



A VICTIM
LOST
IN
SAQIFAH

VOL 2 OF 4

xkyp

Ali Labbaf

Part 1
Discourse One Criticism and In-
vestigation about Propaganda of
Silence of Amirul Momineen
(a.s.)

Doubts Created Regarding Silence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)

Deviated analyses regarding the silence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) can be divided into three categories:

Conjectures that claim 'Letting go of Caliphate linked with consent'

One of the most important deviated consequences of this conjecture is release of Abu Bakr's regime from the circle of usurpation and granting legitimacy to his Caliphate.

This partiality in the sources of Ahle Sunnat has succeeded in giving false coverings based on 'immediate *Bay'at*' of His Eminence, to Abu Bakr.

By the same argument, sometimes instead of 'Letting go of Caliphate linked with consent' they talk about 'Willful *Bay'at* of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to Abu Bakr' and that also in the initial period of his Caliphate!

Style of criticizing the first category of conjectures[1]

Absurd claims of 'Willing renouncement of Caliphate' can be reviewed on the basis of two kinds of authentic documents:

A) Documents indicating 'efforts of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in bringing down the usurped caliphate of Abu Bakr'.

B) Documents indicating 'Forced demand of *Bay'at*' and 'severe opposition of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from accepting it'.

[Documents and sources of siege on the house of Fatima (s.a.)]

Conjectures that claim ‘Detachment of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from Caliphate and overlooking it, after six months of Abu Bakr’ Caliphate’

One of the most important evil results of these doubts is forgetting the historical documents regarding attack on the house of Fatima (s.a.).

Because in this deviated partiality that talks of the allegiance of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to Abu Bakr after some months they have very cleverly put a lid on the oppressions and plots that were the highlights of the initial period of

[1] Refer: *Ali Labbaf: A Victim Lost in Saqifah, Vol. 4, Section 1, Discourse 1 and 2cc*

Abu Bakr’s rule.

In the same way among the other deviated repercussions of this conjecture is that it becomes the basis to subsequent claims of ‘good relations of Ali and Caliphs’. This also goes a long way in making all forget the terrible crimes committed by usurpers of Caliphate in the initial period.

Style of criticizing the second category of conjectures

Absurd claim of ‘gradual withdrawal of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from Caliphate and overlooking it’ although after passing of some months in the Caliphate of Abu Bakr can be evaluated in the following two ways:

A)

Criticism and analysis of ‘False narrations about the willful allegiance of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to Abu Bakr after six months’.**[1]**

B)

Criticism and analysis of ‘Conjectures regarding the co-operation of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) with Caliphs’.**[2]**

Conjectures that claim ‘Absence of plan of right of Caliphate and not proving the School of Imamate’.

These conjectures, sometimes are posed in an indirect way and under the ‘conjectures of two previous categories’ and sometimes also regarding ‘refusal to prove the Alawi Imamate and *Wilayat*’.

The aim of posing such types doubts is ‘To invite Shias to observe silence from planning discussions related to Caliphate and Successorship of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)’.

Style of criticizing the third category of conjectures

Absurd claims of ‘Refusal of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from plan of the right of Caliphate and his remaining silent from explaining the School of Imamate’ can be criticized on the basis of ‘debates of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.)’ with support of ‘statements of His Eminence (a.s.) in the matter of his severe struggle of having his claim recorded in History’.**[3]**

[1] Refer: *Ali Labbaf: A Victim Lost in Saqifah, Vol. 4, Section 1, Discourse 4*

[2] *In the discussions after this writing, we shall criticize and investigate these objections.*

[3] *In addition to criticism of the conjecture “Absence of demanding the right of Caliphate” related to the conjectures of first type we will also refute the supposition of “Lack of*

Did Amirul Momineen (a.s.) Leave Caliphate and Overlook his Rights?

Analyses of unity-seekers regarding the political and social stances of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) after passing away of Prophet are quite untrue and far from reality because they have compared it to 'silence'.

The prime aim of those who inject this suspicion about the silence is to interpret it to effect of foregoing his right and overlooking to demand it. They sketch in a way that the reader concludes that His Eminence (a.s.) did not take any action against usurpation of his right. He also impeded others to take any action in this respect.

The scope of these conjectures has spread to such an extent that they claim:

“Caliphate was the very first issue on which Imam Ali (a.s.) maintained silence in his attitude towards it. He did not allow anyone to make Caliphate a ground for difference in the Ummah or utilize the situation to their own benefit.”! **[1]**

To check and scrutinize this suspicion first it is necessary to see that the conjecture-coiner has so misused events of history that he has reached to this deviation:

“He did not allow anyone to make Caliphate a ground for difference”!

Study of historical events that occurred after Saqifah Bani Saada show that:

“When Abu Sufyan became aware of the event of Saqifah. He voiced national and racial motives and said to Ali: Extend your hand so that I may pay allegiance to you. I swear by God if you want I will fill up Medina with warriors and horses...Ali rejected the offer. By this he showed that in his political school it was not correct to take advantage of everything for the sake of aim. Ali had no doubt that the right was his. But to reach it he did not see proper to use whatever means possible. So understanding Abu Sufyan's intention, he refused him. The aim of

Abu Sufyan was to create differences, corruption and battle among Muslims. Therefore Ali terms this act of Abu Sufyan as malefic and mischievous.”**[2]**

explanation of the position of Imamate and Wilayat by Amirul Momineen (a.s.)”

[1] Muhammad Ali Tashkhiri: Article quoted in *Kayhan Farhangi*, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 34

[2] Jalal Darikhsha: *Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents)*, Pg. 42

This is the only case where Ali has shown his disagreement with support expressed to him. So it seems that the suspect has based his suspicion thereat; and makes it a proof to support the idea. In fact the reaction of Ali was against military support of Abu Sufyan. It also was to defeat his intention of seizing complete power or taking share for Bani Umayyah.

[1]

According to this analysis, the reaction of Ali cannot be attributed to his agreement to usurpation of Caliphate.

Correct Analysis about Ali's reaction to Usurpation of Caliphate

Why Ali did not show negative reaction (similar to one referred) to his friends' support, had his purpose been silence against usurpation of his right? If the aim of Imam Ali (a.s.) was silence what about the program that accompanied his claim to take back his right; what would it mean?

“Ali did not accept allegiance of Abu Sufyan. On the other hand he strongly refrained from paying allegiance to the new authority of Abu Bakr. So he showed his rejection.”**[2]**

“Acquisition of power and uniting his friends, were his other steps. When Bay'at of Abu Bakr took place, Ali (a.s.) began to mobilize his friends, and in this matter he was morally and personally supported by his wife, Fatima, the daughter of Prophet (s.a.w.s.).”**[3]**

“From this stage onwards the campaign of Ali appears more serious and ardent. It takes to itself a special feature against the new regime. The house of Prophet's daughter defended him; Fatima herself came out as a powerful support to Ali. On some cases, she takes the initiative to express her opposition to the extent of physical brawl.”**[4]**

[1] *For deeper understanding of the stance of Abu Sufyan and his aims in this regard refer to the book, Tahleel Neem Qarn Siyasathai Tableeghi Amawiyaan dar Shaam, Pgs. 48-50, by Faheema Farhamandpoor; or the last part of the article: 'Realism in the biography of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and the attitude of enemies' by Abdur Reza Khalili printed in Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue no. 4, Azar 1381.*

[2] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 43*

[3] *Asghar Qaidan: Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 83*

[4] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 44*

“In order to take back his lost right Ali even invited people to pay allegiance to him.”

Among the actions that Imam Ali (a.s.) undertook was that he and wife kept visiting the gatherings of Ansaar and asking for their support.”**[1]**

In order to finalize his argument on Muslim and not to leave any room to posterity to interpret wrongly his silence as concurrence with new order and his withdrawal willingly from his right to lead Islamic Mission, he kept visiting the houses of Muslims in Medina. He reminded them about the words and recommendations of Prophet concerning succession after him. He insisted on them to give him a hand in returning Caliphate to its real and correct tract.”**[2]**

“In the very early days when the Ummah had gone astray and perverted he took his sons, Hasan and Husain and his wife, Fatima and kept knocking door after door of Ansaar (Helpers). It is remarkable to mention here that he was blamed for being too greedy for Caliphate because of his persistence on his right, which he wanted history to record.”**[3]**

“Therefore from each step he took, it becomes evident that his uprising was against backward movement to days of ignorance prior to Islam.”**[4]**

“If actions of Imam (a.s.) had not been there in this regard it might have happened that people would have doubted in his being immediate Caliph of Prophet and the possibility would have strengthened that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has abrogated his insistence on Caliphate of Amirul Momineen (a.s.).”**[5]**

“He knew very well that his silence might cause the people, under the influence of false propaganda of usurpers, to think that he was supporting the Saqifah matter hence in order to put into record his actual stance he broke his silence.”**[6]**

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 45*

[2] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa*

Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pgs. 79-80

[3] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Momin-aan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 18*

[4] *Mustafa Dilshad Tehrani: Meeras Rabooda (Usurped inheritance), Pg. 89*

[5] *Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article: Saqifah quoted in Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 8, Pg. 446*

[6] *Hashmatullah Qambari Hamadani: Asraar wa Asaar Saqifah Bani Saada (Secrets and*

“In this matter the close friends of His Eminence (a.s.) cooperated with him. And the close companions of Prophet like Abu Zar, Salman, Khalid bin Saeed, Abu Ayyub Ansaari, Uthman bin Haneef, Baraa bin Azib - all these gathered in the mosque. They sincerely declared their support to Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s.).”**[1]**

“They launched arguments and put forth such reasoning advocating the right of Ali that Abu Bakr could not dare to come out of his house for three days. Till on the third day his colleagues went to his house with naked swords and brought him out at the point of sword. They seated him at the pulpit of the Prophet. They threatened others by sword that no one had a right to talk about the subject. In modern terms a censorship was imposed.

From this point no one moved or spoke.”**[2]**

All these historical evidences show that the Imam did not leave any stone unturned in defending Alawi School and Imamate. According to conditions of those times, he did whatever was possible to him. He did not sit idle to see his right usurped. But Muslims had gone somnolent and sluggish. They stooped to wrong but did not erect their backs to support the truth.

Historical evidences regarding his sharp debates prove this point:

“Abu Bakr in the early days of Caliphate sent the following message to the Imam: Do comply with request of Caliph of the Prophet of Allah and pay allegiance to him. Imam told the

messenger: How soon you attribute a lie to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). He and his supporters know well that Allah and His Messenger has not installed as Caliph anyone except me.**[3]**

When they took the Imam to the Mosque he began the dialogue and asked Abu Bakr: Did you not pay allegiance to me yesterday at the command of the Prophet of Allah?**[4]**

Then the Imam addressed the audience in the mosque reminding them of

relics of Saqifah Bani Saada), Pg. 85

[1] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pgs. 43-44*

[2] *Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article: Saqifah quoted in Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 8, Pg. 458; quoted from: Ihtijaaj Tabarsi: Vol. 1, Pgs. 186-199*

[3] *Quoted from: Kitab Sulaym Ibne Qays, Vol. 2, Pg. 583*

[4] *Quoted from: Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 865*

all that the Prophet had said about him. He also reminded them of the event of Ghadeer and the Prophet's words regarding him on that occasion.

All agreed and acknowledged Ali's veracity. Even Abu Bakr acknowledged having had paid allegiance to Ali.**[1]**

Zaid bin Arqam says that twelve tribal chiefs were present there who attested the words of Imam Ali (a.s.). Gradually the argument got hotter and a row and din arose in the Masjid. Umar feared that people will go to Ali's side. So he upset the gathering and people left the mosque.**[2]"[3]**

These historical documents show that His Eminence (a.s.) in the most severe conditions; that is in the time when they demanded him to pledge allegiance to Abu Bakr under threat to his life, argued the validity of his Caliphate and spoke in support of the School of Imamate and Alawi Caliphate. He tried to regain his usurped position in every way.

