. The subtle and Aware (Allah) tells me that the two shall never part company until they come to me at the Pool. So take care how you treat them after me.”²¹

When the Holy Prophet was returning (to Medina) from the Farewell Pilgrimage and arrived at Ghadir Khum, he stopped there and said:

“It seems as if I have been summoned and I am going away. However, I am leaving among you Two Weighty Things, one of which is greater than the other. They are the Book of Allah the Almighty and my children. So take care how you treat them after me. The two shall never part company until they come to me at the Pool.’

He continued:

“The Lord, Allah the Almighty is my Master and I am the master of every true believer.”

Then he took the hand of ‘Ali in his hand and said:

“He is the master of all those whose master I have been. O Allah, love those who love ‘Ali and hate those who hate him...”²²

‘Abdullah ibn Hantab related that the Messenger of Allah addressed us at Juhfah saying: “Do I not have authority over you more than yourselves?” They all said, “Yes, of course”. Then he said: “I shall hold you answerable for two things, namely, the Book of Allah and my descendants.”²³

All these authentic traditions, which prove conclusively that it is compulsory to follow the Qur’an and the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt are not ordinary traditions. They are repeated many times and are related on the authority of at least twenty companions of the Holy Prophet through various sources. The Holy Prophet repeated these words over and over again (and not merely in one isolated instance but on several occasions) publicly to show that it is compulsory to follow and obey the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt. He made this announcement during the Farewell Pilgrimage, on ‘Arafat Day, at Ghadir Khum, and on the return from Ta’if, and at Medina from the pulpit in the mosque. Finally, as he lay on his deathbed and the room was packed with his Companions, he said:

“Oh, you folk! I am soon going to depart from here, and although I have already told you, I repeat once more that I am leaving with you two things, namely, the Book of Allah and my descendants, that is, my Ahlu ‘l-Bayt.’ Then he lifted up ‘Ali by the hand and said:

“Behold, this is ‘Ali: he is with the Qur’an and the Qur’an is with him. They shall never part from each other until they come to me at the Pool of Kawthar.”²⁴

A large group of distinguished persons belonging to the Sunni sects has acknowledged this as the Holy Prophet’s last will and testament. Even Ibn

Hajar, after recording the Hadith al-Thaqalayn (the tradition of The Two Weighty Things), comments on it by saying:

“Tradition of Adherence has been handed down through large number of sources and more than twenty of the disciples have related it.’ Then, a little further on, he says, “Here a doubt arises, and it is that while the Tradition has come down through various sources, some say that the words were spoken during the last pilgrimage, others that they were spoken at Medina when he lay on his deathbed and the room was packed with his disciples, yet another saying that he spoke these words at Ghadir Khum or on the return from Ta’if. But there is no inconsistency as it is possible that, having regard to the importance and greatness of the Qur’an and the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt, and with a view to emphasizing the point before people, the Holy Prophet might have repeated these words on all these occasions so that anyone who had not heard them before might hear them now.”²⁵

Moreover, since the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt carry as much weight in the eyes of Allah as the Holy Qur’an, the former have the same qualities as the latter. Just as the Qur’an is true from beginning to end without the shadow of any untruth in it, and just as it is incumbent upon every Muslim to obey its commands, so also must the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt be perfectly true and sincere guides whose commands must be followed by all. Therefore, there can be no escape from accepting their leadership and following their creed and their faith. The Muslims are bound by these saying of the Prophet to follow them and no one else. Just as it is impossible for any Muslim to turn away from the Holy Qur’an or to adopt any set of rules which is at variance with it, so when the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt have been unequivocally described as equal in weight and importance to the Qur’an, the same attitude has to be adopted with regard to their precepts, and it cannot be permissible to turn away from them and follow any other persons.

In the Prophet’s sayings: “I leave among you two things: if you will adhere to both of them you will never go astray; and they are the Book of Allah and my descendants,” the requirement of adherence to both of them should be particularly noted. It plainly shows that whoever adheres to or adopts both of them as his guides will be saved from going astray. Therefore, if a person takes only one of them without taking the other for a guide he will go astray. This point becomes still clearer by considering Tabarani’s version, which contains the further injunction:

“Look out! And do not either go ahead of them or lag behind them, for in either case you will be destroyed; and do not (try to) teach them for they know more than you.”

Ibn Hajar holds that these words show that those members of the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt who possessed these distinctions were superior to all the people.²⁶

Another tradition which should compel every Muslim to follow the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt and accept no one else as guides in matters of religion is that the Holy Prophet said (as narrated by Abu Dharr al-Ghifari):

“Behold! My Ahlu ‘l-Bayt are like the Ark of Noah; whoever embarked in it was saved, and whoever turned away from it was destroyed.”²⁷

Yet another tradition tells us that the Holy Prophet said: “My Ahlu ‘l-Bayt are like the Gate of Repentance²⁸ of the children of Israel; whoever entered therein was forgiven.”²⁹

A further tradition is as follows:

“The stars protect the inhabitants of the earth from being drowned, and my Ahlu ‘l-Bayt are the protectors of my followers against discord (in matters of religion). Therefore, whichever group among the Arabs opposes my Ahl al-Bayt (on questions related to the Divine Commandments) shall be split up by dissensions and become the party of Satan.”³⁰

These traditions, therefore, leave no room for any doubt. There can be no other way except to follow the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt and give up all opposition to them. The clear and unequivocal terms in which the Holy Prophet has directed us about these matters in the above mentioned traditions cannot be surpassed or rivaled in any other language.

Here the ‘Ahlu ‘l-Bayt’ have been collectively referred to. The expression includes all the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt. This epithet applies only to those who are Proofs of Allah and occupy the position of Imams by Divine Decree, as established by reason and upheld by the traditions. Learned scholars of the Sunnis also admit this. For example, Ibn Hajar writes in his Sawa’iqu ‘l-Muhriqah: “Some people think that probably the ‘Ahlu ‘l-Bayt’ whom the Holy Prophet has designated as the protectors are the learned men among the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt, since the guidance can be attained only through them. They are like the stars through whom we are guided in the right direction, and if the stars are taken away we would come face to face with the signs of the Almighty as promised (i.e., the Day of Resurrection). This will happen when the Mahdi will come, as mentioned in the traditions, and the Prophet Jesus will say his prayers behind him, the Dajjal will be slain, and then the signs of the Almighty will appear one after the other.”³¹

In another place Ibn Hajar writes: “The Holy Prophet was asked what would be the condition of the people after the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt, and he replied:

‘Their condition will be like that of an ass whose spine is broken.’³²

You know very well that the Holy Prophet’s tradition which says that the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt are like the Ark of Noah leads to the conclusion that those who adopt their creed and follow them shall be saved from the punishment of Hell, while those who run away from them shall meet with the fate of one who tried to save his life by climbing up the mountain, with the only difference that whereas he (Noah’s renegade son) was drowned in water, these people will be drowned in the fire of Hell. And the Holy Prophet’s use of the simile of the Gate of Repentance signifies that just like that Gate, the Ahlu ‘l-Bayt are the manifestations of the Majesty and Sovereignty of the All-Highest Lord to whom we must submit and offer our humble obedience.

Fundamental Belief of Shi’a Ithna-’Ashariya

In Shi’a terminology, fundamental beliefs are called Usul al-deen, i.e. Roots of Religion. The Usul al-deen are five. Three are called Roots of Islam. They are:

1. Tawheed, Belief in oneness of God.
2. Nubuwwat, Belief in the Prophets.
3. Qiyamat, Belief in the Day of Judgment.

Remaining two are called Usul al-Iman, Roots of Faith. They are:

1. 'Adil, Justice of God.
2. Imamat, the successorship of the Holy Prophet of Islam.

A person believing in all five Usul al-deen is called Shi'a Ithna-'ashariyah. Such a Shi'a believes that:

Tawheed

There is only one God, Eternal, Self-Sufficient. He has no beginning or end. He is Omnipotent, has power over everything and every affair. He is Omniscient, knows everything, nothing is ever a secret from Him. He has His own discretion in all affairs, does not do anything under compulsion. He is All-perceiving, All-hearing, All-seeing and Omnipresent, He sees and hears everything though He has neither eye nor ear. He has no partner or colleague, nor has He any son, daughter or wife. He is neither made nor composed of any material substance. He has no body nor is He confined to a place. He is not afflicted by anything related to body. He is not governed by time, space, change or things like that. He is not visible. He has not been seen, and will never be seen either in this world or the hereafter. His attributes are not separate from His person. He speaks truth and is Truthful. He does not enter into any body, needs nothing, and does no evil. It is He who has created the universe and it is He who sustains it.

'Adl

Allah is just: He does not do injustice to anyone. He has ordered us to do justice to our fellow creatures, but He Himself treats us not only with justice but with grace. He created us for His worship, in order that we may attain spiritual perfection through it. That spiritual perfection enables us to reach nearer to Allah.

For this purpose, He has given us freedom of will and choice. When we choose, by our free will, the Straight path (prescribed by Allah) we are assured in the next world of everlasting happiness and glory by Grace of Allah.

Nubuwwat

To show us the straight path, Allah has been sending His Representatives to the mankind. They are called Nabii (Prophet) and Rasul (Messenger). It is wajib to believe in the Prophethood of the previous Prophets as well as of the Holy Prophet of Islam (S).

There came a total of 124,000 Prophets and Messengers, beginning with Adam (a.s.) and ending with Muhammad (S). All the Prophets were ma'sum (sinless, infallible). Also they were free from every such defect in body or character which might create repulsion in people. Muhammad, the Holy Prophet of Islam, is the Final Prophet; anybody claiming Prophethood after him is a liar and imposter.

The Holy Prophet of Islam ascended to the heavens in mi'raj. The Qur'an is the word of Allah. There has been no alteration, omission or addition in the Qur'an. Hadith is an authentic source of shari'ah.

It is wajib to believe in questioning in grave through Munkar and Nakir, and in the squeeze of grave. The angels, the Satan and the jinns do exist.

Imamat

To lead the people to the Straight Path, and to preserve the religion of Islam, Allah appointed twelve successors, one after another, of the Prophet of Islam. They are called Imams. Imam literally means leader. First of them was 'Ali son of Abu Talib, and the last one is al-Mahdi (a.s.). All Imams are ma'sum (infallible, sinless).

The names of the twelve Imams are as follows:

1. 'Ali, son of Abu Talib.
2. Hassan, son of 'Ali
3. Husayn, son of 'Ali
4. 'Ali Zaynul 'Abideen, son of Husayn
5. Muhammad Baqir, son of 'Ali Zaynul 'Abideen
6. Ja'far Sadiq, son of Muhammad Baqir
7. Musa Kazim, son of Ja'far Sadiq
8. 'Ali Riza, son of Musa Kazim
9. Muhammad Taqi, son of 'Ali Riza
10. 'Ali Naqi, son of Muhammad Taqi
11. Hasan 'Askari, son of 'Ali Naqi
12. Muhammad Mahdi, son of Hasan 'Askari

Imam Mahdi, the twelfth Imam, is alive, but is hidden from our eyes by order of Allah. He will re-appear, when Allah allows him, to establish the Kingdom of God on the earth. It will be near the end of the world, when he will establish justice and equity in the world after it has been devastated by injustice and oppression.

Qiyamat

After that will come Qiyamat, the day of resurrection, the day of judgement. One day this world will come to an end. All people will die; then the whole mankind will be resurrected to face the reckoning of their faith and deed. People having correct belief and doing good deeds will be placed in the paradise; while people having wrong belief will go to hell. The Day of Judgment is a fact and truth; transmigration of soul is a wrong idea.

Everyone will get recompense of his/her good or bad deeds. Mizan (weighing scale), Hisab (reckoning of deeds), Sirat (Path, the bridge over the hell) are facts and the truth; scrolls of deeds will be given in people's right or left hands. Shafa'at (intercession) by the Holy Prophet is a fact and truth. Repentance is wajib. Paradise and hell do exist even now.

To know and believe in the above-mentioned Usul al-deen is the first and foremost responsibility of a person. As explained just now, neglecting them throws one in ever-lasting punishment of the hell. If one does not believe in the Usul al-deen, then his acts of worship are not accepted by Allah.

Status Of Muhammad And His Progeny

According to the Shi'as, Shafi'is and many other Sunnis, when Allah Subhanahu wa Ta'ala wished to create the creatures, he created first of all the Nur (Light) of Muhammad (S). The Shi'a ahadith to this effect may be seen in Biharul 'l-anwar, vol. 15. Here, I am quoting only from Sunni sources for completing the proof against the Wahhabis who erroneously believe that the Prophet was just like other human beings.

Al-Qastalani (d. 923 A.H) has narrated the Prophet's tradition to this effect through Jabir Ibn 'Abdullah al-Ansari and 'Ali (a.s).³³

Al-Mas'udi (d. 346 A.H) quotes a lengthy tradition from 'Ali (a.s) which says that Allah created first of all the Light of Muhammad; then he said to that light:

"You are My chosen one and the Trustee (amin) of My Light and Guidance. It is because of you that I am going to create the Earth and the Skies, lay down reward and punishment, and bring into being the Garden and the Fire". The tradition goes on speaking about the Progeny of the Prophet, creation of the angels, the souls and the world. Then it speaks about the Covenant taken from the souls which combined the belief in the One God with acceptance of Muhammad's Prophethood."³⁴

That is why Ibn 'Abbas narrates that the Prophet said: "I was Prophet when Adam was between soul and body."³⁵ That is, when Adam's creation was in its preliminary stages.

Muhammad's Light adorned the 'Arsh (Throne) of God. When eons later Adam was created that Light was put into his forehead. It continued its journey, generation after generation, through numerous Prophets and their successors, until it came to the Prophet Ibrahim (a.s.); from Ibrahim (a.s.) it came to his eldest son, prophet Isma'il (a.s).

Wathila ibn al-Aqsa' said that the Holy Prophet (S) said: "Verily Allah chose Isma'il from the progeny of Ibrahim; and chose Banu Kinanah from the progeny of Isma'il; and chose the Quraysh from Banu Kinanah; and chose Banu Hashim from the Quraysh; and chose me from Banu Hashim."³⁶

The Holy Prophet (S) said: "Gabriel said to me: 'I looked at the Earth from the east to the west, but I could not find any one superior to Muhammad; and I looked at the earth from the east to the west, but did not find any progeny superior to the progeny of Hashim.'"³⁷

The Holy Prophet said: "I and 'Ali were one Light in presence of Allah fourteen thousand years before the creation of Adam. When Adam was created that Light was placed into his loin. Thus Allah was transferring it from noble loins to pure wombs until Allah settled it into the loin of 'Abdu 'l-Muttalib. Then Allah divided it into two, one part went into the loin of 'Abdullah and the other to that of Abu Talib. Therefore 'Ali is from me and I am from him, his flesh is my flesh and his blood is my blood; whoever loves him, he does so because of my love, and whoever hates him, he does so because he hates me."³⁸

It is unanimously accepted by the Shi'as, the Shafi'is and the Hanafis that the ancestors of the Holy Prophet (S) from 'Abdullah to Qidar ibn Isma'il and from there upto Adam (a.s.) were true believers. They believed in the One and the Only God, and faithfully followed the divine religion of their times. From Qidar to 'Abdullah, all of them followed the shari'ah of Prophet Ibrahim (a.s.), which was the religion prescribed by Allah for them.

The famous Shafi'i scholar, Imam Jalalu 'd-deen as-Suyuti (d. 911 A.H), has written nine books on this subject, and has proved beyond any doubt that all the ancestors of the Holy Prophet (S) were true believers. The famous Hanafi muhaddith, Shaykh 'Abdu 'l-Haqq Dehlawi has written: "All the ancestors of the Holy prophet from Adam upto 'Abdullah were

pure and clean from the uncleanness of disbelief and paganism. It was not possible for Allah to put that Holy Light (of the Holy Prophet) into any dark and dirty place, that is, in the loin of a pagan man or the womb of a pagan woman. Also, how could it be possible for Allah to punish the ancestors of the Holy Prophet on the Day of Judgement and thus humiliate him before the eyes of the world.”³⁹

The Holy Prophet (SAW) himself said: “I was always being transferred from the loins of the clean ones to the wombs of the clean ones.”⁴⁰

For Shi’a sources, see Biharul ‘l-anwar, vol.15.

Al-Hashawiyah Wahhabiya

The Wahhabis’ belief is diametrically opposed to the Muslims’ belief. The Wahhabis say that the parents and the forefathers of the Holy Prophet (S) were idol-worshippers and Kafirs, na’udhu billah. The Wahhabis will see the result of this hypocrisy on the Day of Judgement when the Holy Prophet (S) will stand before Allah to complain against them for such blasphemous slander against his parents and fore-fathers. Can Muhammad ibn ‘Abdu ‘l-Wahhab save the Wahhabis from the wrath of Muhammad ibn ‘Abdullah (S) on that day?

Now that the reader has seen in detail what Shi’ism means and what the Shi’as believe, the time has come to look at the baseless accusations levelled against them in the Nairobi booklet of the unknown writer.

It is necessary to mention beforehand that the Wahhabis are today’s al-Hashawiyah; or let us say that their beliefs are views tally hundred percent with those who were called al-Hashawiyah in the early centuries.

The term, al-Hashawiyah is derived from al-hashw, i.e. stuffing, insertion. This name is used for those who accept and believe in all traditions which were brought into Islam by insincere people. They believe in the literal meaning of all the traditions attributed to the Prophet (S) and his companions without any re-interpretation. Even if a “tradition” was forged (but the forger had taken care to attach a good chain of narrators to it), they accept it without caring whether its text conforms with the Qur’an or mutawatir or accepted traditions or not.

Most of the Sunni muhadditheen were Hashawiyah.

Ahmad ibn Yahya al-Yamani (died 840 A.H.) writes:

“al-Hashawiyah: This name is used for those who narrate stuffed traditions, i.e., which were inserted by Zanadiqah in the Prophet’s sayings and they accept it without any re-interpretation; and they call themselves As-habul hadith and Ahlus-sunnah wal Jama’ah..... They unanimously believe in compulsion (by God, concerning man’s actions), and tashbih (that God is like his creatures), and believe that God has a body and a form, and say that He has various limbs.....”⁴¹

Abul Fath Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Karim ash-Shahristani (467-548 A.H) writes in his Al-Milal wan-Nihal:

“And a group of As-habul-hadith, al-Hashawiyah have explicitly declared their belief of Tashbih (i.e. Allah is like his creatures)..... So much so that they have said that once Allah’s both eyes were ailing, so the angels went to see Him; and He wept (grieving) on Noah’s flood until His eyes were inflamed; and that the ‘Arsh gives moaning sound under Him like

the sound of a new saddle; and that He exceeds the ‘Arsh (Throne) in size to the extent of four fingers on all sides.”⁴²

There is no need to point out that this definition and description fits totally on the Wahhabis who call themselves Ashabul-Hadith or Ahlul-hadith and very often pose as Sunnis, and now-a-days call themselves Ansaru ‘s-Sunnah.

Notes

1. Qur’an 28:15
2. Qur’an 37:83
3. Al-Qamus, vol. 2; at-Turayhi, Majma‘ul ‘l-Bahrayn, vol. 2, p. 539; Ibn al-Athir al-Jazari, an-Nihayah, Egypt ed., [1383/1963], vol. 2, pp. 519-520.
4. al-Mufid, Shaykh, Awa‘ilu ‘l-Maqalat (Qum: 2nd ed., 1370 A.H.) pp.2-3.
5. Qur’an 26:214
6. At-Tabari, Muhammad bin Jarir, Ta‘rikh, vol. 3 (Laden: EJ Brill, 1882-1885) p.1171-1173. It is interesting to note that in the Cario 1939 edition of at-Tabari’s Ta‘rikh (which claims to have been checked by the Laden edition), the important words “wasiyyi wa Khalifati” (my heir and successor) have been changed to “kadha wa kadha” (so and so)! How sad it is to see the academic world sacrificing its integrity on the altar of political expediency. It should be mentioned here that this tradition with the crucial words has been narrated by at least thirty Sunni scholars, historians, traditionalists and commentators of the Qur’an. Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal has narrated this in his Musnad (vol.1, P.111) with the following sanad:
 - (a) Aswad bin ‘Amir from (b) Sharik from (c) al-A‘mash from (d) al-Minhal from
 - (e) ‘Ibad bin ‘Abdullah al-Asadi from (f) ‘Ali. Now (a), (c) and (e) are among the narrators of both al-Bukhari and al-Muslim, while (b) is among the narrators of al-Muslim and (d) among those of al-BukhariAlso, Ahmad b. Shu‘ayb an-Nasa‘i, whose Sunan is one of the six authentic sources of Sunni hadith, has narrated this hadith from Ibn ‘Abbas in his al-Khasa‘is, p.6.
- For other references of this hadith, see al-Muraja‘at of ‘Abdu ‘l-Husayn Sharfu ‘d-Din (letters 20 to 23). This is one of the most important Shi‘a works of recent times; It has been printed scores of times in Iraq, Iran, Lebanon and Kuwait. Its Urdu translation entitled as Din-e-Haqq was published in Kujhwa (Saran) India, which in its turn was translated into English as The Right Path by Mohammad Amir Haider Khan and was recently published by Peermohamed Ibrahim Trust, Karachi. (The English translation has since been reprinted several times in Iran, U.K. and U.S.A)
7. An-Nasa‘i, al-Khasa‘is, p.15
8. Ibid. p. 16
9. Mutawatir means a hadith narrated by so many people that no doubt can be entertained about its authenticity.
10. Siddiq Hasan Khan, Minhaju ‘l-wusul, p.13
11. See volume 1 of al-Ghādir, which deals exclusively with this subject. This is another important Shi‘a book of recent times. Eleven volumes were published before al-Amini died in 1969. It has been published many times in Iraq, Iran and Lebanon. I have seen its Persian translation. Late Shaikh Muhammad Mustafa Jawhar, of Karachi, had translated the first volume in Urdu but it was lost from the press. Now another Urdu translation of the first volume has been printed in India
12. As-Suyuti, Jalalud ‘d-Din (d. 910/1504-5), ad-Durru ‘l Manthur, vol.6 p.379. He narrates a similar ahadith from Ibn ‘Abbas and ‘Ali also in the same place; Al- Khuwarizmi (d.569/1173-4) in al-Manaqib.
- Other ahadith of the Prophet declaring that the Shi‘ahs of ‘Ali will succeed in the hereafter are narrated from Abdullah, Abu Rafi‘, Jabir bin Abdullah, Ibn ‘Abbas and ‘Ali by Sunni authorities including at-Tabarani in his al-Mu‘jam al-Kabir, Ahmad bin Hanbal in his al-Manaqib, Ibn Marduwayh al-Kanji ash-Shafi‘i (d.658/1260) in his Kifayatu ‘t-Talib and many others.
13. Ibn Athir in an-Nihayah; Ibn Hajar al-Haythami al-Makki in his as-Sawa‘iqu ‘l-Muhriqah (Cairo, n.d) p. 92. He narrates many ahadith to this effect.

14. as-Sawa'iqu 'l-Muhriqah
15. Shah 'Abdu 'l-Aziz Dehlawi, Tuhfah-e-Ithna-'ashariyyah, Nawalkishor Press, Lucknow, n.d; pp. 4, 11, 59
16. 'Ubaydullah Amritsari, Arjahu 'l-Matalib, 2nd ed. Lahore, p. 608 (which is wrongly written as 164.)
17. As quoted by Hasan al-Amin, Islamic Shi'ite Encyclopaedia, Vol. 1, Beirut, 1968, pp.12-13.
18. Reported by Tirmidhi and Nasa'i through Jabir and copied from them by al-Muttaqi of India at the beginning of his chapter on "Adherence" in his book Kanzu 'l-'Ummal, Beirut, 5th ed., 1405/1985, vol 1, p.172.
19. Tradition No.874 in Sahih al-Tirmidhi as related by Zayd ibn al Arqam, Kanzu 'l-'Ummal, vol.1, p. 173
20. Imam Ahmad ibn al-Hanbal, Musnad, vol.5, p.182, and vol. 5, p.189 at the end: At-Tabarani, al-Mu'jam al-Kabir from Zayd ibn Thabit; Kanzu 'l-'Ummal, vol.1, p.172; Al-Hakim, Mustadrak, vol.3, p.148, with the comment that this tradition is authentic according to the tests followed by the two Shaykhs (i.e., Muslim and Bukhari) though they have not included it in their collections; Dhahabi, Talkhis al-Mustadrak.
21. Imam Ahmad ibn al-Hanbal from the tradition related by Abu Sa'id al-Khudri in two ways, in his Musnad, vol.3, p.17 and p.26. Also recorded by Ibn Abi Shaybah. Abu Ya'li and Ibn al-Sa'd from Abu Sa'id; Kanzu 'l-'Ummal, vol.1, p.185, tradition No.944 also see traditions 945 & 946.
22. Al-Hakim from Zayd ibn al-Arqam, Al-Mustadrak, vol.3, p.109 with the comment that this tradition is authentic according to the tests applied by the two Shaykhs, although they have not recorded it in full. It has also been related through another source from Zayd ibn al-Arqam and recorded in vol.3, p.533 of Mustadrak with the comment that it is authentic, although the two Shaykhs have not recorded it. Dhahabi has also recorded it in his Talkhis as authentic.
23. Al-Tabarani has recorded this tradition as mentioned by 'Allamah al-Nabahani in his 'Arba'in al-Arba'in, and 'Allamah al-Suyuti in his Ihya' al-Mayt.
24. Ibn Hajar, al-Haythami al-Makki, as-Sawa'iqu'l-Muhriqah, ch. 9.
25. as-Sawa'iqu 'l-Muhriqah, chap 11. sub-heading 1. p. 89.
26. as-Sawa'iqu 'l-Muhriqah, chapter on the Holy Prophet's will, p.136.
27. Imam Hakim, Al-Mustadrak, Vol. 3, p.151.
28. Refer to Qur'an 2:57-58.
29. Al-Tabarani, Al-Mu'jam Al-Aswat (tradition No.18) as related by Abu Sa'id: Al-Nabahani, Arba'in, p.216.
30. Imam Hakim, Al-Mustadrak, Vol.3, p.149 as related by Ibn 'Abbas, with the same note that in this authentic tradition but has not been recorded by the two Shayks, Muslim and Bukhari.
31. as-Sawa'iqu 'l-Muhriqah, chap. 11 p. 91, dealing with the interpretation of the seventh verse referred to therein.
32. as-Sawa'iqu 'l-Muhriqah, p. 143.
33. al-Qastalani, al-Mawahibu 'l-Ladunniyah, vol. 1, pp. 5, 9, 10.
34. al-Masu'di, Maruju'dh-dhahab.
35. at-Tabarani, al-Mu'jam al-Kabir; al-Khasa'is al-kubra, vol. 1, p. 4.
36. Sahih at-Tirmidhi; he has said that this hadith is Sahih (true, absolutely reliable).
37. Abu 'l-Fida', at-Tarikh.
38. 'Ubaydullah Amritsari, Arjahu 'l-matalib, 1st ed. 1340 A.H. pp. 458-463. He has quoted eight traditions, with minor variation, of this meaning from various Sunni Muhaddithin including Ibn Marduwayh, Al-Khwarizmi, Ibnu 'l-Maghazili, Al-Khatib Al-Baghdadi, al-Hamwayni, Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kanji ash-Shafi'i, Abu Hatim and Abu Muhammad Ahmad bin 'Ali Al-'Asimi etc. Some of these ahadith say: "So He made me Prophet, and made 'Ali (my) successor."
39. Madariju 'n-nubuwwah.
40. 'Ubaydullah Amritsari, Arjahu 'l-matalib, pp.526-258.
41. Ahmad ibn Yahya al-Yamani, Kitab al-Munyah wal Amal, fi sharh al-Milal wan Nihal, 1988 ed. p. 114.

42. Ash-Shahristani, al-Milal wan Nihal, printed on the margin of Kitabul Fasl of Ibn Hazam, p. 141.

A Glance at the Booklet “What is Shi’aism?”

Infallibility of the Imams

Tahrif

Hadith

Bada’

Sahaba (Companions)

Fatwas

Taqiyah

Infallibility of the Imams

The writer of “What is Shi’ism?” has given four “proofs” to show that the Shi’as are kafir. The fourth proof according to him is as follows:

“The Shi’as believe that their Imams are infallible and sinless. These attributes and qualities are reserved only for the Prophets and the Messenger of Allah.”

COMMENT: This unknown writer is unaware that his co-religionists, i.e., the Wahhabis, do not believe in the ‘ismah (infallibility and sinlessness) of even the Prophets. I do not want to quote narratives of Sahih al-Bukhari which present the Holy Prophet of Islam (S) in extremely bad light. Although a Persian proverb says that “Quoting a kufr is not kufr”, but my iman does not allow me even to quote those blasphemous ahadith which are the hall-mark of al-Bukhari, and which have given ammunitions in the hands of the Christians and Jews for attacking Islam and its Holy Prophet (S) using this so called Sahih of al-Bukhari.

Apart from that, the Wahhabis openly believe that the Holy Prophet (S) was no more than a big brother to the Muslims; and that he was giving orders based on his Ijtihad. In other words he was just a Mujtahid. And everyone knows that a Mujtahid sometimes arrives at correct decision while at other times he may make mistakes. With such beliefs, how can he claim that the Prophets, especially the Holy Prophet, was ma’sum (sinless and infallible)?

Obviously this unknown author, if not ignorant of his own religion, has committed the sin of Taqiyyah by hiding his actual belief!

Sunni Belief About The Prophets’ Ismat

As for the Sunnis’ belief, I quote here from two authoritative books on this subject:

1. The famous ‘Allamah at-Taftazani (Sa’d al-Deen Ma’ud ibn ‘Umar al-Ash’ari ash-Shafi’i) writes in his Sharh ‘l Maqasid:

“Our madhhab is that (the Prophets) do not commit any major sin (al-kaba’ir) after bi’tah (getting nabuwat) under any circumstances (i.e. neither intentionally nor unintentionally), and (do not do) any small sin intentionally. They can commit small sins unintentionally, but they do not persist nor continue in it; rather they are cautioned and they become cautious.”¹

In other words, the Prophets could commit major sins before bi’tah.

2. Mulla ‘Ali al-Qari-Hanafi writes:-

“The Prophets are ma’sum from lie, especially concerning the matters of shari’ah and conveying of (divine) commandments and guidance of ummah, intentionally (according to ijma’) and unintentionally (according to the majority).

As for all other sins there are some details as follows:

1. They are ma’sum from kufr before bi’tah and after it, according to the ijma’.

2. Likewise, they are ma’sum from intentionally committing major sins, according to the majority of Muslims; But al-Hashawiyah disagree.

3. Whether the Prophets can commit major sins unintentionally, the majority says they can.

4. As for minor sins, the majority says the Prophets could commit it intentionally, contrary to what al-Jubba'i and his followers say.

5. All the scholars unanimously say that the Prophets can commit minor sins unintentionally - except such things which show meanness like stealing a morsel, or short-weighing a few grains; but the research-scholars have added a proviso that they are warned and they become cautious. However, all the above discourse concerns the period after revelation. As for the period before that, that is no proof to show that they could not commit minor sins at that time. But the Mu'tazilites do not agree with it (i.e. according to the Mu'tazilites, the Prophets could not commit minor sins even before revelation.)

6. And the Shi'as say that the Prophets could not commit any sin, minor or major, before receiving revelation or after if."²

Study all this detailed description of the Sunnis' actual belief on this subject, and see the clear statement that the Hashawiyyah i.e. the Wahhabis believe that the Prophets could commit major sins intentionally. Then note how deceitfully the unknown Wahhabi writer pretends that he believes in the 'ismah of the Prophets and Messengers of Allah.

It is the established fact of Islamic history that all their Khalifas were non-ma'sum; they were not sinless or infallible. To protect them from criticism they have pulled down the Messenger of Allah (S) from the pedestal of 'ismah, and as mentioned above, their Imam al-Bukhari has played a major role in degrading the Messenger of Allah (S).

You have seen that the Sunni scholars know and admit that the Shi'as belief concerning the 'ismah of the Prophets is most comprehensive and that according to Shi'as the Prophets were sinless and infallible from beginning to the end of their lives and were ma'sum from all the major and minor sins.

Naturally, because we believe in ma'sum Prophets, we say (as the Quran and ahadith have guided us) that the successors of the Prophet (S) too should be ma'sum. (For our arguments and proofs for the 'ismah of the Prophets and Imams see my books, "Prophethood" and "Imamate", available from the Bilal Muslim Mission of Tanzania.)

But the Wahhabis believe in a Prophet who was liable to commit major and minor sins. Naturally they believe in fallible and non-ma'sum persons as his successors.

Further on the unknown author writes: "Shah Waliullah Dehlavi in his book "Tafheemat e Ilahiyah" (p. 224) unveils the curtain by saying, "Actually they do not believe in the Finality of Prophethood of Muhammad (S). Although they do not believe in the Finality of Prophethood of Muhammad (S), they vehemently profess it."

It is true that Shah Waliullah Dehlavi claimed that the Shi'a belief was batil (false) because they considered their Imams were ma'sum, although they believe that Muhammad (S) was the last of the Prophets.

Much can be said about the book, At-Tafhimatu 'l-Ilahiyah, and its grandiloquent claims which reflect on the egotistic nature of its author; but this is not the place to go into this subject. If one reads the said book, he will

see that the Shah's self-aggrandizing pronouncements are no less outrageous than those of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani. But the Shah was clever enough to cover his claims under the mask of tasawwuf. However let us come back to the present topic.

Shah Waliullah's claim that Shi'a madhhab was batil is understandable. Everyone from among the 73 sects of Islam believes that only his madhhab was the true one and the other 72 sects were false (batil). But the Muslims do not say that other sects are kafir. Even Shah Waliullah refrained from using this word for the Shi'as. His famous son, Shah 'Abdu 'l-'Aziz says that someone enquired of his father (Shah Waliullah) whether the Shi'as were heretics. His father reiterated the different views of the Hanafi jurisconsults on the subject. The man was not satisfied and urged the Shah to give his own ruling. On getting the same reply, he went away filled with rage and is said to have declared that Shah Waliullah himself was Shi'a.³

Shah Waliullah, Shah 'Abdu'l-'Aziz, Muhyiddin Ibn Al-'Arabi And Others Believe In Ismat Of The 12 Imams

Be as it may. Now let us have a look at Shah Waliullah's main argument that the belief of the 'ismah of our 12 Imams was incompatible with the belief in the Finality of Prophethood of the Holy Prophet (S) There is no need to look elsewhere. Interestingly enough, Shah Waliullah Dehlavi himself in this very book (quoted by this unknown writer), At-Tafhimatu 'l-Ilahiyah has attributed the following four spiritual qualities to our twelve Imams:

1. 'Ismah (Sinlessness, infallibility),
2. Hikmah (Sagacity, wisdom).
3. Wajahah (Prestige, excellence),
4. Qutbiyat Batiniyah (Being Spiritual Pivot).

Just to give a glimpse of what he says, I am translating a part of his writing about the wajahah:

"O brother! I have told you only one in a thousand concerning wajahah. When a servant becomes wajih (excellent, distinguished), he becomes beautiful and perfect. Then every step he takes becomes a good act; when he moves or takes a morsel to his mouth, it is a good act; when he rides, every step of his horse is a good act; when he sleeps his turning to his right side and his left sides, all becomes good acts; Allah accepts from him such deeds, multiples of which from others are not accepted.