“Ali (a.s.) always during the Caliphate of Caliphs never refrained from expressing the matter that Caliphate was a right linked to him.”**[4]**

Ali (a.s.) did not refrain from expressing and demanding his rights and complaining against those who had usurped it. He was very vocal about his demands and he did not consider it to be an impediment to Muslim unity.”**[5]**

“To think that Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) did not mention anything about his rightfulness is a view opposed to historical reality.”**[6]**

Careful scrutiny of recorded narrations clearly shows that His Eminence never abandoned his rights and did not overlook them at all and he never left them to the discretion of the Caliphs and he was not at all silent about them. Although it is a matter of regret that they have altered the public debates of His Eminence (a.s.) that took place among the Muslims. Thus it is said:

[1] Quoted from: *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 589*

[2] Quoted from: *Ihtijaaj Tabarsi: Vol. 1, Pgs. 185*

[3] Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article: *Saqifah* quoted in *Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 8, Pg. 456*

[4] Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: *Seeri Dar Seerah Aimmah-e-Athaar (A Glance at the Life of Purified Imams), Pg. 22*

[5] *Ibid. Pg. 20*

[6] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 191*

“Indeed during the period of Caliphs, in the consultant committees and among the special companions he debated about his rights, but he did not do so among the general populace of Muslims! Because he feared sedition and movement against the machinery of Caliphate and due to this in my personal view and confessions of some researchers of the story of Ghadeer, he remained silent about the divine right of the Wilayat of Ahle Bayt.”**[1]**

On the basis of this conjecture, firstly:

Obvious steps and repeated public debates of His Eminence (a.s.) are shown to be special and private discussions; as if His

Eminence (a.s.) did not lay the foundation of awakening of the people!

Absence of an open and widespread revolt of the Imam (a.s.) and his refraining from a large scale attack on the regime is interpreted to be an effort for keeping the Caliphs safe!

Yes, this conjecture creates such a picture in the mind of readers that Imam (a.s.) was never vocal in public about the divine right of his Imamate and *Wilayat*.

Now that if continuous and repeated efforts of the Imam in creating awareness had not been witnessed its evidence would have needed to be obtained from somewhere else (other than silence before the usurpation of Caliphate).

Certainly, it must be asked:

“Did the people of that time forget all that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) had told about his cousin, Ali (a.s.)? And they were waiting for Ali (a.s.) to remind and awaken them to honor his rights?

They detachment from Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) was not due to their complete ignorance about the moral status of His Eminence so that on hearing about his victimization they would wake up and rise up in his support.

His mission was not like the proclamation of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) in the beginning that he should be in search for supporters in his mission of spreading Islam.

In the days following the demise of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) those who wanted made Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) their leader. They knew him as was

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 21*

necessary and those who followed others were not such that with a single call of Ali for help they would rise up in his support and harness the motives of his opposition.”

CONCLUSION

Interpretation of silence of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) by the partiality regarding 'overlooking Caliphate and abandoning willingly and also absence of his expression of his right of Caliphate' is against historical evidences and realities and evidences for protecting Islamic unity cannot conceal these types of deviations in analysis of historical events. Yet they claim:

"The Imam according to his own account held his hand and kindly let go of his right! Because the wellbeing and benefit of the religion necessitated his painful silence and abandoning! A right whose eligibility was confirmed in his own view as well by others"!

"When some people usurped the absolute right of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.), he could have risen up against them in an armed uprising, but only for the sake of complete wellbeing of Islam and guarding the unity and integration of Muslims and that the fresh converts do not go back to their infidelity and the enemies of Islam may not get a chance to benefit from the situation and that the new faith of Islam may not be destroyed in the nascent stage, he overlooked his absolute right"!

"Ali (a.s.) for the sake of Islamic unity abandoned his own right and that of his wife! He bore failures and hardships but in all his dealings preferred unity and oneness of Muslims and also made his wife and sons observe this."!

"And in this way he renounced divine text (Nass) of his successorship, which his friends and relatives use as proof."!

"Inspite of being obdurate on their rights till that time, they overlooked it."!

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 21*

Part 2
Correct Interpretation Ali's Si-
lence and its Causes

Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) from the aspect of fulfilling the duty entrusted to the position of Imamate and on the path of protecting religion that he had received from the Almighty[1] assumed a special demeanor to react to the usurpation of Caliphate and the usurpers - especially after the attack on Fatima's house[2] - which is termed as silence.

Silence of the Imam was not in the sense to give up his right to Caliphs, or to refrain from making any claim. He remained silent only in the sense that he did not undertake an armed uprising against the usurped Caliphate - and that also after opposing vehemently for twenty days against usurpation of Caliphate and a widespread effort to announce illegality of Abu Bakr's Caliphate.

"In every way Imam Ali (a.s.) tried to bring Caliphate to its rightful place, but some Muslims were instrumental in assuring that the Imam does not achieve his purpose.

If His Eminence (a.s.) had continued his opposition he would not have succeeded in sidelining Abu Bakr, rather his own life would have been endangered." [3]

"A third point also exists and it was the awe and terror that the machinery of the ruler had imposed on Islamic society." [4]

For example:

"After paying allegiance to Abu Bakr some people of Saqifah rose against Abu Bakr. Upon direction of Umar, a group of people kicked and crushed Habbab bin Mundhir under their feet. Dust was poured in his

[1] Ezzatudin Abu Hamid Motazalli (Ibn Abi Hadeed) writes: One day the Prophet hit on the shoulder of Ali and cried and said: "I weep for the hatred that is in the hearts of the nation. They do not make it open to you as long as I am alive". Ibn Askar writes: Ali asked as to what he should do then. The Prophet told him to be patient. Ali asked: What would happen if I couldn't do that? The Prophet said: You will face hardships. (Yusuf Gholami After Sunset, Pg. 160 narrated from Nahjul Balagha) Vol. 4, Pg. 107; History of City of Damascus Vol. 2, Pg. 325

[2] *This incident happened in the third week of Abu Bakr's Caliphate.*

[3] *Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article: Saqifah quoted in Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 8, Pg. 449*

[4] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pgs. 49-50*

mouth and his nose was broken

Saad bin Ubadah was kicked until he reached the frontiers of death.

If anyone raised his voice, immediately his mouth was filled with dust.

On the return route of Muhajireen to Mosque, associates of Umar stopped everyone and pulled each them and touched his hand to Abu Bakr's as a token of paying allegiance to him and then left him.

In that scuffle Bani Aslam tribe of desert-dwellers entered Medina as the chief of Muhajireen had promised to give plenty of provision to them if they helped. They started beating the people with canes, sticks and lances without a pretext or a warning unless they paid allegiance to the new Caliph.

Umar often used to say: I became sure of our victory only on arrival of Bani Aslam in Medina.

They were in a pact with Emigrants. They were so many that lanes and streets of Medina were blocked.” **[1]**

“The fact is that their efforts imbued with tyranny and torture had gone so far as to prepare the old category of Prophet's companions to discard Ahle Bayt of Prophet including the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, Ali, from government. Such was their determination. Imam Ali (a.s.) was not ignorant of this reality. This too was among the reasons that discouraged Ali to take a practical step towards taking back what was usurped from him.” **[2]**

On the basis of this:

“His Eminence keeping in view the political realities of that Muslim society considered it better to remain patient because

every action needed power and he believed that at that time he was not having such a power.”**[3]**

“His Eminence, Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) had told Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) about such circumstances and said that...the people after his passing away would cheat him. ‘If you get supporters you stage an uprising and if

[1] Yusuf Gholami: *Bohraan-e-Jansheeni-e-Payambar (Crisis of Succession to the Prophet)*, Pgs. 34-35

[2] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pgs. 191-192

[3] Jalal Darikhsha: *Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents)*, Pg. 49
not you remain silent.”**[1]**

“In our view silence of the Imam denotes refraining from armed uprising. And if not, His Eminence never refrained from raising his claim throughout period of Caliphs and after that also he always referred to it.”**[2]**

“There is no doubt that if the son of Abu Talib before he did that called people to help him his opponents would have tried more to trample his rights and the rights of the family of the Prophet.”**[3]**

Under conditions that developed, any kind of armed uprising would only have resulted in bloodshed of His Eminence (a.s.).

It is natural that such a thing would have served as an excellent opportunity for fulfillment of the wishes of senior righteous persons! For which they had spent years around the Prophet put on a show of piety in a hypocritical manner.

Following the martyrdom of the son of Abu Talib - which would also have been accompanied by the martyrdom of his few loyal companions - the Emigrant hypocrites would have removed their veil of piety that had concealed their real faces. Not only were they capable of bloodshed of the Imam by ‘public deception’ they would have got a free hand to uproot the faith of Islam. The stages of deviation would have been crossed

more swiftly and in a short time no trace of real teachings of Islam would have remained.

On the other hand the Umayyad party under the leadership of Abu Sufyan, seeing the field empty from the real supporter of religion of Islam (Ali Ibne Abi Talib) and his loyal Shias, would have again resumed their struggle to regain power and they would have gradually taken the Muslim society to idol worship and apostasy.

In other words, within a short period of martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) the religion of Islam would have been completely destroyed.

Therefore with one glance of impartiality without any historical emotionality we will realize that the safety of Islam from being destroyed was directly linked to the security of the life of Amirul Momineen (a.s.).

[1] Yusuf Gholami: *Bohraan-e-Jansheeni-e-Payambar (Crisis of Succession to the Prophet)*, Pg. 65

[2] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pg. 160

[3] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pgs. 194-195

The proof of abstinence of Imam (a.s.) from Jihad that required martyrdom, the secret of bloodied supports and defenses of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) for the life of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and also initiatives of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) in the period of confrontation with the tyrant ruler should also be searched in this same point.

Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and his Stern Refusal to Pay Allegiance to Abu Bakr

Absence of silence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) against usurpation of Caliphate and the level of correctness of the claim of 'kindly leaving his right to the Caliphs' can be seen in the incident of attack on Fatima's house and the severity of His Eminence (a.s.) against paying allegiance to Abu Bakr. **[1]**

"Abu Bakr and Umar with complete knowledge about the rights of Ali (a.s.) and the special reverence he enjoyed among Prophet's companions, invited him to the mosque to pay allegiance to the Caliph to avoid any reverse reaction from old companions, which was a great source of fear to them. But His Eminence (a.s.) clearly refused to go to the mosque and in reply said:

I have more right to Caliphate; I will not pay allegiance to you and you should come and give Bay'at to me...

But Umar bin Khattab told Ali (a.s.): Unless you don't pay allegiance we shall not let you go. Umar was most active to obtain Ali's allegiance and was directing the affairs. Ali told him: Milk the she-camel because there is a share in it for you. You try to strengthen Abu Bakr because Caliphate goes to you tomorrow. Thus he tried to reject the allegiance of the ruler in every way..." **[2]**

Even then it is claimed:

"Ali, with a lofty nature and enduring sacrifice for this religion and with utmost care that not the smallest difference should arise between the companions, without any hesitation pledged allegiance to Abu Bakr!... Ali in reply said... If I did not consider Abu Bakr worthy of this matter! I would never have left the Caliphate to him...Hazrat Ali gave allegiance one or two days after the passing away of the Prophet! And only this is a fact..." **[3]**

[1] Refer: *Ali Labbaf: A Victim Lost in Saqifah, Vol. 4, Section 1*

[2] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pgs. 44-45*

[3] *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue*

“Following Ali’s oppositions, he and his companions gathered in Fatima’s house. Umar who followed the policy of force, advised Abu Bakr to make haste in getting Ali’s allegiance lest things take a turn. Therefore he surrounded the house with armed men and threatened to burn the house if they do not come out and pay allegiance to Abu Bakr. This shows how much Ali’s disapproval to the new regime was critical. Umar in order to fulfill his threat got ready with the elementary things. Fuel wood was gathered. He was about to set fire when he was told that Fatima was inside. He said: So what?

But nothing of this compelled Ali to come out for paying allegiance. This shows Ali’s obstinacy against usurpation of rulership.

Umar once more recommended Abu Bakr to get Ali’s pledge of allegiance at any rate. Therefore Abu Bakr once again summoned Ali (a.s.) but Ali (a.s.) in reply to the message that the Caliph of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) is calling you said: How soon you have attributed falsehood to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.).

But Umar did not give up. Again he insisted on Abu Bakr that he must not give any respite to Ali (a.s.) and Abu Bakr again sent Ali the request to give allegiance but Ali once more rejected it absolutely and said: You are claiming something which is not yours. Umar could not bear this. Therefore taking support of the political situation of that time and with drawn sword he surrounded the house of Ali (a.s.) and demanded that he pay allegiance and warned that if he desisted he would be killed and ultimately Ali was forced to come out and was taken to the mosque.

This event nicely proves how strongly Ali opposed them and the usurpation of Caliphate.”**[1]**

Inspite of this they claim:

“He surrendered Caliphate to Abu Bakr and Umar for the sake of Muslim unity.”!**[2]**

“He surrendered Caliphate to Abu Bakr for the well being of Muslims, for religious solution of the problem and to attract the hearts of common Muslims.”!**[3]**

No. 15, Autumn 82, Pg. 11

[1] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pgs. 46-47*

[2] *Farooq Safizaada: Article quoted in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 82*

[3] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 82*

Ali, with his own will and not submitting to the circumstances remained at the side of Abu Bakr’s Caliphate; gave his complete assistance! And always kept himself at the disposal of the Caliph to solve difficulties.”!**[1]**

If such was the case why he was so obstinate? Why he was so much restive? On the other hand why he was threatened? Why Fatima’s house was set on fire? The door was opened by force under flames. Fatima was behind the door. The hurt resulted in the martyrdom of Mohsin and then her martyrdom later. What does it all show?

Do these claims not aim to exonerate the Caliphs from crimes they committed against Ahle Bayt (a.s.) of Prophet where Divine Revelations descended with the Archangel?

Obviously it is only this; because inspite of evidences that History has recorded it is still claimed that:

“Ali by his silence of some years put a stamp of approval on Caliphate of all three Caliphs.”!**[2]**

Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Declaration of Illegitimacy of Caliphate

To gauge the level of correctness of the last conjecture it is sufficient that we do not forget what the answer of the Imam was to proposal of Abdur Rahman bin Auf in the six-person Shura committee for appointment of Caliph after Umar.

“With all the same precaution that Imam had taken, in the period of Shura for Caliphate, he did not agree to the conditions of Abdur Rahman bin Auf for acceptance of Caliphate...this was an open rejection of the Imam (a.s.) of the practice and behavior of Abu Bakr and Umar.”**[3]**

“This shows that Ali did not attach any religious legitimacy to Caliphate of Abu Bakr and Umar. And in order to explain it he announced his opposition to their policies and ruling practices.”**[4]**

[1] Ibrahim Baizoon (Translated by Ali Asghar Muhammadi Seejaani): *Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh (Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition), 1379], Pg. 37*

[2] Farooq Safizaada: Article quoted in *Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 80*

[3] Rasool Ja'faryan: *Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 18*

[4] Asghar Qaidan: *Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on*

In the same way after the assassination of Uthman and public allegiance to Ali we witnessed that:

“A man was insistent that besides Quran and traditions of Prophet he (Ali) should also follow conduct of the two - i.e. Abu Bakr and Umar. But the Imam did not agree and he said:

Even if Abu Bakr and Umar did not act on anything except according to Quran and Prophet's tradition they were not right.”**[1]**

On the basis of this even after passage of some years, not only did Amirul Momineen (a.s.) not put a stamp of approval on their regime, rather with complete openness he pointed out the illegality of their Caliphate and declared them to be foundation of falsehood; even then it is claimed that:

“He found many proceedings of Umar similar to his own attitude.”! **[2]**

“The proceeds of the two **[3]** were so close to each other that they provided a frame to political affairs in accordance with each other.”! **[4]**

Final Judgment on Silence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)

Perhaps in a first glance it is pictured that Amirul Momineen (a.s.) did not display any reaction and took no step against the usurpation of Caliphate and he did not take any step against the illegal regime of Abu Bakr.

While historical evidences clearly show that His Eminence (a.s.) cleared his stance by starting scathing debates and protests against the tyranny of the ruler - and that also from the Prophet's mosque.

These firebrand speeches were delivered on Monday and Tuesday; that is the day of the demise of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and the next day; that is the first day of the Abu Bakr's illegal regime to get back his right of Caliphate.

political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 127

[1] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 29; quoted from Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 5, Pg. 76*

[2] *Ibrahim Baizoon (Translated by Ali Asghar Muhammadi Seejaani): Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh(Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition), 1379], Pg. 44*

[3] *[Ali (a.s.) and Umar]*

[4] *Ibrahim Baizoon (Translated by Ali Asghar Muhammadi Seejaani): Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh(Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition), 1379], Pg. 41*

Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the background of these scathing protests spoke about his usurped rights in the most open manner. And he emphasized on the illegality of Abu Bakr's Caliphate and showed that it was usurped.

Following the efforts of the regime for taking forced allegiance from the people of Medina which was helped by the intervention of Bani Aslam tribe on the first day of Abu Bakr's

Caliphate (Tuesday), the residence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Fatima (s.a.) [house of Fatima] became the fort of some people who refused to give allegiance to the Caliphate of Abu Bakr. Opponents who were armed according to some clear historical evidences.

Movement of 'opponents of Abu Bakr's Caliphate' to and from the house of Fatima and their taking asylum in it was not unknown to the Caliph and his supporters.

So much so that some historical documents mention dominant factors of Caliph's supports in the gathering of the refugees and also mention the presence of potentially dangerous personages like Talha and Saad bin Abi Waqqas.

In the end the fort of this group was broken down when the Caliph's men surrounded Fatima's house and Umar threatened to burn it down.

With attention to some points it can be said that: This asylum was in force for a maximum period of three days at the end of which when the house was surrounded by Umar's men and they put the door to fire this was finally over on Friday (fourth day after the Prophet's demise). And only Ali (a.s.) remained in security from the attackers with the special support of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.).

Although this barricade was broken by the threats of Umar to burn down the house the small gathering of opponents of *Bay'at* of Abu Bakr was disintegrated. But this terrible incident did not in the least weaken the resolve of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) to bring down Abu Bakr's regime.

The city of Medina on the fifth day after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) witnessed new steps from Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Hazrat Zahra (s.a.).

The first important incident during these days (from the fifth to the seventh after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah) were of soliciting help at night.

According to some authentic historical documents, Amirul Momineen (a.s.) accompanied by Hazrat Zahra (s.a.), for three continuous nights to visit the houses of Emigrants and Helpers asking them for their support in bringing down the Caliphate of Abu Bakr.

Along with these nightly seeking of help - which was in fact a call for Jihad - Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) began her propaganda to expose the real face of Caliph by protesting against the usurpation of her monetary rights.

These monetary demands - which continued for many days by the help and support of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) - first of all included the demand of her inheritance and share of relatives of the Prophet. Monetary demands of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) fell like a hammer on the head of the Caliphal regime - the culmination of which on the tenth day after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) was the fiery sermon of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) in the Prophet's Mosque, called the Fadak sermon.

In the same way according to some historical evidences, Imam Ali (a.s.) also on the ninth day after the demise of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) delivered a speech and again in the evening addressed the Emigrants and Helpers for the fourth time, urging them to render help to dethrone Abu Bakr.

Although these solicitations also like the previous ones remained unanswered and only a few companions volunteered to come forward and help the rightful successor of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.).

This sluggishness and sloth in helping Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was so bitter and painful that Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) in some of her addresses in the Prophet's Mosque in particular flayed the Helpers by quoting the Quranic verse of '**then fight the leaders of unbelief...**'[1] and again urged them to help them against the tyrant regime.

We can dare say that the ten days (after the Prophet's passing) were days of culmination of helplessness, solitude and victimization of the Family of Revelation (a.s.).

Among the painful events of the days following was the confiscation of Fadak Orchards which most probably occurred on the fifteenth day after the Prophet.

That Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) were not unaware of the intention of the Caliph to confiscate Fadak is obvious from some statements of Umar bin Khattab. Therefore Hazrat Zahra (s.a.), immediately after demanding her inheritance set out to prove her ownership of Fadak Orchards and demanded that they be restored to her.

[1] *Surah Taubah 9:12*

On one hand the support and backing of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) and on the other the terror of the regime of awakening the people's thinking leading to ousting of Abu Bakr from power, especially after the speeches of twelve prominent companions of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the Prophet's Mosque, compelled the Caliph and his supporters to enact the siege of Fatima's house and force Ali (a.s.) to pay allegiance.

Therefore we see that the first fortnight of Abu Bakr's Caliphate began with direct orders of the Caliph to subdue Ali (a.s.) and force allegiance from him and it ended with the blood-filled defense of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.).

That which is most worthy of attention in these events is the determination of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) against paying *Bay'at* in spite of the obstinacy and ferocity of the Caliph's party men.

Severe opposition of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) from accepting the demands of Caliph's attackers and his determination against their request, which was accompanied by the blood-smearred defense of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.); tell us about the height of Ahle Bayt's opposition to the regime.

A delicate point that is noticed in the above events is hopelessness of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from the possibility of deposing the usurped Caliphate of Abu Bakr, especially ten days after the Prophet. Because during the ten days all the petitions of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) to the people had not produced any results. And there was no chance of armed uprising.

Once again it is worth noting that:

Armed Jihad for deposing Abu Bakr's Caliphate would have made sense only if His Eminence (a.s.) had sufficient power to confront the regime.

Because the aim of armed uprising was not only confronting the tyrant rule, rather it should really succeed in deposing the tyrant ruler and putting Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the seat of power and in control of circumstances.

Therefore if it did not result in deposition of Abu Bakr and accession of Ali (a.s.) it was very much likely that it would have brought the martyrdom of Ali (a.s.) and his companions or their absolute defeat. And this would not have resulted in anything but deviation and destruction of Islam.

As we have said before, if in this uprising, His Eminence, Ali (a.s.), due to the paucity of supporters had reached martyrdom, the aged companions of Prophet, who had made a show of piety all these years, would have got all the chance to strengthen their position and initiated the distortion of Islamic values as result of which in a short time no trace of original Islam (Shiaism) would have remained.

Although another possibility was there that after the martyrdom of Ali (a.s.) the Bani Umayyad party under the leadership of Abu Sufyan would have renewed their efforts to regain their lost power as a result of which following the downfall of Islam people would have reverted to idol worship and ignorance.

In the same way it must be remembered that even if the Imam and his men had succeeded in defeating Abu Bakr and

his supporters but failed to take control of the situation, it might have developed into civil war and maybe furthered by Bani Umayyah and Abu Sufyan thus resulting in utter chaos and even the martyrdom of Ali (a.s.) at the hands of Umayyads.

In other words, on one side the fervor of Imam's companions and on the other the determination of the Caliph's party to retain their hold on power would have resulted in complete disorder ending in the destruction of Islam in only fifteen days of Prophet's demise. Hence the security of Islam was very much linked to the security of the life of Amirul Momineen (a.s.).

It was for this reason that after the first fortnight Amirul Momineen (a.s.) contained his aspirations of deposing Abu Bakr's Caliphate and he directed his efforts in supporting the demands of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.). In other words Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) began her efforts to demand her rights from Abu Bakr after the first week of his Caliphate.

On the basis of this after feeble response of people to help him, Ali (a.s.) decided to follow the second half of the will of the Prophet and that was to observe patience.

It is obvious that patience was dictated by demands of action and not of belief. And it could not be equated with armed uprising, that also without sufficient supporters. But this patience could also not be construed as 'surrendering Caliphate' or 'refraining from espousing the right of Caliphate and abstaining from explaining the School of Imamate'. It cannot be analyzed in this wrong way.

On the whole it can be said:

The link between 'safety of Islam' and 'security of Imam's life' appeared in the beginning period of the Caliphate of Abu Bakr.