"And He is (Allah's) beloved, and whatever Allah has created was created for him. And when 'ismah is completed, all his actions become haqq (true, correct). I do not say that his actions occur according to the haqq; but (I say that) his actions are the haqq (personified); rather, the haqq is a thing which is reflected from those actions as the rays are (reflected) from the sun. And the messenger of Allah has pointed to this rank when he prayed to Allah Ta'ala about 'Ali, saying: "O Allah! turn the haqq with him wherever he ('Ali) turns"; and he did not say: Turn him ('Ali) wherever the haqq turns." (Vol.2, p.19)

One Mirza Hassan 'Ali wrote a long letter to Shah 'Abdu 'l-'Aziz Muhaddith Dehlavi, objecting to how his illustrious father could establish

the above mentioned for qualities for “Hazaraat A’immah Ithna ‘ashar ‘Alayhumussalaam” (the respected twelve Imams, peace be upon them), when ‘Ismah, according to Sunni madhhab was not accepted for other than the Prophets, the Messengers and the angels; and how he (Shah ‘Abdu ‘l-‘Aziz Dehlavi) has confirmed it in his own “Risalah” while explaining the belief of his father.

The question and Shah ‘Abdu ‘l-‘Aziz’s detailed reply is printed in “Fatwa Shah ‘Abdu ‘l-‘Aziz”. It is not feasible to translate the whole description in this small booklet, but some sentences are quoted here to show the general import of his reply. He says:

“Ismah has two meanings: First: Impossibility of committing sins, although one has power to do so. This meaning, according to the Ijma’ of Ahlus-Sunnah is reserved for the Prophets and angels. Second: Not only committing any sin, although one could do so. There is no difficulty in this idea; and this meaning is called “mahfuziyyat” (Protection) in the Sufis’ language..... This meaning is not reserved for the Prophets. The Holy Prophet (Blessings and peace from Allah be upon him and his progeny) has asked for this ‘ismah when he prayed for his Ahlul-Bayt in these words: ‘O Allah! keep uncleanness away from them and purify them a thorough purification.’

“The useful hikmah is the useful knowledge. If it is learned (from people), it is not called hikmah.... If that knowledge is (divinely) gifted to someone’s heart, it is called hikmah, whether it concerns belief, actions or ethics. This too is not reserved for the Prophets..... That is why it has come in the noble hadith: ‘I am the house of hikmah and ‘Ali is its door’; and it has come in (another) well-known hadith: ‘I am the City of knowledge and ‘Ali is its door: And the knowledge in these traditions has this very same meaning (i.e. God-given knowledge.)

“Wajahah means that Allah deals with some of His servants in such a way that rebuts the enemies’ calumny from them, and shows their cleanness from allegations of faults and failings..... It is proved about ‘Ali Murtaza (May Allah be pleased with him) when (the Prophet S) prayed for him: Oh Allah! turn the haqq wherever he turns: and he did not say: Turn him wherever the haqq turns”.

“And Qutbiyat Batiniyah means that Allah Ta’ala selects from some of His servants, so that the divine favour first reaches them personally and directly, and then from them it goes to others, even if the (latter) receiver apparently has not learned or received directly anything from them. For example, sun’s rays reach inside a house through a skylight; first that skylight is illuminated and then other things are brightened through the skylight.”⁴

In this way, the belief in the ‘ismah and other qualities of our twelve Imams (“Alayhumussalaam”) is established by Shah Waliullah Dehlavi and confirmed with proofs by Shah ‘Abdu ‘l-‘Aziz Dehlavi. We have a right to ask these two illustrious Sunni scholars, whether they themselves believed in the Finality of Prophethood of Muhammad (S) or not?

The belief in the ‘ismah of our twelve Imams is not confined to the above- mentioned two scholars who incidently were among the bitterest

enemies of the Shi'as. Even before and after them Sunni 'ulama have been announcing such beliefs. For example, Shaykh Muhyiddin ibn Al-'Arabi Al-Undulusi (died 638 A.H) writes in his famous book, Al-Futuhāt Al-Makkiyah:

“Know that Mahdi (Allah be pleased with him) must appear. But he will not appear till the world becomes full of tyranny and injustice, then he will fill it with justice and equity: and if there were no more than one day remaining from the (life of the) world, Allah would elongate that day to enable this Khalifa to rule. And he (Imam Mahdi) is from the progeny of the Messenger of Allah (Blessings and peace from Allah be upon him), from the children of Fatimah (Allah be pleased with her): his forefather is Hussain, son of 'Ali bin Abi Talib, his father is Hassan Al-'Askari, son of Imam 'Ali An-Naqi, son of Imam Muhammad At-Taqi, son of Imam 'Ali Ar-Rdha, son of Imam Musa Al-Kazim, son of Imam Ja'far As-Sadiq, son of Imam Muhammad Al-Baqir, son of Imam Zainu 'l-'Abideen 'Ali, son of Imam Hussain, son of Imam 'Ali bin Abi Talib. His name is the name of the Messenger of Allah (i.e., Muhammad). The Muslims will do his Bay'at (will declare their allegiance to him) between Rukn and Maqam (i.e, Rukn Yamani and Maqam Ibrahim in Ka'bah); he will be like the Messenger of Allah (Blessings and peace be from Allah upon him) in appearance, and below him in character because nobody can be like the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be from Allah upon him) in character as Allah has said: “verily thou art on great character....” He will distribute wealth equally and will do justice to the public.... (Help from Allah) will precede him: he will follow the foot-steps of the Messenger of Allah, and he will commit no mistake, there will be an angel supporting him though he will not see him:....”⁵

Mark the word: and he will commit no mistake, there will be an angel supporting him.

Later on, another well-known Sunni Sufi scholar, Maulana 'Ali Akbar Maududi, wrote a hashiyah on Nafahat, in which he writes:

“Shaykh Abu 'I-Hasan ash-Shadhili (may Allah be pleased with him) has said that the Qutb⁶ has fifteen signs, as (for example) he is helped with 'ismah (sinlessness), rahmah (mercy), khilafah and niyabah (successorship) and he is supported by those angels who hold up the 'arsh (throne of God), and the reality of (divine) attributes etc.... Accordingly, the madhhab of those is confirmed who believe that persons other than the Prophets can be ma'sum..... The fact that the promised Mahdi (May Allah be pleased with him) is in existence and he is the Qutb after his father al-Hassan al-'Askari (Peace be upon them both), as he was the Qutb after his father and so on upto Imam 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (May Allah honour us through them), indicates that this rank (of Qutbiyat) is confined into their (these twelve Imams) personalities since the time Qutbiyat came to the person of his (Mahdi's) forefather, 'Ali ibn Talib until it is completed in him (in Mahdi) - not before that. Now any other Qutb who gets this rank, does so as his substitute -- because he (Mahdi) is hidden from the eyes of the general public and even special people (although he is not hidden from the eyes of

highly distinguished persons....). Therefore, it is inevitable that every Imam from these twelve Imams should be ma'sum."⁷

And in the last (14th) century, the well-known Sunni scholar, Maulana Wahidu 'z-Zaman of Hyderabad Deccan had written:

"The correct view is that in this verse (of Purity) only these five persons are included (i.e. the Prophet, 'Ali, Fatimah, Hasan and Husayn), although in Arabic usage, the word Ahlu 'I-Bayt is used for wives also. Some people prove by this verse that these five persons were sinless and ma'sum (infallible). But if not ma'sum, then of course they were surely mahfuz (protected from committing any sin or error)."⁸

So, these are our twelve Imams, whose 'ismah is accepted even by our bitterest enemies. They had to be ma'sum because the Prophet (S), whose successors they were, was ma'sum.

Those whose Prophet was not completely free from sins and errors, had to be content with leaders who were not ma'sum. It is amusing to see such people blaming us why we believe in these ma'sum Imams!! We have not closed the door of Shi'ism to anyone. If they envy us because of our ma'sum Imams, they are welcome to enter the fold of Shi'ism and they too will get guidance from the same ma'sum Leaders!!

Finality of Prophethood

The unknown writer asserts: "Shi'a belief in 'Imamate' is nothing but an extension to Prophethood, which of course is given a different name. But what is then in name when the intent and content is the same?"

Anyone interested in knowing our belief concerning Khatmun Nabuwwat (Finality of Prophethood) should study my book, "Muhammad (S) Is the last Prophet" or its Swahili translation, "Muhammad (S) Ni Nabi wa Mwisho", which are available from the Bilal Muslim Mission of Tanzania. A few sentences are quoted from it for easy reference:

"When humanity reached that stage, Allah sent the final Shari'ah which was to serve the mankind to the last day of the world. After Muhammad Mustafa (S) there was no need for any Shari'ah, there was no need for any new Prophet or messenger from God. And it was for this reason that he was declared by Allah to be the Last of the Prophets." (p. 13)

"Of course, the need for an interpreter of the Qur'an and Protector of the Shari'ah will remain forever. But Allah appointed Imams for this purpose, after the Last Prophet. The chain of the Prophethood came to an end and a new system of religious leadership, known as 'Imamat' was introduced. The Holy Prophet said:

"Bani Israel, Prophets were leading them; when a Prophet died another Prophet succeeded him. But after me there is no Prophet, and surely there will be the successors." (pp. 14-15)

Now this unknown writer should ask the Holy Prophet (S): "But what is then in name when the intent and content is the same?" (But actually the intent and content is not the same, as is clear from the quotation given above).

The unknown author has used p.7 to p.13 of his booklet quoting some sentences from various Shi'a books and booklets to show that Imamate in the eyes of the Shi'as is a continuation of the divine guidance after the Last

Prophet; and that the Shi'as believe that an Imam must be ma'sum (infallible) and mansus min Allah (appointed by Allah). If that author of unknown origin does not like this belief, he should have refuted the proofs offered by those authors. If he had not seen the books printed in Iran, Pakistan or India, surely he must have seen my book "Imamate" from which he has quoted a single sentence on p.10 of his booklet. Now, my book contains 188 pages, all on this very subject.

And the topic of 'Ismah and appointment by Allah begins on p.39 and goes on to p.105. I would have enjoyed it if that author would had tried to refute any of my arguments. But he did not have the courage to do so; and merely went on claiming that this belief of the Shi'as was against the Sunnis' belief. Well, everyone knows that there is a world of difference between the Shi'a and Sunni beliefs about Imamate and Caliphate. So why labour on this point. If he thinks the Shi'a belief is wrong, he should have refuted our arguments. But he has brought no argument, and there is nothing to reply.

In addition to the proofs written in Imamate, I have given here assertions by Shaykh Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi, Maulana 'Ali Akbar Maududi, Shah Waliullah Dehlavi, Shah 'Abdu 'l-Aziz Dehlavi and Maulana Wahidu 'z-Zaman Hyderabadî that our Twelve Imams were Ma'sum (sinless, infallible). If the Shi'as are kafir because of this belief, what about these stalwarts of Sunniism? Were they Muslims? Or they too were kafirs?

Notes

1. at-Taftazani, Sharu 'l-Maqasid, Beirut, 1409/1989, vol. 5, p.51
 2. Mulla Ali al-Qari, Sharu 'l-fiqhi 'l-akbar, Beirut, 1404-1984, p. 93.
 3. Manazir Ahsan Gilani, Tadhkirah-e-Hazrat Shah Waliullah, Karachi, 1959, pp.198-199.
 4. Shah 'Abdu'l-'Aziz Dehlavi, Fatwa 'Azizi, Dehli (India). n.d., pp. 126-128.
 5. Al-Futuhât al-Makkiyah, Chapter 366. These words of Shaykh Muhyiddin ibn Al-'Arabi (died in 638 A.H.) have been quoted by many respected Sunni and Shi'a scholars of Turkey, Egypt and India. Important among them are:
 - a. Shaykh 'Abdul Wahhab as-Sha'rani, (b. 898- d. 973 A.H.) in his Al-Yawaqit wal Jawahir, (which he completed in Rajab, 955, i.e., 18 years before his death), Egypt. 1307, Vol. 2, p.145, reprinted Darul Ma'rifah, Beirut;
 - b. Shaykh Muhammad As-Sabban ash-Shafii (d. 1206 A.H.), in his Is'afu 'r-Raghibeen, Egypt, 1312, p.142; also published on the margin of Mashariqu 'l-Anwar, (see below);
 - c. Shaykh Hasan Al-'Adawi Al-Hamzawi (d. 1303) in his Mashriqu 'l-Anwar, Matba'at Al-'Uthmaniyah, Istanbul, 1307;
 - d. Sayyid Hamid Husayn Al-Musawi (d. 1306), in his Istiqsa'u'l-Ifham, Lucknow, Vol.2 Tahreef in Al-Futuhât:
- Keep in view all these quotations by such respected 'ulama, and then look into Al-Futuhât printed in Egypt in 1339 in 4 volumes. You will find that the publishers have changed the words, "his forefather is Husain", to his forefather is al-Hasan; and then they have omitted the whole genealogy beginning with the words, "his father is Hasan Al-Askari" and ending four lines later at, "son of Imam 'Ali bin Abi Talib".
- Regrettably such tahreef has become a regular feature of all old books published in Egypt and some Muslim countries since last 100 years or so.
6. Some particulars of Qutb have been described by Shah Waliullah, as quoted earlier.
 7. Maulana 'Ali Akber Maududi, al-Mukashafat (Hashiya on Nafahat), under the name 'Ali ibn Sahl al-Isfihani, as quoted in Istiqsa'u'l-Ifham, vol.2
 8. Wahiduzzaman Khan, Anwaru 'l-lughah, Banglore, para 22, p.51.

Tahrif

Some Examples of the Wahhabi Writer's Crass Ignorance

The first proof, according to him:

“is established by the fact that they subscribe to the doctrine of Tahrif in the Qur'an. All the Shi'as belonging to previous generations or present generations, their Imams and various Shi'a sects are unanimous in their belief in this regard. Hence, Shias are Kafirs on the basis of Ijma' (consensus of the Ummah).”

In another place he writes:

“The founders of Shi'a religion ever since they laid its foundation have passed through three historical phases. In the first phase, no one among the Shi'as held the belief that the Qur'an is complete and uncorrupted. However, in the second phase only four priests among the Shi'as professed out of sheer Taqiya that there has been no Tahrif in the Qur'an.

“They were (1) Abu Jaffar Sani Muhammad bin Ali bin Hussain bin Mussa bin Bayyabah Allama Sadduqh, died 381 A.H. (2) Sharif Murtaza Abdul Qasim Ali bin Hussain bin Hassanain bin Mussa Baghdadi, author of 'ilmul Huda, died in 436 A.H. (3) Shaikh at-Taifa Abu Jaffar Muhammad bin Hussain bin Ali Tooosi Mufasir, died in 460 A.H. (4) Abu Ali Tabrisi Aminuddin Fazal bin Hussain bin Tazal Mashudi, authour of Tafsir Majmah al-Bayan, died in 548 A.H.

“That is to say in the second phase from 261 A.H to 548 A.H. only four priests among the Shi'as did not believe that there has been Tahrif in the Qur'an. However, since their sayings were not based on arguments and were against the uninterrupted narrations of the Shi'a religion, the Shi'a Ulama of the second phase rejected their sayings and findings.”

In the first quotation the fool has used an expression by which he accuses our Imams of Kufr. Na'udhu billah. Let him ask Shah Waliullah and Shah 'Abdu 'l-'Aziz whether a person who insults the Shi'a's Twelve Imams (a.s.) in such blasphemous way is Muslim or Kafir. Or let him ask the same qustion from his guide, Manzoor Ahmad Nu'mani. The reply will also be a litmus test for Manzoor Ahmad Nu'mani's Islam.

Also the fool does not know that the Founder of the Shi'ism was none other than the Holy Prophet of Islam (S) as the reader has already seen in the article, “Meaning and Origin of Shi'ism” at the beginning of this booklet.

The historical phases which he mentions are his own invention, or may be it has been invented by his group. However he does not know that the “four priests” mentioned by him were the accepted heads of the Shi'a community in their times, and their writings are revered in the Shi'a world until now.

He is unable even to write their names correctly; and I'm sure he has never seen their books.

He writes:

“(1) Abu Jaffar Sani Muhammad bin Ali bin Hussain bin Mussa bin Bayyabah Allama Sadduqh”

COMMENT: His kunyah was Abu Ja'far: there is no 'Sani' in it. His great-great-grandfather was Babuwayh (not Bayyabah), and he is known as ash-Shaykh as-Saduq (not Allamah Sadduq).

“(2) Sharif Murtaza Abdul Qasim Ali bin Hussain bin Hassanain bin Mussa Baghdadi, author of ‘ilmul Huda.”

COMMENT: The phrase, “author of ‘ilmul Huda” is most amusing. ‘Alamu’l- huda (The standard of guidance) was the title of Sharif al-Murtaza. This ignorant man thought it was his book; and even then, he could not pronounce it correctly and turned ‘Alam into ‘ilm. Then his Kunyat was Abul Qasim (not Abdul Qasim); Sharif al-Murtaza’s father was Abu Ahmad al-Husayn ibn Musa; this ignorant writer has added ‘bin Hassanaain” in between.

“(3) Shaikh at-Taifa Abu Jaffar Muhammad bin Hussain bin Ali Toousi Mufasir”

COMMENT: Shaykhu ‘t-Ta’ifah’s father’s name was al-Hasan (not Hussain).

“(4) Abu Ali Tabrisi Aminuddin Fazal bin Hussain bin Tazal Mashudi, author of Tafsir Majmah al-Bayan”

COMMENT: His as well as his grandfather’s name was “Fazl” (not Fazal or Tazal) and his father was al-Hasan (not Hussain); I could not ascertain which word the ignorant writer has corrupted to “Mashudi”. The name of the Tafsir is Majma’u ‘l-Bayan, not Majmah al-Bayan.

These examples are enough to show the level of this man’s “knowledge”. Also I challenge him to write the name of the Shi’a ‘Ulama of the so-called second phase who had rejected their sayings and findings.

However, let us look at the subject in hand. I will just give some quotations from our books about this subject of Tahrif; and then see what the Sunni books say about it.

The Shi’ah Belief

First, our belief about the Qur’an may be seen from the following quotation from our Kitabu ‘l-I’tiqadat (the Book of Creed) written by Shaykh as-Saduq Abu Ja’far Muhammad ibn ‘Ali ibn Husayn ibn Musa Babuwayh, (the first “Priest” mentioned above):

“It is our belief that the Qur’an which Allah has revealed to His Prophet Muhammad, is the same which is between the two boards (daffatayn): and it is that which is in the hands of the people, and is not more than that”

Then he says:

“And he who asserts that we say that it is more than that is a liar.”