With the difference that in the initial days Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was in opposition to Abu Bakr while Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) acted as his protector and defender, but after one week, when

there was no response from the people and the severity of Caliph's men also increased to subdue him, (day signaling the beginning of the period of patience and silence) Hazrat Zahra (s.a.), in addition of the responsibility of protecting the life of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) also assumed the role of opposition to the tyrant regime. His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) intentionally took up the defense and support of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) in her steps and this continued to the last.

The above analysis was done on the basis of following sources:

1 - Allamah Muhammad Baqir Majlisi: *Biharul Anwar*, (Vols. 28-29)

2 - Abduz Zahra Mahdi: *Darasata wa Tahleel Haul Al-Hujoom Alaa Bait-e-Fatima*

3 - Shaykh Abbas Qummi: *Baitul Ahzaan fee Massaib-e-Sayyidatun Niswaan*

4 - Sayyid Muhammad Baqir Musawi: *Al-Kauthar fee Ahwaal-e-Fatima binte Nabi al-Athar*

5 - Sayyid Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Maa Saa az-Zahra (s.a.)* (Vols. 5-6)

6 - Sayyid Mahdi Hashmi: *Fatima Zahra Dar Kalaam-e-Ahle Sunnat* (Vol. 2)

7 - Adnan Darakhshan: *Uboor az Tareeki*

8 - Masoodpur Sayyid Aaqai: *Hoor Dar Aatish*

9 - Muhammad Dashti: *Tahleel Hawaadis Naagawaar Zindagaani Hazrat Zahra (s.a.)*

To what extent Ali Believed in Preserving Silence?

It is a point worth considering that silence of Imam Ali (a.s.) has a limit as everything else. Beyond that it has gone beyond tolerance and control. In that case, it could rest at sword alone. Caliphs too were aware of this fact.

Historical documents indicate:

“One day in a gathering, Umar asked: If we turn you back to what you are denying now, that is idol worship, what would you do?

The narrator says: All were silent. Umar repeated these words thrice. Then Imam Ali (a.s.) got up and said: O Umar! In that case we will ask you to repent and if you repent we will accept.

The Caliph asked: And what if I don't repent?

Imam said: In that case I would cut off your head.”**[1]**

[1] Najmuddin Askari: *Ali wal Khulafa*, Pg. 120; quoted from *Manaqib Khwarizmi*, Pg.

Did Ali Refrain from Arguing about Imamate?

This is another conjecture attached to his practical conduct and his stand with regard to Caliphs' government. They say that Imam maintained silence regarding his Imamate and Guardianship (*Wilayat*). Thus they say:

“Ali (a.s.) refrained from expressing his view and increasing differences among the people about his Imamate. And it was a prominent part of his attitude to the Caliphs, in their times and in his own period.”!**[1]**

It is indeed strange that according to what they claim, His Eminence (a.s.) himself did what he prohibited others.

History proves his actions stood in contrast to claims being made about him.

“Sources indicate that Ali did not retire to isolation when his right was usurped from him.

He believed in the holy text, which establishes his right. At every opportunity, he used to complain to his adversaries and opponents about his right that was snatched from him. He used to remind people about his right. Besides, he used to tell his friends and associates not to give any excuse to them. He did this so that things remain clear to judge on truth and facts. So how can he himself not act on what he preached to others?”**[2]**

“Some friends of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) also resorted to divine text (Nass). Some Emigrants and Helpers in the very initial days of Abu Bakr's Caliphate went to the mosque and each of them standing separately flayed him for usurping the Caliphate, scolded and advised him and mentioned their proofs on the rightfulness of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)...that were clear due to the existence of divine texts (Nass).”**[3]**

In this chapter, our aim is to make clear some of the efforts of Imam Ali (a.s.) to prove his usurped right and revive his Imamate and Guardianship that was being forgotten. And also to criticize the stance of some who believe that Imam

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in *Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 21*

[This article is also quoted with many additional parts in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali 1st Edition 1381, Vol. 2

[2] Asghar Qaidan: *Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 82*

[3] Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article: *Saqifah* quoted in *Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 8, Pg. 457*

Ali (a.s.) did not allow his friends to remind people about his Guardianship and Imamate!!

“Imam Ali (a.s.) on most cases**[1]** reminded people about Ghadeer.**[2]** On the day when the Prophet had appointed him a leader after him.

He used to recite this couplet among companions of Prophet even in the presence of Caliphs:

The Prophet made me leader and Imam of people on the day of Ghadeer Khumm.

Woe! Woe be on one who will meet God on Judgment Day with his hands polluted with tyranny to me.

When they wanted to take him by force to the mosque to take allegiance for Abu Bakr, he reminded them about Ghadeer and this time they acknowledged it. Just as in the incident of Shura that was instituted by Umar for successorship after him and also during Uthman’s Caliphate he argued on the basis of Ghadeer.

Imam Ali (a.s.) says in *Nahjul Balagha*: They have the will.

Does it mean that the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) appointed his Ahle Bayt as his successors or he willed the people to take care of them or was it advice of the Prophet to take Ali (a.s.) as their leader after him? Paying attention to this same sermon we can derive the above meaning. In the preceding sentences Imam (a.s.) has shown Ahle Bayt (a.s.) to be superior to all the people

and considered leadership to be their right and that only they were fit for leadership of Islamic Ummah.

In the later sentences Imam Ali (a.s.) says: Now the right has returned to its rightful owner. It has found its correct location wherefrom it was driven out.

This speech is during his own Caliphate. He considers Islamic government his moral and practical right. He again stresses that the previous Caliphs had usurped his clear and absolute right.

While the government of Islam becomes Imam's right only when there exists a statement from the Prophet.**[3]**

[1] Refer: Muhammad Baqir Ansari: *Chaharda Qarn Ba Ghadeer (Fourteen centuries with Ghadeer) (Itmaam-e-Hujjatha Bahashai Ilmi Munaziraat...)*, Pgs. 39-61

[2] [In the book *Chaharda Qarn Ba Ghadeer (Fourteen centuries with Ghadeer)* 31 proofs of Ghadeer Tradition are mentioned.]

[3] [The Right of the Imam to Caliphate was his self-right that had originated from divine text (Nass). It was not a right by qualification. So to take back the right is to revive

Here we refer to some statements of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) in which he has considered leadership after the Prophet to be his immediate right and considered its usurpation an oppression against himself:

...since the time of Prophet's death always my established right had been taken away from me.**[1]**

From the audience a person got up and said: Son of Abu Talib, you are greedy for Caliphate. Imam in reply said: No, you are greedier than me while with regard to its conditions you are too far from it. I am nearer to it and more deserving. I am demanding any own right. You want to stop me from reaching to my right and want to stand in between.**[2]**

...in the same sermon, the Imam complains to God against Quraish. He says: They want to revolt against my own established right.

Likewise, in the Shura committee he told the people: Islamic government is my right. If it is given to me I will take it...

Thus the Imam considered Caliphate his own right. He regards Caliphs usurpers of his absolute right.

He regards Caliphate to be his right without a gap, in such a way that he considered the rejection of his leadership as oppression of Quraish to him and usurpation of his rights...

Imam is not complaining why he was discarded and others took his place. This is not painful to him. His complaint is that his established and acknowledge right was usurped from him. He used to base his claim on Ghadeer.

Imam considered himself and Ahle Bayt (a.s.) as standard-bearers of truth. He also made it clear that the right that Prophet has left to them and in every way their precedence belongs to Ahle Bayt and separation from them is departure from faith.**[3]**"**[4]**

divine text (Nass). So in the society it denotes his position that comes next to the Prophet.]

[1] Sayyid Razi: *Nahjul Balagha, Sermon 6*

[2] *Ibid. Sermon 172*

[3] *Ibid. Sermon 100*

[4] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pgs. 83-87*

On reading these traditions we derive an important point: Amirul Momineen (a.s.) sees only himself deserving for Caliphate and considers rulership as a right vested by God to him. It is a distinction particular to him. When others come in between, they are usurpers. No one is chosen for succession to Prophet except Ali. So if others come in they are transgressors on the right which is not theirs. Its origin is divine. Therefore

Imam Ali (a.s.) regards himself the only deserving candidate by divine choice.

Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in some other statements introduced himself as 'most fit' and 'foremost' for Caliphate. Thus it is mentioned in *Nahjul Balagha* that: 'I am more eligible for it than others'[1] or he said: 'You are more liable to pay allegiance to me'.[2]

The important point to understand in this statement is that the two qualities of 'most eligible' and 'liable' have two meanings in the dictionary. In the book, *Misbah al-Muneer* this meaning is indicated: 'His statement is more truthful than such and such.' It is used in two ways. One is to particularize a thing with another without their being any commonality in it; like the statement: 'Zaid is most eligible for his money'. It means that except for Zaid no one has the right to his money. And the second is in the meaning of commonality with the other and it is proved in the sense of precedence among others.[3]

On the basis of these terms of 'most eligible' and 'liable' are common and their special connotation must be seen in the style of the sentence. When we see the style of the statements of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) we find that he is talking of 'truth' against 'falsehood'.

There are so many statements of His Eminence (a.s.) of these type in his debates and speeches advocating the supremacy of his divine appointment and the declaration of Ghadeer. In addition to other divine texts (*Nass*) in his favor and his other steps in reminding about his appointment as successor and Caliph, that we can say that:

"Steps of Imam Ali (a.s.) himself, for propagation of 'divine Imamate' was the best proof of propagation of Shiaism in the period of Caliphate of His Eminence and later." [4]

[1] Sayyid Razi: *Nahjul Balagha*, Sermon 74

[2] Ibne Qutaibah: *Al-Imamah was-Siyasah*, Pg. 206

[3] Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 5, Pg. 162; quoted from: Maqri Fiyumi: *Al-Misbah al-Muneer*, Pg. 198

[4] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)*

“It is notable that in the beginning Amirul Momineen (a.s.) based his eligibility on divine text (Nass) as this went on to prove the following:

- It passed that when the followers of Imam (a.s.) protested on the basis of divine text (Nass); Abu Bakr was not able to reply and his men threatened people on the point of the sword so that no one else could utter these words and this threat was effective. On the other hand, Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was also threatened with death many a times...

- The period between Ghadeer and Saqifah was only two months. The divine text (Nass) is reminded when it is not heard by the people or buried in oblivion due to length of time. But the text was still alive in memories of the people because being recent enough people themselves had heard the text from Prophet and witnessed the whole event of Ghadeer.

Therefore the Imam less reminded about the holy text and spoke more of his eligibility. But after some years and death of many eye-witnesses we see that His Eminence again stressed on the holy text.

- The best style of argument is to follow the exigency of debate. That is to debate with something a part of which had already been accepted. Claimants of Caliphate argued with the Ansaar saying that they were more eligible because of their relationship with the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and they mentioned their excellences. Imam (a.s.) also argued in the same style.

- Sometimes mention of ones excellences is necessary...it was because someone asked the Imam: How did they sideline you when you were most eligible?” **[1]**

It is interesting that the manner of Imam Ali (a.s.) was to remain silent and not to go into religious discourses about Imamate and *Wilayat* as we have seen:

The attention of Imam towards Shiite Imamate was so much that:

“In a detailed letter, which Imam wrote to Muawiyah, he has explained this issue in detail. The letter contains interesting points with respect to Imam’s share in dissemination of Shiite *Wilayat*...”**[2]**

[History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 134

[1] *Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article: Saqifah quoted in Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 8, Pgs. 459-460*

[2] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 135; quoted from: Al-Ghaaraat, Vol.*

Anyway, the severity of emphasis done from the side of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) regarding his right of Caliphate and Imamate can be gauged from the fact that those who create such conjectures are pushed a step backward and they are compelled to confess that such steps of Imam (a.s.) is a struggle to correct the deviated beliefs of the people and the meaning of Imam’s statements is to establish his particular personal right which was based on divine text (*Nass*) and which had been usurped by particular persons. And in one matter they are absolutely silent that who is the owner of this right and who are the usurpers.