Then he gives some of the reasons for our belief that the Qur’an is not more than the text which is in the hands of the people. Those reasons are as follows:

- a. The traditions which describe the thawab (reward) of each and every surah of the Qur’an:
- b. The traditions which describe the thawab of the person who recites the whole Qur’an:
- c. The permission to recite two surahs in one rak’ah (in nafilah):
- d. The prohibition of reciting two surahs in one rak’ah in Farizah prayers.

“All these verify what we have said about the Qur’an and that its total amount is what is in the people’s hands. Likewise, what has been narrated from the Prophet forbidding the recital of the whole Qur’an in one night and that it is not allowed to finish recital of the Qur’an in less than three days, All this too confirms what we have said.”

Then pointing to Ahad ith Qudsiyah, (which were also sent by Allah but not as part of the Qur’an), he says:

“We say that so much of revelation was sent down, but not as a part of the Qur’an, that if all of it were collected, its extent would undoubtedly be equal to seventeen thousand verses. And this, for example. is like the saying of Jibra’il to the Prophet (S): ‘Verily Allah says to you, O Muhammad: Deal gently with my creatures in the same manner as I do’; and like his saying: ‘Beware of the hatred of people and their enmity’; and like his words, ‘Live as long as you want, but ultimately you have to die; and love whatever you like, but you have to be separated from it; and do whatever you like, for (in the end) you have to meet it’; and, ‘Glory of the believer is his prayer at night, and his honour is in refraining from hurting the people’; and like the saying of the Prophet (S) ‘Jibra’il always exhorted me to clean (my) teeth until I thought that my teeth would fall down, and he always exhorted me about the neighbour until I thought that he would soon include him in the heirs, and he always exhorted me concerning woman until I thought that she should not be given divorce, and he continued to exhort me about slave until I thought that he would soon fix a time-limit after which he should be freed’; and like the words of Jibra’il when the Prophet had finished the battle of Khandaq: ‘O Muhammad! Verily Allah orders you that you should not pray the ‘Asr prayer except in Banu Qurayzah’; and like the saying of the Prophet (S): “My Lord has ordered me to deal gently with the people as He has ordered me to pray Farizah prayers’; and like his words: ‘We, the Prophets, have been ordered to talk with people according to their understanding’..... .

He goes on quoting many such Ahadith Qudsiyah and concludes by saying:

“There are many such wordings, all of which are revelations, but they were not sent as part of the Qur’an; otherwise they would surely have been included in the Qur’an and not excluded.”¹

This is from only one book. Other proofs showing that there has been no addition in or omission from the Qur’an are clearly explained in hundreds of our books of ahadith, tafseer and theology.

Now we come to what our mufasssir ash-Shaykh Abu ‘Ali al-Fazl ibn al-Hasan at-Tabrisi (a.r.) has written, in the Muqaddamah of his Tafsir Majma’u ‘l-bayan:

“It is unanimously agreed that there is no addition in the Qur’an. As for omission, a group among our co-religionists (that is, the Shi’ahs) as well as the al-Hashawiyah² from among the Sunnis have narrated traditions to the effect that there is some alteration and omission in the Qur’an. But the correct madh-hab of our co-religionists is against it. And it is what has been supported by ‘al-Murtaza (may Allah sanctify his soul); and he has written in full detail on this subject in his Jawabu ‘l-masa’ili ‘t-Tarabalasiyat.” Then

he mentions some of the points given by as-Sayyid Murtaza, in short as follows:

“That the Qur’an was narrated correctly is known as we know about the big cities, great events, important happenings as well as famous books and the narrated poems of the Arabs. The fact is that the motive to transmit and preserve the Qur’an was stronger, and care bestowed on the Qur’an deeper than that given to the above-mentioned things. The attention towards the Qur’an was unprecedented, because it is the miracle of the prophethood, the source of the knowledge of the shari’ah and the religious laws. The Muslim scholars have done their utmost for its protection and preservation, until they have grasped its every detail: its vowels, recitals, letters and verses. How could any thing be changed or omitted from it with all this sincere care and strict precision?

“Also he (may Allah sanctify his soul) has said: The knowledge of the exegesis of the Qur’an and its parts is similar to that of the whole Qur’an in correctness of its transmission. It is similar to what is known about other well-known works, like the Book of Saybwayh and that of al-Muzni... If someone inserts an extraneous chapter in these books, it will at once be known, recognized and detected, that it is spurious...And we know that the care and control in transmission of the Qur’an was more strict and sincere than that used in transmission of the Book of Saybwayh and collections of the poets poems.

“Also he (r.a.) has said: Verily the Qur’an was in collected and compiled form during the time of the Messenger of Allah (S) in the same form as it is today. The following proofs have been given for it:

(1) The Qur’an was recited and memorized-the whole of it -in those days, so much so that the Messenger of Allah (S) had appointed a group of the companions to memorize it.

(2) It was used to be presented (from time to time) and recited before the Prophet (S).

(3) A group of the companions, like ‘Abdullah ibn Mas’ud and Ubayy ibn Ka’b and others had recited the Qur’an from the beginning to the end several times before the Prophet (S).

All these things prove clearly that it was compiled and arranged, not scattered and disarranged.

“Also he has said that those Shi’as and Hashawiyah who have gone against it, their opposition is not worthy of consideration because this view comes from some narrators of traditions who had transmitted some weak traditions which they thought were correct; and such traditions are not of such caliber that they could defeat a definitely known correct fact. (That is, the definitely known fact that the Qur’an was unaltered cannot be ignored because of such weak traditions).”³

I have quoted at some length from the books of as-Saduq (r.a.) and at-Tabrasi (r.a.), i.e. the first and the last of the four scholars mentioned by the un-known writer and the last quotation contains some proofs given by as-Sayyid Murtaza ‘Alamu’l-huda, the second “priest” mentioned in “What is Shi’aism?”.

Now read again what the said writer has said:

“However, since their sayings were not based on arguments and were against the un-interrupted narrations of the Shi’a religion, the Shi’a Ulama of the second phase rejected their sayings and findings:

You may judge whether their writings were based on arguments or not. And can he tell us who were the other “Ulama of the second phase” who rejected their findings? The fool is unaware of the status these scholars had and have in the Shi’a community.

You have seen what strong proofs they have presented, and how they have discarded the traditions of alterations transmitted by some Shi’as and the Sunnis.

And in this light I invite the readers to join me, in order that we bring about the curse of Allah on the liars.⁴

He also claims that:

“Allama Bahrul Uloom Farangi Mahal (sic) earlier issued Fatwa to the effect that Shi’as are Muslims but after seeing Tafsir Majmah-al-Bayan he came to know that Shi’as subscribe to the view of Tahrif in the Qur’an.

“Consequently he gave Fatwa about the Kufr of Shi’as and wrote that whoso subscribes to the view of Tahrif in the Qur’an is definitely a Kafir (disbeliever in Islam)”.

The readers have seen how Tafsir Majma’u ‘l-bayan refutes the idea of Tahrif in the Qur’an. The story written about Bahrul Uloom is apparently just a figment of his imagination. However we agree with that Sunni scholar that whoever believes in the Tahrif of the Qur’an is out of the circle of Islam -whoever he might be.

Also, this unknown writer does not know that Tafsir Majma’u ‘l-bayan was selected by the scholars of al-Azhar and printed under their supervision at Cairo.

His main drawback is his total ignorance -not only of the Shi’a sources but of his own books of traditions and Tafsir. Otherwise no Sunni who has studied his own books of traditions and Tafsir, will dare to write such trash.

I am sure he has never seen the book of Bahrul Uloom Farangi Mahal; not only has he misquoted Bahrul Uloom’s Fatwa, but also does not know the correct name of his book which he has referred to on page 29. I could have corrected his mistake (as I have done above about the names of Shi’a authors and their books). But I am leaving it as it is and challenge him to produce any book of Bahrul Uloom named Fatawah al-Rahmat, and quote that book’s actual wording.

Of course, there are traditions of Tahreef in some Shi’a books as there are in the Sunni books. But the approach of the Shi’as to such traditions differs completely from the approach of the Sunnis. First let me write something about our approach.

Shi’a View

There are four early collections of Shi’a ahadith which are together called “Four early books”- al-Kafi, Man la yahdurhu ‘l-faqih, Tahdhibu ‘l-ahkam and al-Istibsar. Although these books are held in great esteem, the Shi’as have never called them “Sihah”. Consequently, they are not fettered by any hadith written there simply because it is in one of the four books. Instead, they subject all ahad ith in all these books to strict tests, as to their

asnad (narrators), and dirayah, and examine whether a given hadith conforms with the Qur'an, the accepted sayings of the Ma'sumeen and the known facts. If ahadith passes these tough tests, then it is accepted. If not, then it is re-interpreted in an acceptable way, failing which it is rejected outright.

It should be mentioned here that an overwhelming part of traditions concerning tahrif is defective and weak as far as their chains of narrators are concerned. Even then, some of these traditions may be taken to denote that there has occurred misinterpretation in some verses, giving them wrong meanings. Another group of traditions may easily be construed to mention marginal explanatory notes of the reciters.

But there still remain many traditions which cannot be explained in either way. And our scholars unhesitatingly have rejected them because they go against the Qur'an and Sunnah, and are contrary to the Ijma' of Ummah that there has never been any addition in or omission from the Qur'an.

Late as-Sayyid Al-Khoui (r.a.) has written on the Protection of the Qur'an from Tahrif in his tafsir al-Bayan from p.213 to 278, in which he has dealt with all Sunni and Shi'a traditions on this subject. Two short quotations from Shi'a authorities given therein are as follows:

"Muhaddiq al-Kalbasi has said: All these reports which speak of tahreef are against the Ijma' and therefore unreliable (except to a negligible number of people)."

"The commentator of al-Wafiyah, Muhaddiq al-Baghdadi, has clearly stated, by quoting from Muhaddiq al-Karaki (who has written a complete tract on the subject), that: The traditions which speak of omission must either be reinterpreted or rejected. Any tradition which is contradictory to the Qur'an, the acknowledged sunnah and the Ijma', must be discarded if it has no room for re-interpretation or justifiable explanation."⁵

A tradition recorded in al-Kafi is quoted here to give an example in practice of what we mean when we speak of reinterpretation or justifiable explanation:

"Abu 'Abdillah (peace be on him) said:

"The Qur'an which was brought by Jibra'il (peace be on him) to Muhammad (mercy of Allah be on him and his progeny) is seventeen thousand verses."⁶

The statement of ash-Shaykh as-Saduq (a.r.) in his Kitabu 'l-I'tiqadat, about the amount of the revelation that was Hadith Qudsi, may be taken as an interpretation of this hadith.

If one is not prepared to accept this explanation because the tradition speaks about "the Qur'an": then he has no option but to discard this hadith without hesitation, because the number is three times larger than the actual number of the verses of the Qur'an.

This un-known writer after quoting this hadith of al-Kafi, is very, much worried that:

"This means that with the Shi'as two-third of the Qur'an is not in circulation."

Even if we accepted this tradition at its face-value, the missing verses would be much less than the number mentioned by the 2nd Khalifah ‘Umar ibn al- Kahattab. He had said:

“The Qur’an is one million and twenty seven thousand (1,027,000) letters; whoever recites it with patience and reflection, will get for every letter a mate from the houries.”⁷

But reportedly there are only two hundred sixty seven thousand and fifty three letters (267,033) in the Qur’an as may be seen in many editions of the Qur’an which have given at the end the detailed number of each letter of the alphabets. ‘This means that with the Sunnis three-fourths of the Qur’an is not in circulation.’ Will the unknown writer tell us where have the remaining 759,947 letters gone?

Probably it was for this reason that the son of the 2nd Khalifah, ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Umar used to say: “One of you says, ‘I have got the whole Qur’an’, and what does he know what was the whole of it; Surely a great part of the Qur’an has gone; rather he should say: I have got what has come to light from it.”⁸

This brings us to the Sunni traditions.

Sunni Traditions

It is not possible to give details of all the surahs, verses, sentences and phrases which the Sunni traditions say were lost at the time the Qur’an was collected. A few glaring examples are as follows:

1. The 33rd Surah al-Ahzab is alleged to have contained 200 or nearly 300 verses, all of which except 73 are said to have been lost. The claim of 200 verses is attributed to Ummul Mu’mineen ‘A’ishah:

“It has been narrated by Abu ‘Ubayd in al-Faza’il and by ibn Al-Anbari and Ibn Marduwayh from ‘A’ishah that she said: ‘The Surah al-Ahzab was recited in the days of the Prophet (S) two hundred verses, but when ‘Uthman wrote the Qur’an, he was unable to find more than what is there at present.”⁹

But there are only 73 verses in this surah.

Hudhayfah said that 70 verses were lost from this Surah.¹⁰ But Ubayy ibn Ka’b has said that this sura was equal to, or even bigger than, the chapter of al-Baqarah.¹¹ Also the tabi’i, ‘Ikrimah has reportedly said the same.¹²

The ch. of al-Baqarah contains 286 verses. It means, that according to these Sahabah 213 or even more verses’ were lost, including the verse of stoning.

2. The ninth Surah at-Tawbah: It is alleged that 2/3rd or 3/4th of this surah has been lost. This report comes from Hudhayfah al-Yamani:

“Hudhayfah (r.a.) said: ‘That which you call Surah al-Tawbah, it is the Surah of Punishment; by Allah! it did not leave anyone but debased him: and you do read its one-fourth only.”¹³

The same Sahabi in another tradition says: “You do not read (even) its (Surah at-Tawbah’s) one-third.” That is, more than its two-thirds are gone.¹⁴

Imam Malik ibn Anas, the Imam of the Malikiyah Sunnis, was asked as to why there was no “Bismillah” in this surah. He said: “It was lost with its earlier parts, because it is confirmed that it was equal to surah al-Baqarah in length.”¹⁵

But there are only 127 verses in this surah in the Qur'an while surah al-Baqarah contains 286 verses.

I think there is no need to mention the Sunni surahs of al-Khall' and al-Hafd , and another surah equal to surah al-Baqarah, which the Sunni books say were completely lost; former two were recorded by Ubayy ibn Ka'b in his Qur'an and by Abu Musa al-Ash'ari¹⁶ and the 3rd was forgotten by Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari.¹⁷

Hundreds of ahadith of major or minor deletions are narrated in Sunni books by many other big personalities, like the companions, 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbas, 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar, 'Abdullah ibn Mas'ud, 'Abdur-Rahman ibn 'Awf, Zayd ibn Arqam, Jabir ibn 'Abdullah, Buraydah, Maslamah ibn Makhlad, Abu Waqid al-Laythi, Ummul-Mu'mineen Hafsa, Ummul-Mu'mineen Ummu Salimah, and the aunt of Abu Amamah ibn Sahl, in addition to the Tabi'i 'Ikrimah.

These traditions are found in Sahih al-Bukhari, Sahih Muslim, Sunan Abi Dawood, Sahih Tirmidhi, Sunan Nasai, Sunan al-Bayhaqi, Musnad of Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Muwatta' of Imam Malik, Tarikh of Imam al-Bukhari, Fathul Bari (Sharh of Sahih Bukhari of Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani), Tafsir Ad-Durru 'l-Manthur and Al-Itqan (Both by as-Suyuti) and Kanzu 'l-'Ummal. Anyone eager to have a glimpse of those traditions should consult my Urdu book, Itmam-e- Hujjat, Faizabad (India), 1986.

In short the Sunni books of "ahadith" contain a lot of such traditions. But there is a basic difference between the two sects' respective attitudes towards such traditions. I have mentioned earlier what the Shi'a view is regarding such traditions. Now let us see what the Sunnis have to say.

Sunnis' View

The Sunnis' attitude towards such ahadith is influenced by their belief that the traditions of Sihah Sittah (the six correct books of traditions), and especially those found in Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim are all correct.

Imam Nawawi (631-676 A.H.) writes in his Sharh of Sahih Muslim:

"The fact that the Ummah has willingly accepted (these two Sahihs of al-Bukhari and Muslim) has let us know that it is wajib to act on what is written in these two, and it is unanimously agreed. People are obliged to act on a Khabar-ul- Wahid found in books other than the two when its chain of narrators is correct, and (even then) it would not create but only a strong assumption. And the same applies to the two sahihs; but these two differ from the other books in that all that is in these two is correct and there is no need to examine them; rather it is Wajib to follow them unconditionally; but as for the ahadith in other books they will not be followed until their credentials are checked and they are found to fulfill the conditions of "correct" ahadith"

This unconditional blanket acceptance of the ahadith found in these books has compelled the Sunnis to accept the theory of (Naskhut-tilawah) abrogation of recital; that is, they believe that recital of some verses was abrogated although the law contained in some of them continues. Two well-known examples of such supposed verses are the so-called verses of stoning and of ten or five sucklings, which are found in Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim and other books.

For the “verse of stoning” see:

Sahih al-Bukhari, vol. 4, p. 179, 265;

Sahih Muslim, vol. 3, p. 1317;

Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, Egypt: vol. 1, p. 40;

Sunan Ibn Majah, Egypt, vol. 2, p. 853;

Muwatta’ Imam Malik, vol. 2, p. 623.

For the “verse of suckling”, see:

Sahih Muslim, vol. 4, p. 167;

ad -Durru ‘l-Manthur, vol. 2, p. 135

And the hadith of Sahih Muslim explicitly says:

“Ummul Mu’mineen ‘A’isha said: ‘There was among what was revealed of the Qur’an (the verse): “Ten known sucklings create prohibition” (i.e. foster relationship). Then it was abrogated by “Five sucklings”, and the Messenger of Allah expired and they were among what was recited of the Quran.”¹⁸

The question arises: Who had the right to abrogate a Qur’anic verse after the Prophet’s death? Did any other Prophet come after the Holy Prophet of Islam?