In such a way that in this interpretation of unity-seekers Imam (a.s.) has spoken that Islam is having rulership and Caliphate (subject to special conditions and rules). But he never mentioned that the owner of that post was he himself and that Caliphate was a right related to him alone. So how can it be said that he talked of the usurpation of Caliphate and about the usurpers. Thus they falsely claim:

“Did Ali (a.s.) while overlooking the demanding of his personal rights for the sake of Muslim unity and protection of Islam

awaited to explain the great pillar of Islam which is the surety of Islam and he resorted to silence?!”**[1]**

“These statements should not be borne as personal defense and chance historical narration, it would be better to consider them as having a divine message and revelation of a wasted right till it remains in History.”**[2]**

“Ali (a.s.) according to the divine responsibility wanted to propagate one of the pillars of Islam which was very good for the future of Islam and Muslims and it was one of the divine rights that had been trespassed and forgotten...and he wanted to accomplish this without creating disunity among the rows of Muslims.”**[3]**

These conjectures are so complicated and confusing that one who reads them wonders whether those who have coined them have forgotten what they had claimed previously?!

2, Pgs. 195-204

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pgs. 20-21*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 21*

[3] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 23*

But it must be said: These types of expressions were also propagated directly with the previous conjectures and only for concealing numerous historical evidences (all of which show discussions of guardianship and Imamate and plan of usurped right of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from His Eminence (a.s.) himself).

Such plans put the readers into such confusion that it is not understood Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in fact was reviving which subjects?! A Caliphate absolute and ambiguous that is not understood...

Or a personal right and specified that itself has an application that is introduced and also its usurpers are exposed...

Although it must be understood that showing such unlikely analyses from the biography of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) from the previous beliefs based on the separation of 'rulership in Islam' from 'eligibility of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) as a rightful Caliph, immediately after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)'.

Thus it is said:

“In my view one who says today that there is no politics and rulership, his deviation from Islam is more than one who says for example that Ali was not the immediate Caliph due to the fact that this issue in relation to that one is branch issue and they have separated the principles of religion from politics which is a very dangerous thing and his deviation is also more; that is it can be said that they have denied a necessary matter, but with regard to the deniers of immediate Caliphate Ali (a.s.) it cannot be said that they have denied a necessary matter of Islam...”!**[1]**

It is interesting that in the way of attributing separation between the position of Caliphate and Imamate and also in concealing all the debates of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) they still claim:

“Imam instead of stressing on the Caliphate of Ahle Bayt, he has emphasized on their knowledge, intelligence and their scientific and spiritual centrality.”!**[2]**

It is in the circumstances that the makers of these statements themselves have exhibited a contradiction in speech when they claimed that:

“Imam severely prohibited the people excess regarding himself which

[1] *Ibid. Interview in 'Haft Aasmaan' (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 15*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 22*

may in contradiction to what perception the general public holds about him.”!**[1]**

Not only this is contradicting their own statements, it is also against their publicized claim regarding the attitude of His Eminence (a.s.); because firstly:

Statements of His Eminence (a.s.) regarding the moral positions of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) are opposed to what the general public thinks! Because they have themselves confessed that after the Prophet (s.a.w.s.),

“The majority chose the method of selection and the Imam and his supporters stressed on divine text (Nass).”!**[2]**

On the basis of this confession most of the people had not accepted the special status of Imam (a.s.) and in fact it must be said that they even denied and ignored his recognized position; on the basis of explanation of essay writers, stressing on knowledge and intellect and scientific and spiritual centrality of the Imam (a.s.) in such conditions would be accepting of a position and status opposed to public perception about the His Eminence (a.s.)!

Secondly it must be noted that:

“Actions of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reviving the knowledge centrality of Ahle Bayt (a.s.)[3]** in emphatic way should be considered to be a right contained in his Caliphate and not viewed as aimed to dispense with public perception about Alawi Caliphate.**

These steps, themselves are proofs that the eligibility for Caliphate was restricted to His Eminence (a.s.);

So that it may become clear to all that:

“Their sciences and divine knowledge were from a divine source and all the other people are not fit to be compared with them. Therefore others must follow Ahle Bayt.

His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) has introduced Ahle Bayt as follows:

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 13*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 10*

[3] *When people had doubts about Sunnah of Prophet, instead of Ali (a.s.) they used to go to Ayesha and accept whatever she said whether it was right or wrong. Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob, Pg. 281*

They are the trustees of His secrets, shelter for His affairs, source of knowledge about Him, centre of His wisdom, valleys for His books and mountains of His religion.

With them Allah straightened the bend of religion's back and removed the trembling of its limbs.

None in the Islamic community can be taken at par with the Progeny of the Prophet. One who was under their obligation cannot be matched with them.

They are the foundation of religion and pillar of Belief. The forward runner has to turn back to them while the follower has to overtake them.

They possess the chief characteristics for vicegerency. In their favor exists the will and succession (of the Prophet).

When the Imam (a.s.) got the seat of Caliphate he said:

This is the time when right has returned to its owner and diverted to its centre of return." **[1]**

[1] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali (a.s.) and the Rulers), Pgs. 87-88; quoting from Nahjul Balagha, Sermon 2*

Part 3
Are Shias obliged to avoid discussion on Caliphate...?

One of the conjectures indirectly related to the conjecture of silence is that Shias urged silence. They must restrain to debate and discuss the subject of Caliphate and Imamate of Ali. They are expected to not reveal usurpation of Caliphate by preceding Caliphs. Their crimes have sought cover under a false obligation of their being secrets of progeny of Muhammad.

As we pointed out in the first volume of this book, these conjectures are in fact new statements of invitation to silence (and always overlooking differences of knowledge between two schools). Answers too in this respect are dealt with. In short, it is contradiction between secrets of knowledge and political secrets of Ahle Bayt (a.s.).

What we want to explain here is a new point towards answering this conjecture.

A thing, reality of which is hidden from people, is called a secret. Accuracy or keen attention in understanding a subject results in giving it entity of secrecy. Or foreign hands could have been at work that resulted in pushing it into secrecy.

In any case, a reality which can be exposed is hidden from public knowledge. When it is hidden with all proofs it becomes a secret.

In these circumstances there is no need if subjects of all proofs (personal, external or exigency) remain concealed from the people, it is always necessary to maintain its link with the subject matter and it must never be separated from it.

In other words, the responsibility of maintaining this link is a subject that is not only applicable to a secret. Because anything hidden from people and having characteristic of a secret is not always under necessity of remaining behind a curtain.

In fact, between to be concealed or to continue to remain concealed is an issue that does not have a requirement. Except that there be a necessity for it.

On the basis of this if something is secret it does not imply that it is prohibited, therefore it is not that a secret should always continue to be a secret.

There are many things which should be known to all, but the obstacle...! The tyrant governments or tyrants that hold power first spread dread and fear among people to hold them from reaching to facts. These very facts change to secrets with passage of time.

It is obvious that not only concealing of these facts is not necessary, rather if they could be useful in securing prosperity in the next world, or its knowledge is a necessity for happiness in that world to keep them secret would be fatal to us. Especially if there is a direct relation between these facts and matters of faith or these facts help us to separate guidance from misguidance. Therefore it is prohibited.

Now we return to matters called secrets of progeny of Muhammad. This term is actually used for traditions in book of Sulaym Ibne Qays Hilali and connected to incidents that occurred in the early stages of Islam and usurpation of Caliphate and seizing of rulership after the Prophet.

Now the question is: why these facts are called secrets?

Did these incidents automatically became secrets or they were made into secrets? Was there a special aim in keeping them secret?

In reply we say:

Those events occurred or better to say were committed in broad daylight - seen by all, at the surface of society. Now such an open thing is changed into a secret to protect usurpation of usurpers and to protect their government. After every revolution, endeavors are made to hide the tyranny that led to its success and continuity. It is treated as a crime for the coming generations.

That this type of information is called secret is in itself proof that it is told in tyrannical conditions and had remained far

from knowledge of common people due to pressing circumstances that dominated the society. Besides, the narration of events had not gone from a generation to next. So now after a lapse of so many years it would be impossible to know those facts.

So the contents of the book of Sulaym called secrets are facts in their reality and originality. **[1]** The tyrants that grasped Caliphate laid hands upon these facts making them confidential so that they could reach to anyone's knowledge. The reader of the book of Sulaym comes across information about Caliphs, their attitudes and their life by its root. And it contains information that is not available anywhere else.

***[1]** Referring to dictionaries like Taj al-Uroos and Qamoos it would be known that 'Sirr' is not only 'that which he hides' it also conveys things like 'purity of all things' 'fear of all things' etc.*

Such type of confidentiality cannot be a correct interpretation of the word 'secrets'. Because secondly today the past tyranny is no more.

Of course there are certain points in Sulaym's Book, which should not be told openly because they relate to particular time and place? It will be detrimental to make them public. The matter is such that it needs special precaution and care. But not all matters in the book are such.

Therefore the word of 'secrets' should not be interpreted to keep all the matters of the book of Sulaym confidential.

Suffocating circumstances some centuries ago ruled society and therein were a few particular persons instrumental in this. Those restrictions were effective at that time but how it can now be a ruling for this present generation?

This question must be asked from those who claim:

"This writer on the basis of all he has learnt of the biographies of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) has narrated most narrations that caused mischief and unrest and gives advantage to the enemies. They

caused scuffles between Shia and Sunni and Muslim bloodshed entailed. Things took the worst turn. Dissimulation became necessary. The Impeccable Imams had to prohibit revealing the secrets of Muhammad's House." [1]

It is thus said that only because only calling some historical narrations as secrets does not mean that Imams have prohibited them. It must be seen what the obligation of a Shia is? To narrate events or not, should be decided by independent arguments. Can the word, secrets be applied or not? The answer must be found in Islamic rulings.

Although some correct applications of it indicate the same conjecture. However, careful attention must be paid because if secrets do not have any detrimental consequences, it is not necessary to keep them unrevealed.

In jurisprudence also revealing secrets has a bearing on condition of time and place. Some conditions could be fixed and unchangeable. Some may alter with change of time and place. Therefore decision depends upon their nature.

Propagator of this conjecture regards every secret confidential. To him detrimental consequences are enough to prove a secret as confidential. Within these milestones, he is groping his way between a secret and confidential matter. It is only to escape from narration of events which are shameful due to their criminal characteristics.

[1] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 10, Bahman 1379*

Even if we accept some information in early stages of Islam concerning events of Caliphate and division of the nation there-at are secrets. Still there remains a question if these events in their width and breadth found in books of Sunni sect or found in documents, are they still secrets or confidential?

There are libraries where historical books are collected, through them bitter events that occurred in the early period of

Islam can easily be traced, hence these events can no more be secrets.

In the same way in the present age, analysis of events had become a science. Scholars and historians trace the track of past nations. How can Muslim historians be prohibited and restricted from reaching to root of the causes?

If it is claimed that it is an insult to the Prophet's House where divine revelation descended, then what to say about the train of events that ensued, such as setting fire to the door of the House, miscarriage of Mohsin, threat of killing to Ali and a series of events? Should these events not be told or recorded in history?

In reply we say: None of these events can be considered as secrets as all are mentioned in Sunni books.

We invite our readers to the book, *Attack on Fatima's house* by Abdul Zahra Mahdi. He has mentioned the event in detail with documentary proofs. The scholar has presented the events following Saqifah for public scrutiny and judgment.

Again, oriental scholars like Wilfred Madelung have written with courage recorded every bit of events of that early period of Islam and describes in detail the plot of Helpers and Emigrants. (Companions of the accursed scroll). All this is supported by documentary proofs and evidences.

“Wilfred Madelung, German orientalist, in his book, **[1]** first puts forward the theory of Lammens **[2]** i.e. the triumvirate of power (Abu Bakr, Umar and Abu Ubaidah Jarrah). Then he explains according to the analysis of Caetani **[3]** that in this triangle, the inspiring element was Umar. According to Madelung, Abu Bakr had aspired power and undoubtedly, prior to the Prophet's demise he had decided to be his caliph...Therefore he was

[1] [*Succession of His Eminence, Muhammad*]

[2] [*Belgian orientalist*]

[3] [*Italian orientalist*]

determined to destroy his opponents who were Ahle Bayt of Prophet and was waiting for an opportunity.

Further, Madelung stresses on existence of a pre-planned and well-decided design of Abu Bakr for obtaining Caliphate. However he thinks it was fortuitous, a matter of chance that the plot took shape in Saqifah. Besides, he considers the help of a few from the people of Quraish was very much efficacious which led to public allegiance..."[1]

The Second caliph has admitted most confidential matters quoted in Sulaym's Book:

"During journey to Syria, when Umar reached the district of Shura he was informed of an epidemic in Damascus. Umar said: If I die and Abu Ubaidah were left alive, I would have appointed him to Caliphate. If he (Abu Ubaidah) is dead I will make Maaz bin Jabal[2] a caliph.

If we keep this statement in line with episode of Saqifah it appears too congruous with its very spirit. Because the most important persons who supported candidacy of Abu Bakr were themselves: Umar, Abu Ubaidah Jarrah, Salim and Maaz bin Jabal."[3]

"Not only Maaz he also preferred Salim for leadership and he said: If Salim[4] were alive, I would have appointed him."[5]

On the basis of this except for the issues specified by Ja'fari jurisprudence every topic that in the view of unity-seekers is to be kept secret must be propagated if those things are mentioned in Sunni sources or they can be traced in Sunni books. Unity-seekers cannot prohibit making them public.

All these matters, that is about Caliphs, their identities, intentions etc. that exist only in Shia books and records are such that their refutation is nowhere to be

[1] Allamah Askari: Saqifah, Pgs. 11-13, Preface by Dr. Mahdi Dashti

[2] [He was from the Ansaar - emigrants]

[3] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pg. 58; quoting from: *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 4, Pg. 227

[4] [He was a Persian]

[5] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pg. 59; quoting from: *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 4, Pg. 227

[The point to be noted is that the Caliph is talking of conditions of successorship of Maaz and Salim but before that in Saqifah he had argued on the basis of Caliphate for Quraish and overpowered the Ansaar.]

seen in Sunni books and according to the authority of these books they are not disproved.

Now we should see as to where dissimulation stands in our days:

In every sense, silence of Ali in having intellectual discussions based on proofs was not to create differences nor did it carry any motive to foment disunity. Still they say:

“Imam Sadiq recommends unity. He advises dissimulation against tyrants in order to avoid divisions. It is especially for Shia and Sunni brothers that they should say that Muslims must have piety, they must practice dissimulation and refrain from creating any type of difference.”!**[1]**

Anyway, analysis of events of early Islamic days is an urgent need for Islamic society and our present young generation. It is also a valid foundation of creating unity.

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Payaam-e-Taqreeb, (Message of Unity)* Pg. 80

Part 4
Are Shias obliged not to Debate
on Imamate?

A you have seen, unity-seekers have always made efforts so that events may be forgotten. They prefer that all records of deeds of usurper Caliphs should be forgotten. Recently they have also invited to maintain silence under the excuse of maintaining secrets and it also includes discussions related to Imamate and *Wilayat* (Guardianship) of Ahle Bayt (a.s.). In short, their endeavors are far reaching beyond past conjectures. Their aim is to distort face of Imamiyah school and extinguish lamp of Shiaism by perverting and deviating facts and fundamentals of Alawi Guardianship i.e. *Wilayat*. They even say:

“I do not deny that there were secrets in Ali’s heart. He did not reveal them because he did not see fit. We too should not reveal them in emulating our Chief, Ali. He even did not tell the nearest ones. We too must do the same.”!**[1]**

To analyze this we must first see what those secrets were, which Imam Ali (a.s.) did not see fit to be revealed.

A glance at the article: Imam Ali (a.s.) and Unity,**[2]** shows that these secrets, which according to this claim must not be revealed, ‘The moral stations of the Imams; that is the splendor of their *Wilayat*, Imamate and guidance’. Thus they say:

“To acknowledge moral stations of Imams needs time. One should cross stages of learning and knowledge to know their position. Ali, prior and after Caliphate, used to speak regarding it. But he did not see among people required maturity and preparedness to reveal the secret of Guardianship. Later he settled in Kufa. His friends and companions too gathered there around him. Then he spoke some matters to them. Such matters that he told were most probably for Shias. Earlier to this, no one knew the facts except Salman, Abu Zar, Miqdad and Ammar. Before Caliphate, a few persons knew the secrets. They were under mandate to keep them confidential.”!**[3]**

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in *Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 24*

[2] *Ibid.* Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in

Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pgs. 2-31

[3] *Ibid. Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pgs. 22-23*

This claim is being made at the time when all this can be found with evidences in Sunni books. The superiority of morals, exalted tributes and divinely bestowed qualities of Imam Ali (a.s.) glare from pages of Sunni books. What is so open now, is called a secret.

In the same way divine text (*Nass*) that supports the *Wilayat* (Guardianship) and Imamate of Ali can also be found in historical sources because history of the Message of Prophet cannot be separated from history of propagation of his teachings.

Allamah Abdul Husain Amini; his literacy endeavors in compiling the book of *Al-Ghadeer* are too worthy and valuable and very much useful. Likewise, the valuable research of Indian scholar, Hamid Husain, in his book *Abaqaat al-Anwaar* is too beneficial to a reader. Another scholar in this field, Qadi Nurullah Shushtari has also exerted efforts in compiling realities in his book *Ihqaq al-Haqq*. Later on Allamah Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin compiled a book titled *Al-Murajaat*. The documentary evidences and facts collected and compiled in these books clearly establish rights and moral stations of Ali and the Imams. That which makes these books more trustworthy is that all sources are from opponents of Shia School. Books of those who do not see eye to eye with Shia School are full of material, which stands a ground to defend Shia belief. As such this material is and never was confidential.

If Imam Ali (a.s.) did not reveal the matter, it was because he was not under a mandate to do so. Taking into consideration twenty-three years of Prophet's labor from the day of announcement of his Mission to Ghadeer, Ali was mandated to preserve the message. Muslim society had attained maturity to the extent of sufficiency.

Therefore the Imam only exhausted the argument on the deniers and warned the negligent ones and he had no other purpose. Because secondly, in this matter, the Islamic Ummah is one that has the responsibility to refer to the Imam and Divine Proof (Hujjat).

There is thus no reason to argue its being confidential. This itself is enough proof of existence of pressure, which had crushed liberties in society. Imam Ali (a.s.) could have done more had he been free. He did not tell because he could not. That Caliphs ruled with tyranny can well be understood by the very behavior of Imam Ali (a.s.). The Prophet had conveyed to the nation all aspects of guidance and attributes of Ali. What Ali should and could have said when the Prophet had told everything?

If the moral position of Ali be regarded as a secret, does it not crawl into oblivion? Will it not put the Message of Prophet to question?

There remains nothing unknown to Muslim society, which Shia cannot find in Sunni books.

Another point

Inspite of clear contradictions in the above-mentioned claim they make another:

“Imam instead of stressing on the Caliphate of Ahle Bayt, has emphasized on their knowledge, intelligence and their scientific and spiritual centrality.”**[1]**

And the emphasis of this view of unity-seekers to continue this attitude. Thus it is said:

“Difference between the issue of Caliphate and Imamate is a strong pillar of nearness.”**[2]**

The question is:

What is the motive of these contradictory statements?

The reply can be:

According to their thinking, the moral stations of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) are such that they can make their audiences conclude that the personal right of Imam Ali (a.s.) was usurped and pilaged by three Caliphs. The Imam was deprived of right of Caliphate that God had bestowed on him. Caliphate was his heritage.

In the view of these people, whenever there was discussion of the moral stations of Ahle Bayt (a.s.), invariably there was also mention of the usurpation of personal rights of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) through the Caliphs, secondly these issues should be considered as the hidden secrets?!

Therefore they treat it a secret in order not to talk about it. The word, secret is a good excuse and a covering on crimes of Caliphs. Their Caliphate loses its

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 22*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab-e-Wahdat, Pg. 256*

validity and credibility if facts were broached that it was Ali's right. There is no way to conceal except to maintain silence. Secrets are not to be revealed. Hence such things should be ignored and gradually they would disappear from the root.

"These statements should not be considered as defense of personal rights..." **[1]**

They say:

"As for issues related to Caliphate there is much material in history and tradition on behalf of Ali in addition to narrations of Ali. This has not been evaluated from literary standard or according to Imam's standard or motive. If evaluated they will not correspond with the attitude of Ali or Caliphs.

If we keep this as a base to judge the authenticity of these statements we will see, mostly they are from the book of Sulaym bin Qays. Hence they do not carry any authenticity" **[2]**

Now it should be asked: Let us see how the Imam's conduct towards Caliphs was. And from where this should commence?

To make a correct judgment about any historical personality is there any other way except that the facts must be drawn from history or a reliable source?

Please pay attention: For a personality like Imam Ali (a.s.), regarding his relations with Caliphate and Caliphs we must refer to narrations and information recorded in books of History.**[3]**

Therefore it will not be logical that without referring to historical sources we only base our analysis on personal whims as far as the Imam's attitude is concerned. And then make it the base and standard of correctness or incorrectness of historical evidences and narrations regarding the attitudes of His Eminence (a.s.) towards the Caliphs.

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 21*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 23*

[3] *Although that which confirms the correctness of these traditions is the special tenor of these narrations mentioned in books related to this subject but it shall be applicable to these narrations only.*

In other words, exposing the biographical details of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) with regard to his relationship with Caliphate or Caliphs is possible from analysis of captioned issues in history and traditions and in consequence of referring to these narration reports and sayings. Now how can these fruits and results be falsified on the basis of a standard drawn from some other sources?

This standard is invalid and its application is not aimed except to put a lid on the misdeeds of the usurpers of the rights of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and abuses against the Caliphs. Because every investigation has demonstrated that understanding the attitude of Ali by referring to History and narration reports related to their behavior has referred to these sources, so talking about the behavior of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in every matter will be meaningless.

From where have they arrived at the claim that Imam (a.s.) refrained from emphasis on the usurpation of his rights at the hands of Caliphs that they should make it a reliable standard and scientific aspect to question the information contained in Shia History and hadith books?!

There is no other aim in this except to make interpretations based on ones personal whims to support their own claims and to refute what is in opposition to their views.

In fact in such a manner one is not in pursuit of finding the reality; one only endeavors to present that which one has accepted to be reality and which one has preferred through some selected evidences and rejection of all other sources.

Part 5
Criticism and Scrutiny of Ana-
lyses Propagated about Consulta-
tion of Caliphs with Ali

What doubts are propagated in this regard?

One of the wrong analyses propagated by some extremist unity-seekers is that in spite of differences between Ali and Caliphs, the Caliphs consulted Ali whenever necessary.

They thus say:

“He[1] sought answers to his difficulties in Ali’s company. Ali explained to him issues not clear to him. And he executed Ali’s judicial decrees. Ali too like a kind lover used to guide his beloved. He did not keep anything short from him. We shall deal with Ali’s practical conduct with Umar. This will show good relations between these two great historical persons.”![2]

Does Consultation Alone Suffices to Prove Good Relations?

Now our aim is to answer this question: to offer consultation or to give opinion on various issues wherein ignorance of Caliphs pushed and enmeshed them which was about to leave bad effects on Islamic legislation and spoil fundamentals, is it enough to show existence of a lover and a beloved type of relations? In later chapters we shall dwell upon relations between Ali and Caliphs on the basis of historical evidences.