That is why as-Sayyid Abul Qasim Al-khoui (r.a.) has said:

“And it is clear that the theory of “abrogation of recital” is exactly the belief in alteration in and omission from the Qur’an”¹⁹

Even more explicit is the hadith narrated by Ummu ‘l-Mu’mineen ‘A’ishah that the paper containing the verses of stoning and sucklings of elder people was under the pillow of the Prophet. When he expired and people were busy in burial arrangements, a goat entered and ate away the paper. Thus it was lost forever.²⁰

Now this author of unknown origin should read again the names of those companions, Tabi’in and Imams who have narrated these ahadith, and the names of those muhaddithin and mufassirin who have written these ahadith in their books, and after that pronounce the fatwa of ‘Allama Bahrul Uloom which he has quoted on p. 25 of his pamphlet that: “whoso subscribes to the view of Tahrif in the Qur’an is definitely a kafir (disbeliever in Islam).”

Congratulations!

Notes

1. Shaykh as-Saduq, Kitabu ‘l-I’tiqadat, Ch. of ‘Belief about the length of the Qur’an’.
2. It has been described that Wahhabis are today’s al-Hasbawiyah.
3. Majma‘u’l-bayan, Beirut ed. Vol. I. pp. 30-31.
4. Qur’an, 3:61.
5. As-Sayyid Al-Khoui, Tafsir al-Bayan, Kuwait. 1399/1979. p 253.
6. Al-Kulayni, Al-Kafi, 1388. Vol.2, p.463.
7. As-Suyuti, Al-Itqan, Dehli ed. Vol. 1. p. 93.
8. As-Suyuti, Al-Itqan, Vol. 2. p. 32; Tafsir Ad-Durru ‘l-manthur, vol.2 p.298.
9. Al-Itqan, Vol. 2, p. 32; Ad-Durru ‘l-manthur, Vol. 5, pp. 170-180.
10. Ad-Durru ‘l-manthur, Vol. 5, pp.180, quoting from al-Bukhari, At-Tarikh.
11. Al-Itqan, Vol. 2, p. 32.
12. Ad-Durru ‘l-manthur, Vol. 5, pp. 179.
13. Ad-Durru ‘l-manthur, Vol. 3, pp. 208; Al-Itqan, Vol. 2, p. 34.
14. Ad-Durru ‘l-manthur, Vol. 3, pp. 208.
15. Al-Itqan, Vol. 1, p. 86.
16. Al-Itqan, Vol. 1, p. 86-87.

17. Ibnu'l-Athir, Jam'u 'l-usul. Egypt, 1370 A.H., Vol. 3. p. 8.
18. Sahih Muslim, vol. 4, p. 167; ad-Durru 'l-Manthur, vol. 2, P. 135.
19. As-Sayyid Al-Khoui, Tafsir al-Bayan, p.224.
20. Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal, al-Musnad, Egypt, 1313 A.H. Vol. 6. p. 269; Sunan Ibn Majah, p. 626; Ibn Qutaybah, Ta'wilu Mukhtalafi 'l-ahadith, Beirut. 1409/1989. p. 372; ad-Durru 'l-Manthur, vol. 2, p. 135.

Hadith

The ignorant writer writes under the heading “Denial of the Hadith”:

“The Shia’s have their own books of traditions; however, in these books the sayings of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi Wasallam) are no more than five percent; the rest 95 % contains sayings and doings of their imams. In Shi’a terminology “Hadith” means talk, action or speech of an Imam. Thus the Shi’as have broken all the links with the Islam of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi Wasallam) who on the occasion of Farewell Pilgrimage said:

“I am leaving behind two things among you; if you hold fast to them you will never go astray. These are the Book of Allah and my Sunnah”

There are a lot of amusing things in this short quotation.

Let us begin with the definition of Hadith. Hadith even in Sunni terminology is not confined to “narration of the talk, action or ‘Taqreer’ of the Holy Prophet (S) but includes talks of his companions and their disciples too.

Likewise, in Shi’a terminology it means the talk, action or “Taqreer” of the Holy Prophet (S), his daughter Bibi Fatimah and the twelve Imams (a.s.) (i.e. the 14 Ma’sums) or its narration.

Now it is for the reader to decide whether the words of the companions and their disciples (who were admittedly not Ma’sum) are more worthy of acceptance or those of Bibi Fatimah and the 12 Imams whose ‘Ismah is accepted even by such pillars of Sunni’ism as Shah Waliullah Dehlavi, Shah ‘Abdu ‘l- ‘Aziz Dehlavi and others. This is quite apart from the fact that 4 of this group - Bibi Fatimah, ‘Ali, Hasan and Husayn a.s - were also companions of the Holy Prophet (S).

The unknown writer has given the definition of hadith in these words: “In Shi’a terminology “Hadith” means talk, action or speech of an Imam.’ You have seen that it is not only Imams but even before them the Holy Prophet and Bibi Fatimah whose talk, action and Taqreer or its narration which is called Hadith. Most amusing is his translation of “Taqreer” as speech, which shows his crass ignorance of even his own madhhab and its terminologies, because the terminology “Taqreer” is commonly used by all sects, and it means this:

“When a follower does something in the presence of the Prophet or Imam and the Prophet or Imam does not forbid him to do so (in spite of being in a position to guide that follower if he so wished), then that silent or tacit approval will prove the validity of the follower’s action.’ This “silent approval” is called “Taqreer” which this fool has translated as “speech”

He claims that 95% of the Shi’a traditions are from the Imams. Can anyone accept the claim of someone who has not ever seen any book of Shi’a traditions? He is ignorant of the fact that our Imams never spoke of their own accord. Whatever they said was a narration of the ahadith received through their immaculate and sinless forefathers. As this fact was known to one and all, there was no need for them to elongate their hadith by mentioning the chain of narrators.

Someone who was unaware of this fact asked Imam Muhammad al-Baqir (a.s.) about the hadith “which you transmit without mentioning its chain of narrators” The Imam (a.s.) said: “When I narrate a hadith without

mentioning its chain of narrators, then my link in that is “my father (Imam Zaynu ‘l-‘Abedeem a.s.) from my grandfather (Imam al-Husayn a.s.) from his father (Imam ‘Ali a.s) from the Messenger of Allah (Blessings of Allah be on him and his progeny), from Jibra’il from Allah the Mighty, the Great.”¹

The same declaration was made by Imam Ja’far as-Sadiq (a.s.) about his own ahadith.²

Salim ibn Hafsah says: “When Abu Ja’far Muhammad al-Baqir ibn ‘Ali (Zaynu ‘l-‘Abedeem) (peace be on both) died, I said to my companions: ‘Wait for me, so that I may go to Abu ‘Abdillah Ja’far (as-Sadiq) ibn Muhammad (Al-Baqir) (peace be on him) to offer condolences to him’. Then I went to his house and offered condolence. Then I said: “To Allah we belong and to Him are we to return. By Allah, such a man has passed away that when he said, ‘The Messenger of Allah (S) has said: he was not asked about the links between him and the Messenger of Allah (S). No, by Allah! his like will not be seen again!’”

He says: “(Hearing this), Abu ‘Abdillah (Imam Ja’far as-Sadiq a.s.) was silent for a while; then said: ‘Allah, the Mighty, the Great, has said: “Verily, whosoever gives in sadaqah even a portion of a date, I make it grow for him as one of you brings up his colt, until I make it (big) for him like the (mountain of) Uhud;”’” Then I came to my companions and said: ‘I never saw anything more wonderful than it. We used to regard as great the words, “The Messenger of Allah (S) said” when spoken by Abu Ja’far (Imam Muhammad al-Baqir a.s.) without the intermediate links: and (now) Abu ‘Abdillah (Imam Ja’far as-Sadiq a.s.) has said to me, “Allah, the Mighty, the Great, has said” --without the Intermediate link.”³

So when our Imams spoke, their connecting link upto Allah Ta’ala was known and understood by their listeners: and they had no need to give those sacred names every now and then. That is why a poet had said:

“If you want to choose for yourself a madh-hab

Which will protect you from the Fire on the Day of Resurrection.

Then leave aside the opinions of so and so and this and that

And love and follow those people whose narration and hadith (runs as follows):

“Has narrated it our Grandfather from Jibra’il from (Allah) the Creator”.

It is such a holy and blessed link that if it was uttered for some reasons by our Imams it was treated as a precious treasure of spiritual benefits.

Golden Link

A lot of muhadditheen have narrated that when our 8th Imam, Abu ‘I-Hasan ‘Ali Ar-Rdha (peace be on him) was passing from Nishapur on his way to Marv, two famous muhadditheen, Abu Zar’ah ar -Razi and Muhammad ibn Aslam at- Tusi met him together with innumerable scholars and students of fiqh, hadilh and dirayah. The two muhadditheen said: “O Great Sayyid, son of the Sayyids who were Imams, we request you by the haqq of your purified forefathers and venerated progenitors that you show us your blessed face and narrate to us a hadith through your fathers from your grandfather, Muhammad (S), that we should remember you by it:’ The Imam stopped his mule, and ordered his servants to raise the shade from his

howdah; and thus the people were delighted to see his blessed features; he had two strands reaching his shoulders.

All the people of various categories stood there looking at him, some were crying, others weeping, yet others putting their cheeks on the earth and some kissing the hooves of the mule. Then the scholars and the jurisprudents asked the people to keep quiet, saying: “Hear and listen and remain calm in order that you may hear what would benefit you, and do not trouble us by excessive crying and weeping.” Thereafter the Imam (‘Ali) Ar-Rdha said:

“Narrated to me my father Musa al-Kazim from his father Ja’far as-Sadiq, from his father Muhammad al-Baqir, from his father ‘Ali Zaynu ‘l-’Abedein, from his father al-Husayn the martyr of Karbala, from his father ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib that he said: ‘Narrated to me my beloved and the delight of my eye, the Messenger of Allah (S) from Jibra’il, that he said: “I heard the Mighty and Exalted Lord saying: ‘The Kalimah, La Ilaha Illallah, is My fort, and whoever utters it enters My fort, and whoever enters My fort becomes safe from my chastisement.” Then the shade was drawn on the howdah and he proceeded a little, and then he called to them: “(It depends) on its conditions and I am one of its conditions,”

This hadith was written on that day in that place by more than twenty thousand scribes⁴. It is one of the traditions agreed upon by Sunnis and Shi’as both; and is narrated by scholars of both sects. The famous Sunni muhaddith Abu Nu’aym al-Isfihani has narrated it in his well-known book, Hilyatu ‘l-awliya’; and then he writes: “This hadith is confirmed and famous, with these links, by riwayah (narration) of the purified ones from their clean fathers;’ Then he adds: “Some of our predecessors among the muhaddithin used to say after narrating this link of narrators: “If this asnad (chain of narrators) were recited on a mad person, he would be cured.’ Ibn Hajar al-Haythami al-Makki has said that this belief was expressed by Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal.⁵ Incidentally, this asnad is known to muhaddithin as silsilatu ‘dh-dhahab (the Golden chain).

Perhaps now this ignorant writer would understand why it was not necessary for our Imams to spell in so many words their links to the Prophet (S), for it was understood by everyone that whatever they said was taken from their holy progenitor, the Messenger of Allah (S).

Nor it will be out of place to mention that a hadith of the same meaning has been narrated with a longer “Golden chain” starting with our twelfth Imam (a.s.), by none other than the Shah Waliullah Muhaddith Dehlavi, who writes in his “Al Fazl al-Mubeen fi al-Musalsalat min hadith al-Nabi al-Amin”:

“I say: Ibn ‘Uqlah had given me ijazah (permission) to narrate all that he had the authority to narrate. And I have found in his al-Musalsalat, a musalsal hadith in which each of its narrators has the distinction of possessing a great virtue uniquely. He (may Allah have mercy on him) has said: ‘Informed me the peerless of this time ash-Shaykh Hasan ibn ‘Ali al-’Ujaymi; from the Hafiz of his time Jamaluddin al-Babili, from the Relied one of his time Muhammad al-Hijazi al-Wa’iz, from the Sufi of his time ash-Shakh ‘Abdul Wahbab ash- Sha’rawi, from the Mujtahid of his time

Jalaluddin as-Suyuti, from the Hafiz of his time Abu Nu'aym Rizwan al-'Uqba, from the Reciter of his time ash-Shams Muhammad ibn al-Juzwi from the Imam Jamaluddin Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Jamal the Zahid of his time, from the Imam Muhammad ibn Mas'ud the Muhaddith of the Fars in his time, from our Shaykh Isma'il ibn Muzaffar ash-Shirazi the Scholar of his time, from 'Abdus Salaam ibn Abi'r-Rabi' Hanafi the Muhaddith of his time, from Abu Bakr 'Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Shapur al-Qalanasi the Shaykh of his time, from 'Abdu 'l-'Aziz ibn Muhammad al-Adami the Imam of his times, from Sulayman ibn Ibrahim ibn Muhammad ibn Sulayman the extra-ordinary person of his time, from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Hashim al-Baladhuri the Hafiz of his time, who said that: Narrated to us Muhammad (Al-Mahdi) ibn al-Hasan (Al-'Askari) ibn 'Ali (al-Hadi), the Hidden Imam of his time, (who said) narrated to us (my father) al-Hasan (Al-'Askari) ibn 'Ali (Al-Hadi), from his father (Imam 'Ali Al-Hadi) from his grandfather (Imam Muhammad At-Taqi) from his great grand-father 'Ali ibn Musa Ar-Rdha, from (his father) Musa Al-Kazim who said: Narrated to us my father (Imam) Ja'far as-Sadiq, (who said) narrated to us my father (Imam) Muhammad al-Baqir, (who said) narrated to us my father 'Ali ibn al-Husayn Zaynu 'l-'Abedeen as-Sajjad, (who said) narrated to us my father al-Husayn the Chief of the martyrs, (who said) narrated to us my father 'Ali ibn Abi Talib the Chief of the Awliya: who said: Informed us the Chief of the prophets Muhammad ibn 'Abdullah (Allah's blessings and peace be upon him!) who said: Informed me Jibra'il the Chief of the angels who said that Allah the Paramount Lord has said: "Verily I am Allah, there is none to be worshipped except Me; whosoever acknowledges My Tawheed (Oneness) enters My fort, and whosoever enters My fort is safe from My chastisement."⁶

At this juncture, it is necessary to draw the attention of the readers to the following facts:

First: Shah Wahyullah Dehlavi narrates a hadith from the twelfth Imam of the Ithna-'asharis whom the said narration describes as "the Hidden Imam of his time". How could he narrate by ijazah that hadith if he did not believe in the existence of that Imam who had transmitted it through his illustrious forefathers up to the Holy Prophet?

Second: As quoted earlier, Mirza Hasan Ali in his question and Shah 'Abdu 'l-'Aziz Dehlavi in his detailed reply have used the words, (The Respected Twelve Imams, Peace be on them). It means that they too believed in the existence of our Twelfth Imam, and all of them had shown full reverence and respect for these Imams; so much so that they used for them the phrase "Peace be on them".

Third: Maulana Ali Akbar Maududi, like Shah Waliullah, Shah 'Abdu 'l-'Aziz and Shaykh Muhyiddin ibn Al-'Arabi, Shaykh 'Abdul Wahhab Sha'rani and many others, believed that our Twelfth Imam (who is the son of the Eleventh Imam a.s. and was born in 255 A.H.) is the Qutb of this time, and all the bounties of Allah reach the creatures through him; and that he, like his forefathers upto 'Ali (a.s.) is Ma'sum, sinless and infallible; and this distinction is reserved in this ummah to these twelve persons only.

In spite of the above distinctions, no Shi'a has ever said, written or thought that 'Ali (a.s.) or his children were more virtuous than the Messenger of Allah (S), as this writer of unknown origin accuses the Shi'as to believe. (See p.22 of his booklet) The fool does not realize that in the Shi'a's eyes the virtues and distinctions of the Imams (a.s.) are based on, and derived from the virtues and distinctions of the Holy Prophet (S). Such demented balderdash should not be glorified by reply. We should rather say: Curse of Allah be on the liars.

Before closing this topic it is necessary to point out that even if our Imams had not made it clear that whatever they said was actually the saying of the Holy Prophet (S) which had come to them through their holy forefathers, we were bound to accept their words and follow their guidance. Why? Because of the mutawatir hadith of "The two precious/weighty things" which is accepted by both the Sunnis and the Shi'a as we have briefly mentioned in the beginning.

Is it not strange that our adversaries are ready to accept and follow the words of thousands of non-ma'sums -not only the Companions but even their disciples like 'Ikrimah, Mujahid, al-Hasan al-Basri and others; but recoil from accepting and following the words of the ma'sum Imams of Ahlu 'I-Bayt, who are clearly designated by the Holy Prophet (S) as the equals of the Qur'an!?

It is about the people of such mentality that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (a.s.) had said in the presence of some people from Kufa: "How strange it is that the people say that they have got all their knowledge from the Messenger of Allah (May Allah's mercy and blessings be on him and his progeny), and that they have acted upon it and have been guided; and at the same time they think that we, the people of his house, did not receive any knowledge from him, nor were we guided aright while we are his people and his progeny! !It was in our house that the revelation was sent to him, and from our place the knowledge was imparted to the people. DOh, you think that they got the knowledge and were guided while we remained ignorant and went astray? Certainly it is impossible."⁷

Notes

1. al-Mufid, Kitabu 'l-Irshad, Tehran. 1377. p. 250; Al-Majlisi, Biharul 'l-Anwar, new ed, Vol. 46. p. 288.
2. al-Mufid, Kitabu 'l-Irshad, p. 257; Al-Kafi, Vol.1, p.42.
3. al-Mufid, Al-Amali, p. 90; Al-Majlisi, Biharul 'l-Anwar, new ed Vol. 47. p. 27 and 337.
4. Ash-Shaykh As-Saduq, 'Uyunu Akhbar 'r-Rida, Beirut, 1404/1984. Vol.2, pp.143.
5. as-Sawa'iqu 'l-Muhriqah.
6. Shah Waliullah, Al-Fazl al-Mubeen. as quoted in Istiqsa'u 'l-ifham.
7. Biharul 'l-Anwar, Vol. 26. p. 158.

Bada'

The unknown author writes as the 2nd proof of Shi'as' Kufr:

“According to Shi'a belief, Allah is subject to Bada. That is to say that the knowledge of Allah changes from time to time because Allah is not fully aware of the causes and their consequences.”