While it is that:

“It must be acknowledged that had not the Imam gone to help the Caliphs, Muslims would have been involved in a great chaos. It was likely that Muslims could have even apostised. Or when they did not receive an answer, Islam itself would have fallen into suspicion and it was likely they would have denounced Islam as a false religion.”**[3]**

Reply to this question needs a thorough research regarding consultation of

[1] [Umar]

[2] Muhammad Barfi: *Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni point of view)*, [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 95

[3] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pgs. 175

Caliphs with Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and to derive conclusions from it. But first only by way of logical refutation we want to mention that by studying history we can also find cases in which Muawiyah sought Ali's opinion.

The table given below show instances of Muawiyah referring to Hazrat Ali (a.s.), taken from the valuable book of *Ali and the Caliphs* by contemporary research scholar, Shaykh Najmuddin Askari.

		(Fifth type) Some instances of Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan referring to Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) 349
Topic	No.	Instances of Muawiyah bin Abu Sufyan referring to Amirul Momineen Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) narrated by Sunni scholars 351
Legal	1.	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the verdict of digging graves 352
Legal	2.	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the verdict of one who found a man ... and killed him 352
Legal	3.	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the verdict of two men having dispute about the cloth 354
Legal	4.	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the verdict of who marries a girl and later marries her to another 354
Scientific query - religious	5.	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply to question of Ibnal Asfar 355
Scientific query - religious	6.	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply to question of the Roman King 357
Scientific query - religious	7.	Another referral to him in reply to question of the Roman King 358

On investigation it does not remain concealed that relationship of Muawiyah with Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was in no sense cordial and these referrals and consultations in no way prove good relations between them. Except that we want to be careful in passing off as good straining of relations of the Imam (a.s.) with Muawiyah and for the aspect of protecting Muslim unity suffice to say:

“But he took Muawiyah to task because his act had gone beyond the limits of difference in opinion...”!**[1]**

Analysis of Consultation of Caliphs with Amirul Momineen (a.s.) on the basis of Statistical Scrutiny

On the basis of this only consultation does not describe the motives of the two sides and for obtaining correct analysis from consultation of Caliphs with Amirul Momineen (a.s.) it is necessary to examine each instance of these consultations case by case basis. We should classify each instance according to the subject of inquiry and mode of referral etc. and then analyse on the basis of statistics.

Therefore we have made a systematic table of all instances of referrals in the book, *Min Noor-e-Ali, Part Two, Ali wa Khulafa*, [2] written by Shaykh Najmuddin Askari, and classified by subject of inquiry and mode of consultation.

Chart of Consultations of Three Caliphs with Amirul Momineen (a.s.)

Mode of Referral	Topic	No.	(Second Type) some instances of Abu Bakr consulting Amirul Momineen (a.s.)
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	1	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of the Jew 75
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	2	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of Jathileeq 76
First Companions' consulted then Imam (a.s.) mentioned his view	Laws of Shariah	3	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the verdict one who marries like... 77
First Companions' consulted then Imam (a.s.) view is asked	Administrative affairs	4	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) during battle of Rome 78
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	5	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in verdict of one who consumed liquor and claims he did so not knowing its illegality 78
Mode of referral not mentioned. Apparently Imam (a.s.) was present and he gave the reply	Laws of Shariah	6	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the man who marries.. 81

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Mashal-e-Ittehaad (Torch of Unity)*, Pg. 30

[2] Dar az-Zahra, Beirut, 1st Edition, 1414

First Companions' consulted then Imam (a.s.) mentioned his view	Scientific inquiry - Religious	7	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about building of Masjid at the sea shore... 82
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	8	Referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the reply questions of Christians 83
News reached Imam (a.s.) and he interfered	Scientific inquiry - Religious	9	Ref. to Amirul Momin- een (a.s.) in reply of messenger of Roman king 85
The questioner himself asked the Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	10	Ref. to Amirul Momin- een (a.s.) in reply of Raas al-Jaloot 86
News reached Imam (a.s.) and he replied	Scientific inquiry - Religious	11	Question of Abu Bakr regarding meaning of Quranic word: Abaa 88
News reached Imam (a.s.) and he replied	Scientific inquiry - Religious	12	Question of Abu Bakr regarding meaning of Kalaala 93
The questioner addressed the Imam (a.s.) directly	Scientific inquiry - Religious	13	Question of Abu Bakr regarding place of Allah 94
Mode of referral not mentioned. Apparently Imam (a.s.) was present and he gave the reply	Laws of Shariah	14	Ref. Amirul Momin- een (a.s.) in the ver- dict of one who says to a man... 97
Mode of Referral	Topic	No.	(Third Type) some instances of Umar bin Khattab consulting Amirul Momineen (a.s.)
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	1	Ref. to Amirul Momin- een (a.s.) about a man who is shrouded in

			cloth spun with gold threads 101
In the beginning Imam (a.s.) mentioned the issue and then Umar who was present there posed the question to him	Laws of Shariah	2	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about marrying the mother of the young man... 102
In the beginning Imam (a.s.) mentioned the issue and then Umar who was present there posed the question to him	Laws of Shariah	3	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about wife of Uqbah's slave ... 102
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) was asked about his view	Monetary affairs	4	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about Baitul Maal ... 103
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) was asked about his view	Monetary affairs	5	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the amount that can be taken from Baitul Maal 106
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Monetary affairs	6	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about sale of Kaaba cloth... 107
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) expressed his view	Laws of Shariah	7	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about punishment of drinking wine 109
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) expressed his view	Laws of Shariah	8	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about one who drinks wine under a pretext 110
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) was asked about his view	Laws of Shariah	9	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the group of people who imbibed wine in Syria 113

News reached Imam (a.s.) and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	10	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about Khamr... 115
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) expressed his view	Laws of Shariah	11	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the Imam who sees a man and his wife on... 119
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) expressed his view	Laws of Shariah	12	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about one who does not turn the people to ignorance 120
At the request of both sides the Imam was referred to	Laws of Shariah	13	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about two men... 121
First the Companions were asked and then Imam (a.s.) was asked about his view	Laws of Shariah	14	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about marrying slaves 123
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	15	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about divorce 124
Referred both parties to the Imam directly	Laws of Shariah	16	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about two men disputing 127
Referred both parties to the Imam directly	Laws of Shariah	17	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the Bedouin who sold his camel 128
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	18	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about one who killed the camel of someone... 129
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	19	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about necessity of Ghusl for... 130
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Scientific inquiry - Religious	20	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about Hajar Aswad 133

Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	21	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the in Ihram eating... 139
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	22	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about killed in the Kaaba... 141

Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	23	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about fixing of the time of Mischief 146
By chance Imam (a.s.) was present and he interfered in the matter	Scientific inquiry - Religious	24	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about a man from the companions whi said that he liked mischief 147
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) expressed his view	Administrative affairs	25	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in victory of Baitul Maqdas 155
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam (a.s.) was asked about his view	Laws of Shariah	26	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the incident of Maan Ibne Zaida 159
In the beginning Imam (a.s.) mentioned the issue and then Umar who was present there posed the question to him	Laws of Shariah	27	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the man whom Amirul Momineen (a.s.) told to abstain from his wife 161
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	28	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to fulfill the request of slave of a Jew 161
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	29	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of Caesar of Rome 168

First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Scientific inquiry - Religious	30	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply to the questions of Roman King 175
News reached Imam (a.s.) and he gave the reply	Scientific inquiry - Religious	31	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply to Rabbis 179
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	32	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of Kaab al-Ahbaar 189
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	33	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of Asqaf Najran 197
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	34	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about in reply to Jews... 201
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	35	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of some Jew people 203
Chance presence of the Imam (a.s.) and reply of His Eminence (a.s.) in the matter	Scientific inquiry - Religious	36	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of Kaab al-Ashraaf and Malik bin Saifi 205

Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	37	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply of 40 women... 206
News reached Imam (a.s.) and he gave the reply	Laws of Shariah	38	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the verdict of the woman who... 211
From the narration it seems that the Imam was not referred to directly	Laws of Shariah	39	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the woman who delivers in six months 214

First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) mentioned his view	Laws of Shariah	40	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the woman.. while she was forced 221
By chance Imam (a.s.) was present and he interfered in the matter	Laws of Shariah	41	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the woman...insane 224
By chance Imam (a.s.) was present and he interfered in the matter	Laws of Shariah	42	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the who is pregnant and confesses... 230
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	43	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about not punishing Abu Bakra 235
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	44	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the woman who gave birth to... 240
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	45	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the free woman and a slave woman disputing about a male child 242
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	46	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the pregnant woman who had a miscarriage in fear of Umar 247
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	47	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the one... and he was fasting 250
Referred both parties to the Imam directly	Laws of Shariah	48	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the man who divorces his wife

			without uttering the word of 'divorce' 251
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	49	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about selling the daughters of kings 261
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	50	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about taking Jizyah 262
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	51	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about Meeqaat... 264

Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	52	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the meaning of Alhamdulillah 265
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	53	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the incident of Qataf 265
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	54	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about distribution of Kufa lands 267
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) mentioned his view	Scientific inquiry - Religious	55	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about fixing the beginning of Hijra calendar 268
First the Companions were consulted and then Imam	Administrative affairs	56	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about mounted attack 270

(a.s.) expressed his view			
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	57	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about inheritance of grandfather 275
By chance Imam (a.s.) was present and he interfered in the matter	Laws of Shariah	58	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the woman who denied her son 277
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	59	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the woman who delivered a red-skinned child while she was herself black 282
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Scientific inquiry - Religious	60	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the woman accused by the Ansaari 283
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	61	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the thief whose one hand and leg has been cut off 286
In two narrations the referral was indirect	Laws of Shariah	62	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the man who hit the killer of his brother till he thought that he was dead; so he fled. But he came back to kill him again 287
By chance Imam (a.s.) was present and he	Laws of Shariah	63	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the woman who marries an old man and that man dies 289

interfered in the matter			
Referred directly to the Imam	Laws of Shariah	64	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about th woman who resembles the mother of man 291

First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	65	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the man... 291
Referred directly to the Imam	Laws of Shariah	66	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the orphan... 292
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	67	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about two men disputing about eight dirhams 295
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	68	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the man in ladies clothes 299
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	69	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about two women disputing about a male child 307
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	70	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the youth... 307
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	71	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the man who told his wife... 312
Imam (a.s.) was present there	Laws of Shariah	72	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about five arrested for... 313

and he interfered			
First the Companions were questioned and then Imam (a.s.) was asked	Laws of Shariah	73	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the newborn child... 314
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	74	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the amount of blood money of one who attacks another cutting off a part of his tongue 320
In two narrations the referral was indirect	Laws of Shariah	75	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the man who planned to kill the killer of his brother a second time 320
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	76	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the slave who killed his mistress and master 323
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	77	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the man who divorced his wife when he was a non-Muslim and again when he became a Muslim 324
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	78	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the man... 325
Referring the questioner directly to Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	79	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in reply to women... 326

By chance Imam (a.s.) was present and he interfered in the matter	Laws of Shariah	80	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about inheritance... 327
---	-----------------	----	---

Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	81	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the woman... 328
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	82	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about a woman whose husband is missing 328
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	83	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict whether the Magians are Ahle Kitab or disbelievers 328
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Scientific inquiry - Religious	84	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the three things Umar forgot to ask the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) 329
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Scientific inquiry - Religious	85	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about fixing a place for Allah about which he was asked 333
Mode of Referral	Topic	No.	(Fourth Type) some instances of Uthman consulting Amirul Momineen (a.s.) 335
Imam (a.s.) received the news and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	1	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the woman who delivers a child in six months 337
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	2	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the old man who married... 338
Referred both parties to the Imam directly	Laws of Shariah	3	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about the man who... 339
Mode of referring is varied in narrations	Laws of Shariah	4	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the woman of Ansaar whose husband died 340

Imam (a.s.) received the news and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	5	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the hunter... 342
Imam (a.s.) was present there and he interfered	Laws of Shariah	6	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for verdict about the man... 344
Directly asked Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	7	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about correspondence... 344
Both parties told to refer to the Imam (a.s.)	Laws of Shariah	8	Ref. to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) about a slave who... 345

Part 6
What does Scrutiny of Statistics
show?