COMMENT: Again it is the manifestation of the author's ignorance. First let me make clear what Bada' means:

Every sane person knows that the knowledge of Allah can never be wrong. In other words, there can never be any change in the knowledge of Allah. In contrast to it is the knowledge given by Allah to the angels and the Prophets. Their knowledge, though the most complete and perfect of all creatures, is still incomplete when compared to the knowledge of Allah. Allah in His mercy constantly replenishes, perfects and completes their knowledge.

Also, we know that Allah often puts his servants to test and trial. Again, it appears from many stories in the Qur'an that sometimes Allah, in His mercy and wisdom, reveals only a part of His future plan to the angels or the Prophets concerned. They are informed of His plan to a certain stage, and the knowledge of the later stages is not revealed to them in advance.

Before going ahead, let me give here two examples from the Qur'an.

The Sacrifice Of Prophet Isma'il

Prophet Ibrahim was shown in a dream that he was sacrificing his only son for the pleasure of God. As it was a dream, he must have seen how he was killing Isma'il. He must have seen himself binding the hands and feet of the child, blind-folding himself and then putting the knife on the child's throat and pressing it down. Naturally, he could not have seen who or what was actually being killed as his eyes were covered. By seeing the dream he believed that he was required to kill his son Isma'il in that way. Therefore, he steeled his heart to sacrifice his only child.

The child heard it and prepared himself to be sacrificed in obedience to the command of God. The father and the son both were willing to sacrifice everything in the name of Allah. Prophet Ibrahim did as he had dreamed himself doing: he bound the hands and feet of the child and put him in the required position and, blindfolding himself, put the knife and cut the throat. After removing the blindfold from his eyes, he saw Isma'il smiling and a lamb slaughtered in his place.

Prophet Ibrahim thought that he had failed in his test. But he had clearly done what he had seen himself doing in the dream. Of course, Allah had not informed him of the events of the last stage. For if Ibrahim had known that Isma'il would be saved, or if Isma'il had known that he, would be saved, there would have been no meaning in that test; there would not have been any chance of showing their willingness to sacrifice everything in the name of Allah.

So God showed to Ibrahim in his dream the events to a certain stage but kept him unaware of the final stages; not informing him how the whole episode was going to end. As they did not know the result, Ibrahim and Isma'il were able to show how willing they were to obey the command of

God even to the extent of sacrificing their lives and the lives of their dear ones in His name.

If they had known the result from the beginning, the test would have been meaningless.

Tawrah Given To Prophet Musa

Another example concerns Prophet Musa and the revelation of the Tawrah. Prophet Musa was ordered to go to Mount Sinai, fast there for thirty days in preparation for receiving the tablets of the Tawrah. On the thirtieth day he cleansed his teeth and went to Mount Sinai. There he was asked by God as to why did he cleanse his teeth. He explained that as he was coming to a holy place, he thought it proper to make himself neat and clean. God told him that the smell of the mouth of a fasting person was sweeter before God than the smell of musk and ambergris. And then he was told to return to his staying place, and fast for ten days more and then come to Mount Sinai without cleansing his teeth. Thus it was on the fortieth day that he was given the stone tablets of the Tawrah.

Allah knew from ever that Musa would come after cleansing his teeth, and would be asked to fast for ten days more. But neither Musa nor the Israelites had been told about it; nor was Musa told beforehand that he was not to cleanse his teeth on the thirtieth day.

When Allah refers to His knowledge, He describes the whole period of forty nights together:

When we made appointment with Musa for forty nights. Then you (the Israelites) took the (image of) calf (for your god) after he left you and thus you transgressed.¹

And where He refers to the knowledge of Musa, He mentions thirty days and ten days separately:

And We made an appointment with Musa for thirty nights: and We completed with ten (more); thus was completed the term of his Lord forty nights.²

The reason of not giving the advance information is clear from the behavior of the Israelites who because of his ten days delay, discarded the worship of the only and true Allah and started worshipping the image of a calf. The story is given beautifully in the following verses of the Qur'an:

Said God to Musa: "Verily we have tested thy people in thy absence. and the Samiri had led them astray." So returned Musa unto his people angered and sorrowful. Said he, "O my People, did not your Lord promise you a good promise? Did then the promise seem long to you, or did you want the wrath from your Lord should light upon you, that you violated the promise with me?" Said they, "We violated not thy promise of our own accord" Then he (Samiri) brought forth for them a calf, a mere body with a lowing sound. Then they said, "This is your god and the god of Musa, but he (Musa) has forgotten"³

Just imagine a whole community of several thousand Companions of an ulu 'l-'azm Prophet, in the presence of his successor and vicegerent Harun, leaving the path of true religion and starting idol worship, just because Musa was delayed for a few days! This test of faith could not be conducted if

Allah would have told Musa that he was supposed to stay for forty days; or if he had been told beforehand not to cleanse his teeth on the thirtieth day.

This is the meaning of Bada'.

Now where it says that "the knowledge of Allah changes because Allah is not fully aware of the causes and their consequences"?

The name Bada' and its meaning, both are derived from the Holy Qur'an. Allah Ta'ala says:

"and became plain to them from Allah what they had never thought"⁴

This is the meaning of Bada: and the term is applied when Allah Ta'ala makes something happen to the creatures which they had not expected.

The change occurs in the creatures' knowledge, not that of Allah Subhanahu wa Ta'ala.

The writer has quoted a hadith from al-Kafi, from Imam 'Ali Ar-Ridha (a.s.) that: "Allah did not ever send a Prophet but that he should proclaim wine as forbidden, and that he should as well recognize that Allah is subject to Bada' (the proposition that if a new circumstance should intervene it may cause Allah to alter His determination):"

What the hadith in al-Kafi says is simply this:

"Never has Allah sent any prophet except with the prohibition of intoxicant and with the affirmation to Allah of bada'".⁵

The unknown author has given a totally wrong meaning of bad a' in brackets and has put it within the quotation marks to deceive the readers, who might think that the said meaning was a part of the hadith!!

It is for people like him that Allah says in the Qur'an:

Most surely there is a party among them who distort the Book with their tongue that you may consider it to be a part of the Book while it is not a part of the Book.. and they tell a lie against Allah whilst they know.⁶

If this unknown writer had really seen al-Kafi, he would have read the following ahadith which are recorded before the hadith he has "quoted":

"Abu 'Abdillah (peace be on him) said: 'No Bad a' occurs to Allah in anything but that it was in His knowledge before its occurrence.'"

"Abu 'Abdillah (a.s .) said: 'Verily, Bada' does not occur to Allah because of ignorance:'"

"Mansur ibn Hazim says: 'I asked Abu 'Abdillah (peace be on him): 'Can anything happen today which was not in the knowledge of Allah yesterday?' He said: 'No. Whoever says it, may Allah humiliate him:' I said: 'Tell me, is it not that what has already happened and what is to happen upto the day of resurrection, is all in the knowledge of Allah?' He said: 'Certainly, even before He created the creatures.'"⁷

Incidentally, this is the belief of many of the Sunnis too, although they do not call it Bada'. It means that they too accept the meaning although they differ from us in the name. For example, look at the following quotations from three Sunni Tafseers:

1. Imam Fakhruddin ar-Razi writes under the verse,

Allah erases out whatever He pleases and Writes (whatever He pleases): and with Him is the mother of the book.⁸

"There are two sayings about this verse: First that it is general (encompassing) all things, as the apparent wording demands. They say that

Allah erases the sustenance and increases it; and likewise is the case of death and sa'adah (felicity) and shaqawah (infelicity) and Iman and Kufr. This is (also) the belief of (the companion) 'Amr ibn Mas'ud; and (the companion) Jabir has narrated it from the Messenger of Allah (S)

Second: That it is restricted to some things, and there are many aspects of it:

(1) Erasing and writing refers to abrogation of a previous order and bringing another order in its place; (8) It concerns sustenance, and misfortunes and calamities, that Allah writes it in the book and then removes it through invocation and sadaqah (alms), and this contains exhortation to attach oneself exclusively to Allah Ta'ala; (10) He erases whatever He pleases from His orders without informing anyone about it, because He has the absolute authority to order as He pleases; and He has the independent authority to bring into being and to destroy, to give life and death, to make rich or poor, inasmuch as no one of His creatures is appraised of His ghayb.”⁹

2. 'Allamah Az-Zamakhshari writes under the verse,

..and no one whose life is lengthened has his life lengthened, nor is anything diminished of his life, but it is all in a book; surely this is easy to Allah.¹⁰

“It means, we do not increase a man's life or decrease it, but it is written in a book. That is, it is written in the Lawh (Tablet) that: If that man performed hajj or participated in jihad then his life will be forty years; and if he did both, then his life will be sixty years. Now if he combined both and reached the age of sixty then his life was lengthened; and if he did only one (i.e. either hajj or jihad) and did not go beyond forty years, then it means that his life was shortened from the final limit of sixty. And it is this reality which the Messenger of Allah had pointed to in his saying: ‘Verily sadaqah and good behaviour towards relatives keep the homes populated and increase the lives.’”¹¹

3. Mufasssir al-Qadi al-Baydawi writes under the same verse:

“It is said that increase and decrease in a person's life occurs because of various causes which have been written in the ‘Tablet’. For example, it may be written in it that if ‘Amr did hajj then his life will be sixty years; otherwise it will end at forty years.’”¹²

This unknown writer does not know his own religion nor the writings of his own ‘Ulama. Leave aside the writings, he cannot even pronounce correctly the names of the books of the Sunni scholars, and he has taken upon himself to write about the Shi'as!

If this unknown author really desires to see what his co-religionists (Ahlul hadith al-Hashawiyyah) believe about the knowledge and decisions of Allah, he should read the report by Abul Fath Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Karim ash- Shahrastani (467-548 A.H.), quoted on p. 23:

“And a group of Ashabul-had ith al-Hashawiyyah have explicitly declared their belief of Tashbih (i.e. Allah is like His creatures)... So much so that they have said that once Allah's both eyes were ailing, so the angels went to see Him; and that He wept (grieving) on Noah's flood until his eyes were inflamed.”¹³

Why did Allah weep on Noah's flood? Was He not aware of the Consequences when He had sent the flood? Should not this unknown writer offer his sympathies to his god as the angels had supposedly done?

Notes

1. Quran, 2:51.
2. Quran, 7:142.
3. Quran, 20:85-88.
4. Quran, 39:47.
5. al-Kulayni, Al-Kafi, Al-Makatabah Al-Islamiyah. Tehran. 1388. Vol.I p.115.
6. Quran, 3:78.
7. Al-Kafi, p. 115.
8. Qur'an, 13:39.
9. Imam Ar-Razi, Tafsir Mafatih 'l ghayb.
10. Qur'an, 35:11.
11. Az-Zamakhshari, Tafsir Al-Kashshaf.
12. al-Baydawi Tafsir.
13. Ash-Shahristani, al-Milal wan Nihal printed on the margin of Kitabul-Fasl of Ibn Hazm. p.141.

Sahaba (Companions)

“Third proof of Shi’as kufr” is given by the unknown writer in these words: “The Shi’a believe in wickedly reviling the Shaikhain (i.e. Sayyidina Abu Bakr and Sayyidina Umar (Radhiallahu ‘anhu) and launch false charges against the chastity’ of Sayyidina (sic.) Aisha (R.A.)”

COMMENT: Before writing anything on this proof it is necessary to mention that no Shi’a has ever said, written or transmitted anything “against the chastity” of Ummu ‘l-mu’mineen ‘A’isha. This man probably does not know that the word, Chastity, is generally used for “abstaining from unlawful sexual intercourse.” We, the Shi’as, cannot think in such terms about any “Mother of the believers” or for that matter about any wife of any Prophet be she the wife of Nuh (a.s.) or of Lut (a.s.). Of course, we cannot stop the Wahhabis from indulging in such obscene talk. The Shi’as will whole-heartedly agree that anyone who launches a charge against the chastity of Ummu ‘l-mu’mineen ‘A’isha is kafir. Obviously, such a charge will go against the clear verdict of the Qur’an, and will therefore be tantamount to disbelief in the Book of Allah.

Coming to the position of the companions of the Holy Prophet (S), there is a basic difference between the outlook of the Sunnis and that of the Shi’as.

First, let us see what is the meaning of a “Companion”. According to the Sunni books, a companion is a person who after accepting Islam had seen the Prophet, at least once, even if he had not had any talk with the Prophet, nor heard any hadith from him nor fought under the Prophet in any jihad; provided he died as a Muslim. This definition includes those who could not see the Prophet because of blindness.¹

And this name is applied to all who professed Islam, even if faith had not entered their hearts yet, even if they were hypocrites.

In other words, almost the whole of Arabia was full of the companions.

Now, according to the Sunni belief all the companions were just and pious. They ascribe a tradition to the Prophet which forms the basis of their belief:

“My companions are like the stars, which one of them you followed you should be guided aright.” Therefore they believe that all the Companions were just (‘adil).

This view is diametrically opposed to the Qur’an and the ahadith of the Holy Prophet (s.a.wa.), leave aside the fact that the historical events totally disprove it.

As for the Qur’an, the criterion of excellence is the individual’s faith, good deeds and piety, as is seen in hundreds of verses, no matter whether that person was a companion or not. Also the Qur’an says in surah at-tawbah (revealed in 9 A.H., just about 1112 years before the death of the Prophet S):

And from among those who are round about you of the Arabs there are hypocrites. And from among the people of Medina; they are stubborn in hypocrisy; you (O Prophet!) do not know them; We will chastise them twice, then shall they be turned back to a grievous chastisement.²

Perhaps someone might say that this verse concerns the hypocrites. But the hypocrites too were counted among the Companions, especially so when hypocrisy of many of them was not known even to the Prophet. However, we quote here only a few verses (out of many) which are addressed to the believers among the Companions:

Oh, you who believe! What (excuse) have you that when it is said to you: Go forth in Allah's way, you should incline heavily to earth; are you contented with this world's life instead of the here-after? But the provision of this world's life compared with the hereafter is but little. If you do not go forth, He will punish you with a painful punishment and bring in your place a people other than you and you will do Him no harm; and Allah has power over all things.³

Say: if your fathers and your sons and your brethren and your mates and your kinfolks and property which you have acquired and the slackness of trade which you fear and dwellings which you like, are dearer to you than Allah and his Messenger and jihad in His way, then wait till Allah brings about His command, and Allah does not guide the transgressing people⁴.

Oh, you who believe! be not disloyal to Allah and the Messenger, nor be unfaithful to your trusts while you know.⁵

Even as your Lord caused you to go forth from your house with the truth, though a party of the believers were surely averse. They disputed with you about the truth after it had become clear, (and they went forth) as if they were driven to death while they looked at it.⁶

Behold! you are those who are called upon to spend in Allah's way, but among you are those who are niggardly, and whoever is niggardly is niggardly against his own soul; and Allah is Self-sufficient and you are the needy; and if you turn back He will bring in your place another people, then they will not be like you.⁷

As for the ahadith of the Holy Prophet (S), the following few are given here to clarify the issue:-

1. It has been narrated by the companions, Talha ibn 'Abdullah, Ibn 'Abbas and Jabir ibn 'Abdullah that the Messenger of Allah (Allah's mercy and peace be on him) conducted funeral prayer on the martyrs of Uhud; and the Messenger of Allah (Allah's mercy and peace on him) said: "I am witness for these:" Abu Bakr (r.a.) said: "O Messenger of Allah! Is it not that our brothers had accepted Islam as we did, and did jihad as we did?" He (i.e. the Prophet S) said: "Certainly! But they did not eat anything from their reward, and I do not know what you will do after me." Abu Bakr wept and said: "Are we going to remain after you!"⁸

Imam Bukhari narrates from al-'Ula' ibn al-Musayyab from his father that he said: "I met (the Companion) al-Bara' ibn 'Azib (R.A.) and said: 'Blessings to you! You remained with the Prophet (Mercy and peace of Allah be on him) and did his bay'ah under the tree: He said: 'O son of my brother! You do not know what have we done after him!'"⁹

2. The Companion, Ibn 'Abbas narrated that the Holy Prophet (S) said inter alia in a hadith about the Day of Judgment: "And verily some people of my ummah will be brought and taken to the left side (i.e. the side of the Fire): so I will say: 'O my Lord! (they are) my companions: But I will be

told: ‘Certainly you do not know what they did do after you; they continued to turn back on their heels right from the time you left them: Then I will say as had said the good servant (i.e. the Prophet ‘Isa): ‘and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when Thou didst take me (away) Thou wert the watcher over them and Thou art witness of all things...’^{10,11}

The Holy Prophet (S) said: “Surely you will be taken to the left side on the day of Qiyamat (Resurrection), so I will say: ‘Where to?’ and will be told: ‘To the Fire, by Allah!’ Then I will say: ‘O my Lord! They are my companions: Then it will be said. ‘Surely you do not know what did they do after you; verily they had gone out of Islam since the time you had departed from them: Then I will say: ‘To hell with them! To hell with them who changed after me!’ And I do not think anyone will be saved from them except (a few) like unattended cattle.”¹²

Ahadith of similar meaning have been narrated from the companions, Abu Bakrah¹³ and Abu‘d-Darda’¹⁴.

In spite of hundreds of verses and traditions criticizing many of the companions, the Sunnis refuse to look critically at individual companions to verify whether a particular companion really deserved to be followed or not. For them, every one of them deserves to be followed.

Their method of argument runs on the following lines. They will take a verse praising some companions and then apply it to all of them without pondering on its provisos and restrictions.

For example:

Certainly Allah was pleased with the believers when they gave allegiance to you under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquility on them and rewarded them with a near Victory.¹⁵

If you ponder on this verse, you will find that it is not a blanket declaration of pleasure with all those who did bay’ah for all times to come. In other words, it does not say: Allah was pleased with those who gave allegiance to you: It restricts it to the believers and that too for a certain time, “when they gave allegiance ...”

Clearly, those who did not do bay’ah or who were not true believers are beyond the limits of this verse. Not only that; a preceding verse puts this verse in clear perspective:

“Surely those who swear allegiance to you do but swear allegiance to Allah; the hand of Allah is above their hands. Therefore whoever breaks (this allegiance) he breaks it only to the injury of his own soul, and whoever fulfills what he has covenanted with Allah, He will grant him a mighty reward.”¹⁶

So there is another most important proviso here: Those who have done bay’ah should not break it. Why this proviso, if all the companions who had done bay’ah under the tree, were immune from breaking it?

The bay’ah under the tree was on one specific term that “they would not flee from battle ground.”¹⁷

And the Qur’an itself is the witness that almost all of them broke it in the battle of Hunayn, 2 years after the said bay’ah. Allah says:

“Certainly Allah helped you in many places, and on the day of Hunayn, when your great numbers made you vain, but they (i.e. number) availed you

nothing and the earth became too small for you notwithstanding its spaciousness, then you turned back retreating.”¹⁸

The books of traditions and history clearly say that in the battle of Hunayn, in which ten thousand companions (including all those who had done bay’ah under the tree) had participated, all of them fled away except four who remained steadfast, three of them were from the Prophet’s clan, Banu Hashim (‘Ali ibn Abi Talib, ‘Abbas ibn ‘Abdul Muttalib and Abu Sufyan ibn al-Harith ibn ‘Abdul Muttalib) and one from another clan (‘Abdullah ibn Mas’ud).¹⁹

According to other traditions, ‘Aqil ibn Abi Talib, Zubayr ibn al-’Awwam, ‘Abdullah ibn Zubayr ibn ‘Abdul-Muttalib and Usamah ibn Zayd also remained steadfast.

The Prophet (S) told his uncle, ‘Abbas to call the Muslims back. He wondered as to how his voice would reach the fleeing herd. The Prophet (S) said that Allah would cause his voice to reach them, no matter how far they might have gone. So, ‘Abbas called them in these words as the Prophet (S) had taught him: “O group of the Ansar (helpers), O People of the tree of samurah (where they had done the above mentioned bay’ah 2 years earlier)”²⁰

By this fleeing from the battle-field, all of them (except the four or eight named above) broke their allegiance, and cannot be included in good-news of Allah’s pleasure. But the Sunnis refuse to look at these clear signs.

This is a very vast topic, but I have merely shown the basic difference in the outlooks of the Sunnis and the Shi’as.

However, we do not “wickedly revile” anyone; we only repeat what the Qur’an, the hadith and the history say. And we use the same words for each group which the Qur’an and hadith have used for them.

But let us suppose, just for the sake of argument, that the accusation of this unknown writer against the Shi’as is correct and that they really abuse the Shaykhayn; and then let us see if this really is a ground to declare that they are kafirs.

Ibn Taymiyyah, the Shaykhul Islam of the Wahhabis, quotes a group of Sunni scholars as follows:

“And merely abusing someone other than the Prophets does not necessarily make the abuser kafir, because some of those who were in the time of the Prophet (i.e. the companions) used to abuse one another and none of them was declared kafir because of this (practice); and (also) because it is not wajib (compulsory) to have faith particularly in any of the companions; therefore abusing any of them does not detract from the faith in Allah and His books and His messengers and the Last day.”²¹

Even more clear is the wording of Mulla ‘Ali al-Qari who writes in his Shrahal- Fiqh-al-akbar:-

“To abuse Abu Bakr and ‘Umar is not kufr, as Abush-Shakur as-Salimi has correctly proved in his book, at-Tamhid. And it is because the basis of this (claim that reviling the Shaykhayn is kufr) is not proven, nor its meaning is confirmed.”

“It is so because certainly abusing a Muslim is fisq (sin, moral depravity) as is proved by a confirmed hadith, and therefore the Shaykhayn (Abu Bakr

and ‘Umar) will be equal to other (Muslims) in this rule; and also if we suppose that someone murdered the Shaykhayn, and even the two sons-in-law (i.e. ‘Uthman and ‘Ali), all of them together, even then according to Ahlus-sunnah wal Jama’ah, he will not go out of the Islam (i.e. will not become kafir): and we know that abusing is less serious than murder...”²²

These two declarations by these giants of the Wahhabis and Hanafis respectively are more than enough to show the baselessness of this so-called proof.

Notes

1. Ibn Hajar Al-‘Asqalani, Al-Isabah, p.10.
2. Qur’an, 9:101.
3. Qur’an, 9:38-39.
4. Qur’an, 9:25.
5. Qur’an, 8:27.
6. Qur’an, 8:5-6.
7. Qur’an, 47:38.
8. Al-Waqidi, Kitabu ‘l-maghazi, vol.I, p.310.
9. Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 5, p.195; Imam Malik, Al-Muwatta, Vol. 2 p.462.
10. The verse quoted is from Surah Al-Maidah, verse 117.
11. Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Egypt ed. Vol. I. p. 235.
12. Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 7, p.209; Vol. 4, pp.94 and 156; Sahih Malik Vol. 7, p.66.
13. Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Vol. 5, p.50.
14. Majma’u ‘z-zawaid, Vol. 9, p.367.
15. Qur’an, 48:18.
16. Qur’an, 48:10.
17. Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Vol. 3, p.192; Tarikh Tabari, Vol.3, p.87.
18. Qur’an, 9:25.
19. Tarikh al-Khamis, Vol.2, p.113; As-Sirah al-Halabiyah, Vol.3, p.255.
20. Ibn Sa’d, At-Tabaqat Al-Kubra, Beirut, n.d., Vol. 4, pp. 18-19.
21. Ibn Taymiyyah, As-Sarimu ‘l-maslul, 1402/1982; p.579 (published by ‘Alama’l-kutub).
22. Mulla ‘Ali Qari, Shrahal-Fiqh-al-akbar, (1) Matha ‘Uthmaniyah, Istanbul, 1303, p.130,
(2) Matha’ Mujtaba’i, Dehli, 1348. p.86, (3) Malba’ Aftab al-Hind, India, no date, p.86

We have quoted here from 3 old editions printed in Turkey and India. Now a new edition had been printed by Darul Kutubil ‘Ilmiyah, Beirut, in 1404/1984 which claims to be “the First Edition” and from which four pages (including the above text) have been omitted. The deleted portion contains also the declaration that those who believe that Allah has a body are definitely kafir according to Ijma’ without any difference of opinion. Obviously this statement expels the Wahhabis out of Islam because they believe that Allah has a body, as described earlier.

Then 2.5 pages contain the debate whether it is permissible to do la’nah on Yazid. Mulla ‘Ali Qari has quoted some Sunni scholars as saying that Yazid became Kafir the moment he ordered the killing of Imam Husain; but he (Mulla ‘Ali Qari) himself allows only the la’nah in these words:

“May Allah curse him who killed Husain or was pleased with it.” Even this was unpalatable to the Wahhabis who call Yazid “Amiru ‘l-mu’mineen”!!

The white lie that the Beirut edition is the “First” and this Tahrir by omission is one more proof how honest and trustworthy the Wahhabis are.

And the omission has left a sentence hanging in the air - its subject is omitted while the predicate is intact. Wahhabi scholarship indeed!!

Fatwas

The unknown writer has written some fatwas and a few forged ahadith declaring the “Rafidha” or Shi’a as Kafir.

As for these ahadith, the readers will find it interesting that no less a person than the Wahhabis’ Shaykhul Islam, Ibn Taymiyyah, has stated that all the ahadith in which the word ‘Rafidha’ has been used are forged. He writes: “(Because the word Rafidhah was coined in the year 105 A.H.) therefore it is clearly understood that all ahadith in which the word “Rafidha” has been used are lies (forged).”¹

Now we come to the fatwas of some Sunni or Wahhabi writers or muftis. Who has told these people that we care a damn for their views. Our Islam and Iman is linked to Allah Subhanahu wa Ta’ala through Muhammad (S) and his progeny who are his rightful successors. Why should we care about those who are not connected with this Golden Link. We thank Allah that our pristine Islam is not polluted with these people’s paganistic beliefs.

Did the respected Companion, Abu Dharr al-Ghifari ask from ‘Uthman ibn ‘Affan any testimonial for his Iman?

Did ‘Amr ibn al-Humuq al-Khuza’i and Rushayd al-Hajari need any certificate from Ibn Ziyad?

Was ‘Ammar ibn Yasir given any credential by Mu’awiyah? Did Mitham al-Tammar need any warranty from Ibn Ziyad? Was Imam Husayn in need of any testimonial from Yazid?

So why should we the Shi’as care what these followers of Mu’awiyah, Yazid and Ibn Ziyad say about us?

Our Imam ‘Ali was the “total Iman” as the Holy Prophet (S) had declared in the battle of Khandaq². As a result, we the Shi’as of ‘Ali are so full of Iman that if in a manner of speaking, the word “kufr “ is attributed to us, that “kufr” becomes lovely and praiseworthy in the eyes of Allah, and Allah extols its virtues. He says in the Qur’an about the believers like us:

“therefore, whoever disbelieves (yakfur) in the taghut and believes in Allah, he indeed has laid hold on the strongest handle which shall not break off...”³

We the Shi’as of ‘Ali have heeded the words of Allah when He says:

“Indeed, there is for you a good example in Ibrahim and those with him when they said to their people: Surely we dissociate from you and from what you worship other than Allah; we disbelieve in you (kafarna bikum) and enmity and hatred have appeared between us and you forever until you believe in Allah alone.”⁴

Following this “good example” we, the Shi’as of ‘Ali, send the same message to these self-styled muftis and their followers. If they say that we are disbelievers, let the world know that we disbelieve in these muftis, we disbelieve in their falsehood, we disbelieve in their hypocrisy and we disbelieve in their American Islam.

Notes

1. Ibn Taymiyyah, Minhaju ’s-sunnah, old ed. vol. I, p. 8.

2. Arjahu ’l-matalib, pp. 219-220.

3. Qur’an, 2:256.

4. Qur’an, 60:4.

Taqiyah

The writer of “What is Shi’aism?” writes on page 15, under the heading “Taqiyah”:

“Nifaaq or hypocrisy is a principle of the Shi’a religion. They technically term such hypocrisy as Taqiyah which means the permissibility to conceal one’s true belief for the sake of expediency”

COMMENT: It is easy to give a wrong meaning to a word and then heap abuses on it. Taqiyah is a Qur’anic term: it means permission of hiding one’s true faith, not for the sake of expediency, but when there is danger to one’s own life, property or honour or to that of another believer. This principle is initiated by Qur’an, was followed by many respectable Sahabah, and is accepted by all Muslims, Shi’as and Sunnis alike.

But the writer of that booklet is outside the circle of Islam; therefore, he does not know these things. He does not realize that it is not only the Shi’a “religion” but the religion of all Muslims.

I would like to give here only a few references from the Qur’an, actions of Sahabah, Tafsirs, traditions and writings of respected Sunni scholars.

From the Holy Qur’an

مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ أَكْرَهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَكِنْ مَنْ شَرَحَ
بِالْكُفْرِ صَدْرًا فَعَلَيْهِمْ غَضَبٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ

He who disbelieves in Allah after his belief in Him, (is the liar) except he who is compelled while his heart remains steadfast with the faith (has nothing worry). But who opens his breast for infidelity; on these is wrath of Allah, and for them is a great torment.¹

This verse of the Qur’an refers to the incident when the respected Sahabi ‘Ammar bin Yasir (May Allah be pleased with both) had to utter some words against Islam to save himself from the Quraishite infidels.

The Quraishites brutally martyred Yasir and his wife Sumaiyah just because of their faith. They were the first martyrs of Islam. When the parents were killed, ‘Ammar pretended to renounce Islam and thus saved his life. Someone told the Prophet that ‘Ammar had become Kafir. The Prophet said: “Never; verily the flesh and blood of ‘Ammar is saturated with true faith.” Then ‘Ammar came to the Holy Prophet bitterly weeping that he had to utter evil words against Islam, in order that he could slip away from the clutches of the infidels. The Prophet asked him: ‘How did you find your heart?’ ‘Ammar said: “Steadfast in Faith”. The Holy Prophet told him not to worry and advised him to repeat those words if the infidels again asked him to do so.

And it was not only the Holy Prophet who liked the choice of ‘Ammar (r.a.) Even Allah confirmed his action in the verse quoted above.

This event is mentioned in almost all books of Tafsir, under this verse. For example:

Tafseer Ad -Durru ‘l-Manthur of Imam as-Suyuti. vol.4 , p. 132

Tafseer Al-Kashshaf of az-Zamakhshari, Beirut ed. vol. 2. p. 430

Tafseer Kabir of Imam ar-Razi.

Another Ayat:

لَا يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِنْ دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلَّا أَنْ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً وَيُحَذِّرُكُمُ اللَّهُ نَفْسَهُ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ الْمَصِيرُ قُلْ إِنْ تُخْفُوا مَا فِي صُدُورِكُمْ أَوْ تُبْدُوهُ يَعْلَمُهُ اللَّهُ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَاللَّهُ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

“Let not the believers take the disbelievers as their friends rather than the believers; whosoever shall do this then he has no relation with Allah, except when you have to guard Yourself against them for fear from them; but Allah cautions you of Himself, for unto Allah is the end of your journey. Say: whether you conceal what is in your hearts or manifest it, Allah knows it; and He knows all that is in the heavens and all that is in the earth; and verily Allah has power over all things.”²

The reason of this permission is given in this very ayat: “Say whether you conceal what is in your hearts or manifest it, Allah knows it”.

Here Allah assures the Muslims that Faith is a spiritual thing, connected with heart; and if your faith inside your heart is unimpaired, then Allah is pleased with you whether you manifest that faith or hide it. It is all the same with Allah, because He knows your hidden secrets, and even when you hide your faith from unbelievers, Allah knows it and recognizes it.

There are other verses too; but we do not want to spend much time on this topic here.

Now some statements from the books of Tafseer.

Imam as-Suyuti writes inter alia under this verse:

واخرجنا بآيها بمنزلة العوفي عن ابن عباس قوهل: إلا نتقوا منهم تقية: فالتقية باللسان من محل عيل امر بتلكم به وهو معصية هلل في تلكم به خفاة انالاس وقلبه مطمئ باليمان فإن ذ لك ل يرضه إنما اتقية باللسان ... واخرج عبد بن محيد عن احلسنقال اتقية جائزة إيل يومالقيامة - واخرج عبد عن أيب رجاء أنه اكن يقرأ إل ان تتقوا منهم تقية - واخرج عبد لنب محيد عن قتادة أنه اكن يقرأها إل ان تتقوا منهم تقية بالاء.

“And Ibn Jarir and Ibn Abi Hatim have narrated through al-’Awfi from Ibn ‘Abbas (that he said about this verse): ‘So taqiyah is by tongue. Whoever is compelled to say something which is disobedience of Allah and he speaks it because of those people’s fear while his heart remains steadfast in the faith, it will do him no harm; verily taqiyah is with the tongue only.’³

“.....And ‘Abd ibn Hamid has narrated from al-Hasan (al-Basri) that he said: ‘Taqiyah is lawful upto the day of resurrection: And ‘Abd (ibn Hamid) has narrated from Abu Raja’ that he was reciting, ‘ilia an tattaqu minhum taqiyatan’; and ‘Abd ibn Hamid has narrated from Qatadah that he was reciting (likewise).... taqiyatan with ya.”¹

So, you see here the name ‘Taqiyah’ favourably mentioned in the Qur’an. And this unknown writer says it is hypocrisy!!

Imam Fakhruddin ar-Razi has mentioned some rules concerning taqiyah under this verse, some of which are given here:

المسألة الثالثة : قال الحسن أخذ مسيلمة الكذاب رجلين من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال لأحدهما : أتشهد أن محمداً رسول الله؟ قال : نعم نعم نعم ، فقال : أفتشهد أني رسول الله؟ قال : نعم ، وكان مسيلمة يزعم أنه رسول بني حنيفة ، ومحمد رسول قريش ، فتركه ودعا الآخر فقال أتشهد أن محمداً رسول الله؟ قال : نعم ، قال : أفتشهد أني رسول الله؟ فقال : إني أصم ثلاثاً ، فقدمه وقتله فبلغ ذلك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ، فقال : « أما هذا المقتول فمضى على يقينه وصدقه فهنيئاً له ، وأما الآخر فقبل رخصة الله فلا تبعة عليه . » واعلم أن نظير هذه الآية قوله تعالى : { إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ } [النحل : 106]

المسألة الرابعة : اعلم أن للتقية أحكاماً كثيرة ونحن نذكر بعضها.

الحكم الأول : أن التقية إنما تكون إذا كان الرجل في قوم كفار ، ويخاف منهم على نفسه وماله فيداريهم باللسان ، وذلك بأن لا يظهر العداوة باللسان ، بل يجوز أيضاً أن يظهر الكلام الموهم للمحبة والموالة ، ولكن بشرط أن يضمر خلافه ، وأن يعرض في كل ما يقول ، فإن التقية تأثيرها في الظاهر لا في أحوال القلوب.

الحكم الثاني للتقية : هو أنه لو أفصح بالإيمان والحق حيث يجوز له التقية كان ذلك أفضل ، ودليله ما ذكرناه في قصة مسيلمة.

الحكم الثالث للتقية : أنها إنما تجوز فيما يتعلق بإظهار الموالة والمعاداة ، وقد تجوز أيضاً فيما يتعلق بإظهار الدين فأما ما يرجع ضرره إلى الغير كالقتل والزنا وغصب الأموال والشهادة بالزور وقذف المحصنات وإطلاع الكفار على عورات المسلمين ، فذلك غير جائز ألبته.

الحكم الرابع : ظاهر الآية يدل أن التقية إنما تحل مع الكفار الغالبين إلا أن مذهب الشافعي رضي الله عنه أن الحالة بين المسلمين إذا شاكلت الحالة بين المسلمين والمشركون حلت التقية محاماة على النفس.

الحكم الخامس : التقية جائزة لصون النفس ، وهل هي جائزة لصون المال يحتمل أن يحكم فيها بالجواز ، لقوله صلى الله عليه وسلم : « حرمة مال المسلم كحرمة دمه » ولقوله صلى الله عليه وسلم : « من قتل دون ماله فهو شهيد » ولأن الحاجة إلى المال شديدة والماء إذا بيع بالغبن سقط فرض الوضوء ، وجاز الاقتصار على التيمم دفعاً لذلك القدر من نقصان المال ، فكيف لا يجوز ههنا ، والله أعلم.

الحكم السادس : قال مجاهد : هذا الحكم كان ثابتاً في أول الإسلام لأجل ضعف المؤمنين فأما بعد قوة دولة الإسلام فلا ، وروى عوف عن الحسن : أنه قال التقية جائزة للمؤمنين إلى يوم القيامة ، وهذا القول أولى ، لأن دفع الضرر عن النفس واجب بقدر الإمكان.

“Third Rule: Taqiyah is allowed in matters related to manifestation of friendship or enmity; and it is also allowed in matters connected to professing (their) religion. But it is certainly not allowed in matters which affect other persons, like murder, fornication, usurpation of property, perjury, slander of married women or informing the unbelievers about the weak points in the Muslims’ defence.

“Fourth Rule: The Qur’anic verse apparently shows that taqiyah is allowed with dominant unbelievers. But according to the madh-hab of Imam Shafi’i (May Allah be pleased with him) if the condition between (various sects of) the Muslims resembles the condition between the Muslims and the polytheists, then taqiyah (from the Muslims too) is allowed for the protection of one’s life.

“Fifth Rule: Taqiyah is allowed for protection of life. The question is whether it is allowed for the protection of property; possibly that too may be allowed, because the Prophet (S) has said: ‘The sanctity of a Muslim’s property is like the sanctity of his blood’; and also He (S) has said: ‘Whoever is killed in defence of his property, is a martyr’; and also because man greatly needs his property; if water is sold at exorbitant price, wudhu does not remain wajib and one may pray with tayammum to avoid that small loss of property; so why should not this principle be applied here? And Allah knows better.

“Sixth Rule: Mujahid has said that this rule (of taqiyah) was valid in the beginning of Islam, because of the weakness of the believers; but now that the Islamic government has got power and strength, it is not valid. But ‘Awfi has narrated from al-Hasan (al-Basri) that he said: ‘Taqiyah is allowed to the Muslims upto the day of resurrection: And this opinion is more acceptable because it is wajib to keep off all types of harm from one’s self as much as possible.”⁴

From Ahadith

Imam Bukhari has written a full chapter, Kitabul Ikrah, on this subject of compulsion, wherein he writes, inter alia:

قول الله تعالى: إلا من أكره وقلبه مطمئن بالإيمان... وقال إلا أن تتقوا منهم تقاة وهي تقية... وقال الحسن التقية إلى يوم القيامة... وقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: الأعمال بالنية

And Allah said ‘except when you have to guard yourselves against them for fear from them’. And it is Taqiyah ... And Hassan (Basri) said: ‘Taqiyah is upto the Day of Resurrection’ And the Prophet (s.a.w.) said: ‘Deed are according to intention’.⁵

That is why the Prophet (S) has categorically said:

لا دين لمن لا تقية له

He who has no taqiyah has no religion.⁶

It is clear that the principle of Taqiyah is a part of the religion of Islam, initiated by the Qur'an, confirmed by the traditions of the Prophet, fully agreed by the Sunni scholars and mufassirin, and followed by respectable sahabah. And now look at this ignorant man saying that Taqiyah is nifaaq or hypocrisy!! Certainly he himself is not only a munaafiq (hypocrite) but an out-right kafir who accuses the Holy Prophet (S) and respected sahabah of propagating and practising nifaaq!! Astaghfirullah! Remember that according to the hadith of the Prophet this enemy of Taqiyah is not Muslim at all (has no religion).

The fact is that taqiyah is opposite of Nifaaq. Remember, Iman and Kufr, when seen with their 'declaration, can be divided in four categories only:

1. Correct belief of Islam by heart and its declaration in words. This is open Iman (faith).

2. Belief against Islam by heart and expression of that anti-Islamic belief in words.

This is open Kufr (infidelity). These two categories are opposite to each other and cannot combine in one place.

3. Belief against Islam in heart but declaration of Islam in words. This is Nifaaq (hypocrisy).

4. Correct belief of Islam by heart but declaration of anti-Islamic belief in words.

This is taqiyah, and these two categories (Nifaaq and Taqiyah) are, likewise, opposite to each other and can never be found in one place.

In other words, he who opposes Taqiyah is munafiq like that unknown writer.

Imam ar-Razi too has clearly described this contrast in his tafsir in the following words:

وهذا إشارة إلى أن الاعتبار بما في القلب ، فالمنافق الذي يظهر الإيمان ويضمّر الكفر كافر ، والمؤمن المكروه الذي يظهر الكفر ويضمّر الإيمان مؤمن والله أعلم بما في صدور العالمين ، ولما بين أنه أعلم بما في صدور العالمين

“This points to the fact that (in these matters) consideration is given only to what is hidden in the heart. A hypocrite who shows faith and hides disbelief is a disbeliever, while a believer who under compulsion shows disbelief and hides faith is a believer; and Allah better knows that is hidden in the hearts of all.”⁷

If anyone wants to know more on this subject, he should read my booklet, Taqiyah, available from Bilal Muslim Mission, Box 20033, Dar es Salaam, or P.O. Box 10396, Nairobi.

Before closing this chapter, I would like to ask this unknown author why has not he disclosed his name in his booklet? Is it not Taqiyyah? And that too without any justification? Kenya is a free country and there was no danger to his life, honour or property if he wrote his name as the author. So

Taqiyyah is a shameful thing if it is done by a non-Wahhabi to protect his life from Wahhabis' barbarism; but very admirable if done by a Wahhabi without any reason!

Notes

1. Qur'an, 16:106.
2. Qur'an, 3:28-29.
3. As-Suyuti, ad-Durru 'l-manthur, Vol. 2, pp. 16 – 17.
4. Imam ar-Razi, Tafsir Mafatiu 'l-ghayb Beirut, 3rd ed., vol. 7, p. 13.
5. Sahih al-Bukhari, Egypt ed., vol. 9, pp. 24-25.
6. Mulla 'Ali Muttaqi, Kanzu 'l-'Ummal, Beirut, 5th ed., 1405/1985, vol. 3, p. 96, hadith no. 5665.
7. Tafsir Mafatiu 'l-ghayb, under verse 19:10.

Epilogue

The unknown author has blackened many pages against what he calls “False Slogans of Unity and Brotherhood”. He reviles “the ignorant supporters of the Shi’ahs among Ahle-Sunnah” who “expect the Ulama to raise slogans of brotherhood and to fabricate a common basis and a common platform of fraternity” with the Shi’as.

This is the real purpose of this booklet; and it is the common aim of all the hundreds and thousands the books, booklets, articles and fatwas which the Wahhabi press churns out every day in Arabic, Urdu, English, Turkish and scores of other local and regional languages.

They claim to be followers of the Qur’an; and they are spending billions of petro-dollars to stop the Muslims of the worlds from joining hands together, while Allah Subhanahu wa Taa’ala says:

And hold fast by the rope of Allah all together and be not divided.¹

And obey Allah and His Messenger and do not quarrel, for then you will be weak in hearts and your power will depart, and be patient; surely Allah is with patient ones.²

It is a tragic fact that in spite of so much emphasis on Unity, the Muslims are divided into so many groups. Nevertheless, we have to salvage whatever we can from this onslaught of disunity and strife. The clarion call of Iran to the Muslims of the world to unite is based on this divine order. Unfortunately, the enemies of Islam have twisted its meaning to frighten the unsuspecting Muslims by imputing false motive to this sincere ideal.

There are three conceivable ways of unity for the Muslims. Two of them are:

1. Unity in belief: That all Muslims should adopt a single set of beliefs; and
2. Unity in rulings of shari’ah: That all should follow a single set of rites of worship, as well as personal, social, financial and penal codes.

Obviously both these methods are impossible to adopt. The unity of belief and shari’ah will not be achieved until the re-appearance of Imam Al-Mahdi (a.s.).

Now there remains only the third way of unity, and that is the Unity in face of the enemies of Islam. It means that all Muslims should stand shoulder to shoulder to defend Islamic values, Muslims’ lands, Muslims’ honour and Muslims’ lives. They should forget their sectarian differences in face of the Zionists, Communists and Capitalists. If they will not stand together, surely they will hang together. See what is happening in Kashmir and India, how Bosnia is being obliterated from the map of Europe. Millions of Bosnian civilians have been massacred by Christian Croats and Serbs, thousands of Muslim women have been raped. But the usurpers of petro-dollars spend this Muslim wealth in protecting the London Zoo from closure! Animals are more precious than the Muslim masses - the victims of genocide and ethnic cleansing - of Bosnia, Kashmir, Burma and Azerbaijan.

Squandering millions of dollars in one night on gambling tables of Las Vegas is more important than alleviating the sufferings of the helpless Muslims in Iraq, Bangladesh, Somalia and Albania. The fact that Tajikistan

has fallen again in the hands of the hard-core communists creates no discomfort for them.

Unfortunately, the Wahhabis - or rather the ruling families of the Arabian Peninsula (wrongly named 'Saudi Arabia'), Kuwait and Bahrain do not care what the Qur'an and the hadith say about a Muslim's right on other Muslims. The alpha and omega of their endeavours is to save their Kingdoms and Sheikhdoms from the wrath of their people. They know that no Muslim worth his name can support their debaucheries, their drinking orgies and their gambling sprees.

They are fully aware that no man worth his salt can approve of their oppressions, their tyrannies and their systematic crushing of the non-Wahhabi Muslims. Propelled by this realization, they seek refuge with their Western mentors. They ignore the warnings given by Allah not to incline to the Jews and the Christians, not to seek their help, but rely solely on Allah, as the following verses spell it out clearly:

And the Jews will not be pleased with you, nor the Christians until you follow their religion. Say: Surely Allah's guidance, that is the (true) guidance.³

Oh, you who believe! do not take My enemy and your enemy for friends; would you offer them love while they deny what has come to you of the truth...⁴

Let not the believers take the unbelievers for friends rather than the believers; and whoever does this, he shall have nothing (to do) with Allah...⁵

Oh, you who believe! do not take the unbelievers for friends rather than the believers; do you desire that you should give to Allah a manifest proof against yourselves?⁶

Oh, you who believe! do not take the Jews and the Christians for friends; they are friends of each other; and whoever amongst you takes them for a friend, then surely he is one of them. surely Allah does not guide the unjust people.⁷

But these Wahhabi rulers have sold their souls to Reagans, Bushes and Clintons: and what is more tragic they have heavily mortgaged the Arabian Peninsula to those open enemies of Islam.

Since last ten centuries, the European (and American) powers have been announcing that Islam was their enemy No. 1. After the collapse of the Russian empire, the Sunday Times (London) wrote in May 1991 in an editorial that as the West has accomplished this task, "now" it should concentrate its energies "on Middle East" (Read, against Islam). What happened soon after that was an eye-opener for those who might have been under the illusion that the Western countries stand for "democracy" and "human rights" and defend these values.

America has openly condemned Islam as its enemy No. 1. Archbishop of Canterbury, Rev. George Carey, in his recent visit (July, 1993) to Tanzania blasted "Muslim fundamentalists" as being a threat to the world peace.

And the U.S.A. and its allies are encouraging their puppets in Middle East and agents everywhere to wipe out the Islam and the Muslims from the face of the Earth. Of course, they add the epithet, 'Fundamentalist' before "Muslims" to lull the masses to sleep.

These petro-shaykhdoms have the strongest whip to make the west bow down to their will; as Imam Hafiz Ismet Saphic of Sarajevo (Bosnia) - whose three daughters were killed while waiting in a bread queue - has said, "If the Muslim countries that are dealing with oil stopped their tankers just for one day, the West would start acting in a different way."⁸

But they have no courage to use this God-gifted weapon against the West, because they are fully aware that their survival depends on the sweet wish of the U.S.A.

These Wahhabi rulers think the Western-nations are the friends of the Sunnis. Nothing can surpass this folly. These powers are neither the Sunnis' friend nor the Shi'as' enemy. They are friends of only their own interests and enemies of all who pose slightest danger to their interests.

If they love Sunnism, then why did they order the Turkish army to usurp power when Arbaken (a religious Sunni Muslim) had won the election? Why did they instigate Algerian military to annul the election when the victory of Islamicists appeared certain. Why John Major allegedly wrote in a letter that he did not want any Muslim government (of Sunni Bosnia) in Europe?

I do not want to linger on the political side of these anti-people shaykhdoms. But what they are doing against Islam in general is more heart-wrenching.

In their zeal to please their lords in the White House and the White Hall, they are indulging in such activities which may bring down the citadel of Islam.

This current "fitnah" of anti-Shi'a propaganda is one such example. The Wahhabis think that if they accuse the Shi'as of, let us say, believing in the Tahrif of the Holy Qur'an, it will tarnish the image of the Shi'a faith; they do not realize that it is shaking the foundation of Islam (which is the real aim of their Western patrons). Let us look at this case in order to understand this Western game in its true perspective.

The Muslim 'ulama, Shi'a and Sunni both, did not believe that there was any alteration in, addition to, or omission from the Qur'an. No sensible 'Alim of either sect has accused the other sect that it believed in tahrif of the Qur'an.

Of course there have appeared from time to time some 'ulama on both sides who indulged in mud-slinging against the opposite sect, not realizing that presence of ahadith in a book does not necessarily mean that the people of that group really believed in it. Such traditions, i.e. of Tahrif, remained more or less buried in the books and they were not propagated for the simple reason that nobody based his belief on them.

Things abruptly changed in February 1979, when the Iranian nation, under the guidance of the late Ayatullah al-Khomeini (May Allah's mercy be on him) succeeded in establishing the first truly Islamic government on Earth, centuries after the days of the Imams.

Had the Iranian Revolution resulted in a satellite government following the line of the Western or the Eastern ideology, it would have been gladly accepted - or at least, tolerated - by the self-appointed guardians of "democracy". But, contrary to the conventional wisdom, it chose to follow

the line of Islam. Then it raised the slogan of Islamic Unity. By standing against all un-Islamic “isms”: and not bowing before anyone except Allah, Ayatullah Khomeini and the Iranian leadership gained unsurpassed popularity in the Muslim ummah throughout the world, from Morocco to the Phillipines and from Europe to Americas. Down-trodden masses saw with their own eyes that unarmed bare hands had defeated the mightiest war machine in the Middle East. It gave a new heart to the oppressed people even in non-Muslim countries, like South Africa. This rapidly spreading influence of “Khomeinism” alarmed the U.S.A., “the paramount chief” of the Westen “tribes”. They started fighting against Iran, through the proxy war, through news media and in political fora.

On another front, they made their clients in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait believe that the call of Islamic Unity was a mortal danger to their crowns. Ordered by their masters, the Wahhahis started an intensely hateful propaganda against “Khomeinism”:Iran and Shi’ism. Hired pens began churning out books, articles and tracts against the Shi’as, saying that the Shi’a were Ka.fir, they were mushrik , they had their separate Qur’an, and believed this Qur’an of the Muslims to be altered and incomplete. Some of their top employees were Ihsan Ilahi Zaheer in Pakistan and Manzoor Ahmad No’mani and Abul Hasan ‘Ali Nadwi in India. The last-named case was interesting. Long before the Revolution, he had posed as a champion of the Islamic unity. He was the Chairman of the Muslim Personal Law Board in India with a Shi’a ‘Alim as his Vice- President. But he was also a recipient of the “Faisal Award” of the Saudi dynasty. And no sooner was the slogan of “Neither East nor West, Islam is the Best” raised from Iran, than he aligned himself with the anti-unity forces.

It seems that the sound coming from their mouths is their master’s voice and the Zionism’s dagger dipped in Muslims’ blood is used for their pen.

A book written by these agents might be written in Urdu, Arabic or any other language; but within a few months it is translated in all major languages of the Muslim world, and made available everywhere as well as freely distributed to the hujjaj.

Ostensibly, these agents of American Islam are doing it to weaken Iran and prevent the Iranian Revolution from influencing the “Muslim Youths” - as Abul Hasan ‘Ali Nadwi himself had admitted in the preface of a book. But is this the actual motive of their Masters - the Judea-Christian enemies of Islam? Obviously, “Not:” The manipulators of the American Islam have exhumed some Shi’a traditions of tahreef buried in the books, with the sole aim that the Shi’a would retaliate by publicizing the similar traditions found in the Sunni books, and thus the validity of the Qur’an would be questioned, Muslims’ faith in this Last Divine Revelation would be destroyed and, as a result, Islam would lose its power.

This demeaning polemics will provide the Christian missionaries with effective arms and ammunitions to shake and rattle the Muslim’s faith in the Qur’an. They hope that in this way many Muslims would easily be persuaded to embrace Christianity, and even those who would not convert, would not remain truly Muslim, nor would they follow a Book whose authenticity was doubtful.

Gladstone is reported to have once stood up in the parliament with a copy of the Qur'an in his hand, and declaring that as long as the Muslims followed this Book, the British could not subjugate them. He advised his people to use every subterfuge to shake the Muslims' belief in the Qur'an.

That strategy of Kufr has succeeded in Turkey, Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria and many other so-called Muslim countries where a special hybrid variety of Muslims has been hatched which seems to be allergic to Islam and the Qur'an. It was about to succeed in Iran too, thanks to the Pahlavi regime. But the plan failed, because of the religious leaders under the guidance of late Ayatullah al-'Uzma Khomeini, and because of the religiosity of the Iranian masses. Now the enemies of Islam are using this propaganda of tahreef to achieve that goal.

This is what they have planned. But Allah Subhanahu wa Ta'ala says,

They desire to put out the light of Allah with their mouths, and Allah will surely perfect his light though the unbelievers may be averse.⁹

To sum it up, Wahhabis oppose the unity of the Muslims - which Allah has so much emphasized, and they have taken the Jews and the Christians as their friends and helpers - which Allah has so forcefully and in so many places forbidden.

Notes

1. Qur'an, 3:103.
2. Qur'an, 8:46
3. Qur'an, 2:120.
4. Qur'an, 60:1.
5. Qur'an, 3:20.
6. Qur'an, 4:144.
7. Qur'an, 5:51.
8. The Muslim News, London, 30/7/1993.
9. Qur'an, 61:8.