Items of Abu Bakr's Consultation with Imam Ali (a.s.)

The following are the results of statistical analysis of First Caliph's consultations with Amirul Momineen (a.s.):

In all there were 14 instances when Abu Bakr referred to Ali. Its detailed order is: 9 items concern knowledge and religion, 4 items regarding justice, legislature, criminal sentences and jurisprudence. One item only on military side. In finance there is no item registered in history.

Point worth noting in this is that the mode of contacting the Imam: Four times Abu Bakr contacted directly without any formality. Three of them were for religious matters and learning and one for religious decrees.

Only in one instance, he consulted his companions and then finally sought Ali's view and opinion. The question was a military matter. In other words in nine remaining instances Imam's presence in the scene or in affairs is completely overlooked. And in fact the Caliph never referred to the Imam. Rather the Imam himself, in spite of this negligence in two instances after the Caliph's consultation with the companions expressed his view. There are two incidents when Imam himself interfered, since he was present there. There are other three instances when the Imam received the news he took steps; and lastly in two other cases the questioner referred to the Imam.

So we leave judgment to the reader. In spite of these open matters they still say:

"And in this way, Abu Bakr, the First Caliph, has benefited from Imam Ali (a.s.) in difficult issues."**[1]**

Or they say:

"During his Caliphate Abu Bakr consulted Imam Ali (a.s.) in most important matters."**[2]**

In order to invalidate the latter claim it is sufficient to say that Abu Bakr in the last moments of his life appointed Umar as his successor.

“Abu Bakr being conscious of oppositions that will pose later, first

[1] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 6, Pg. 14*

[2] *Ibid. Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 7, Pg. 8*

summoned Abdur Rahman bin Auf and informed him about his decision and after his initial disapproval secured his permission. Then the next person he acquainted with his decision was Uthman bin Affan.

It is worth mention that when Abu Bakr spoke he advised both of them to keep the matter secret.

Anyway, why at all Abu Bakr mentioned his determination to these two? Why he did not take into account senior companions of Prophet. It is interesting to note that Abdur Rahman bin Auf was from Bani Zahra tribe while Uthman bin Affan was from Bani Umayyah. Both were old friends of Abu Bakr and had become Muslims through him. They were in the group of Abu Bakr and Umar. Later too they were seen in the six-person committee of Umar.

Anyway, in case Abu Bakr really intended consultation why he did not consult Ali (a.s.)? Who according to the Egyptian writer, **[1]** Dr. Noori Gaffer, commanded more respect and was more competent than others. And this was an obvious tyranny and trespassing on eligibility and right of Ali.” **[2]**

Items of consultation of Umar with Imam Ali (a.s.)

The following are the results of statistical analysis of Second Caliph's consultations with Amirul Momineen (a.s.):

In all there were 85 instances when Umar consulted Imam Ali (a.s.). Among them 59 are religious problems such as jurisprudence, criminal sentences, judgments; 21 cases pertaining to religious knowledge; three instances of monetary affairs and two military problems.

It is interesting that out of these 85 cases only in 27 cases did Umar have direct contact with the Imam - 13 of them in field of religious verdicts and 13 in field of knowledge. One case was financial. On the other hand they claim that:

"Hazrat Umar was always consulting Hazrat Ali (a.s.) in his difficulties and problems."**[3]**

[1] *[Refer: Ali wa Manawao, Matbuaat an-Najah, Cairo, 1396 A.H. 1976 A.D.]*

[2] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 53*

[3] *Muhammad Barfi: Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni point of view), [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 104*

A little attention and care will prove to us that Umar contacted Ali whenever he was convinced that no one else could help him to solve his problem. Because in 13 other instances also on legislative side Umar did not consult Ali first. He first sought companions' opinion and then consulted Ali.

Similarly, he did the same in two other financial cases and a question of religious knowledge; after having had asked companions he finally approached Ali.

Statistics show that in 42 cases Imam Ali (a.s.) was never contacted for any consultation. Moreover, the presence of Imam Ali (a.s.) in the scene was ignored. Umar depended upon his own opinion and decision and thought himself needless of

Ali's opinion. As he was wrong in his opinion, Imam feared it would establish a wrong precedent. So he himself, without being invited, gave his opinion and corrected the wrong decision. The Imam did this in the interest of Islam as he saw himself responsible before God.

Although by wrong interpretation of these steps of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) it is claimed that:

“Ali (a.s.) had a prominent presence during the Caliphate of Umar, and had a position of presidentship among the companions.”!**[1]**

Despite such a position can it be possible that in 42 cases the Caliph did not think of referring to Amirul Momineen (a.s.)? This negligence of the Second Caliph calls your attention to another narration in this connection:

Did the Second Caliph always consult Ali? Did he always accept his view?

In historical sources it is recorded that Umar was asked about marriage and divorce and Umar answered. Regarding this Amirul Momineen (a.s.) has said:

“He wrote down while I was present there. But he did not ask me nor did he refer to me as though his knowledge had enriched him beyond me. I wanted to correct him. But I preferred to be silent because he will be vilified by God. But no one censured him. On the contrary, they appreciated him. They made it a tradition. Even if a mad man would have passed judgment it would have been better.**[2]”[1]**

[1] *Ibrahim Baizoon (Translated by Ali Asghar Muhammadi Seejaani): Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh(Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition), 1379], Pg. 42*

[2] *In another version it is mentioned: While it was such a judgment that if a mad man*

Similarly, there are evidences that the Second Caliph was not always inclined to consult Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.):

“In the fifteenth year of Hijra, Umar wanted to go to Jerusalem. He consulted Ali. Ali told him not to go there, but Umar went. It is said that he appointed Ali in his place in Medina and went to Syria and Palestine.

Again, in the same year he consulted Ali what to do with the revenue of Iraq and other conquered countries. Amirul Momin-een (a.s.) advised him to distribute them among warriors and campaigners of respective countries. Umar did not accept. He treasured the revenue. Later it was spent on salaries after the fashion of Iran of those days.” **[2]**

Instances of Uthman consulting Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.)

The following are the results of statistical analysis of Third Caliph's consultations with Amirul Momineen (a.s.):

In all there are 8 instances when the Third Caliph sought Ali's advice. All these are with regard to jurisprudence, religious decrees, dispensing punishments and judgments. In no instance is it recorded that the Caliph sought Imam's advice directly with due attention to the presence of Imam (a.s.) in the society and the possibility of his getting benefit from his guidance and advices.

Regretfully we see that in only three cases the Caliph referred to the Imam directly. In other cases, Ali's presence on the spot was the reason for his advice.

More interesting is the fact that in instance no. 5 Uthman addressed Imam (a.s.) in the following words:

"You oppose us very much." [3]

Paying close attention to this statement will tell you about the truth behind claim of good relations between the Caliphs and Amirul Momineen (a.s.). Because:

had judged this matter he would have said more than this.

[1] Refer: Muhammad Ismail Ansari Zanjani: Translation of Asraar Aale Muhammad, Pg. 340

[2] Muhammad Baqir Bahboodi: Seerah Alawi (1st Edition), Pg. 41; quoting from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 3, Pg. 608

[3] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pg. 289; quoting from Musnad Ahmad, Vol. 1, Pg. 100

"From Uthman's statement to Imam (a.s.): 'Indeed you oppose us very much' it can be nicely concluded that Imam (a.s.) had opposed Uthman in various issues.

Indeed it is a well-known that the opposition of Imam (a.s.) was not due to personal enmity and selfish motives; but when he saw that the Caliph was going against a divine command or creating an innovation in religion he used to oppose him and this matter becomes clearer on scrutiny of other arguments between him and Uthman. For example regarding the lawfulness of meat hunted by others, Uthman consumed it while in Hajj and when the Imam recited the verse of Quran: 'and the game of the land is forbidden to you so long as you are on pilgrimage',**[1]** instead of confessing his mistake he became angry and said:

You have made this food bitter for me!"**[2]**

While the unity-seekers claim:

"Circumstances during the Caliphate of Uthman bin Affan were also like the tenures of the previous Caliphs and he in numerous instances consulted His Eminence in problems connected to faith and jurisprudence as mentioned in books of traditions, jurisprudence and History."**[3]**

The authenticity of the above claim can be judged from the following historical document:

"Uthman consulted the Imam as regards the decision about Ibne Umar. His Eminence said that retaliation must be taken from him and he must be executed because his hands were smeared with innocent Muslim blood.

Although Uthman did not accept Imam's opinion."**[4]**

In the same way in this matter**[5]**:

"Uthman gave precedence to the statement of Amr bin Aas over that of

[1] Surah Maidah 5:96

[2] Ibid. Pg. 290; quoting from: Wasaelush Shia, Vol. 5, Pg. 44-46

[3] Muhammad Ali Taskhiri: Article quoted in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 32

[4] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali (a.s.) and the Rulers), Pg. 174; quoting from Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 5, Pg. 24

[5] Ibid. Pgs. 264-269

Imam Ali (a.s.) and the Muhajireen and Ansaar.”[1]

Results of Statistical Analysis

Result A) Of the total of 107 cases only three concern finance and three cases are related to military matters. In these cases the Imam did not initiate his opinion unless he was requested.

Now the question arises that in duration of Caliphs which stretched to twenty-five years, statistics show that only on six occasions the Imam was asked to give his opinion. In other cases, Imam himself intruded because he saw that the Caliph's claim was incorrect. When such is the reality, how can they claim that:

“His Eminence was present in all political and martial matters in the form of highest authority of consultation and the trustworthy and truthful one of the Caliphs.”!**[2]**

Can all political and martial instances of twenty-five years be condensed into only six cases?

History shows that in any rulership such instances are more.

With a little consideration: “It can be easily said that with the group of Abu Bakr and Umar coming to power, the period of political isolation of Hazrat Ali (a.s.) began and it continued for 25 years.”**[3]**

Result B) From 107 cases 71 concern legislation and judiciary and thirty are regarding faith and knowledge. This makes a total of 101 cases.

We request extremist unity-seekers to reconsider their following claims:

“Umar also did not do anything without consulting Ali.”!**[4]**

“The Second Caliph used to say...we are commanded by Prophet to consult Ali.”!**[5]**

“Mostly the Second Caliph preferred Ali's opinion to that of others.”!**[6]**

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 269*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Ittelaat Daily, Issue*

No. 26, Khordad 1379

[3] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 51*

[4] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 7, Pg. 8*

[5] *Ibid. Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 6, Pg. 6*

[6] *Ibid. Interview in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 16*

“Before him Abu Bakr and later Uthman also always consulted Ali.”!**[1]**

“Throughout 25 years Ali acted as a guide and consultant in all affairs.”!**[2]**

“Caliphs too had accepted him as a consultant in all matters.”!**[3]**

In all these 101 cases, only 17 times they contacted Imam directly. In a period of 25 years this number shows how little they cared for him or his presence. They claim such because they want to cover this shortcoming. They themselves know facts are not as they claim. In this direct contact, 16 items were about knowledge and religion and 17 concerned religious knowledge. That is 33 out of 101; which is only one-third.

In other words there remain 68 items in which either there was no attention from the side of the Caliph to the presence of Imam (a.s.) - in 42 cases. And in 16 cases the Caliphs did not want to ask the Imam so first he asked others and only later the Imam.

In ten cases when the Caliph did not pay any attention to the presence of the Imam, Amirul Momineen (a.s.) as a person present in the society mentioned his opinion.

The reason is not obscure. It is that the Caliphs wanted to cut short possibilities of Imam’s credit among the people and to hinder his knowledge taking root in society.

It could be summed up in a single sentence thus:

“They avoided every type of action and even statement that could strengthen the trust of society in him.”**[4]**

Final Analysis about Caliphs' Consultation with Amirul Momineen (a.s.)

“It was not that the Caliphs showed courtesy of inviting Ali to government meetings or take his advice as a minister or senior experienced dignitary. And that he accepted thus showing his co-

[1] *Ibid. Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 2, Pg. 7*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Interview in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 4, Summer 79, Pg. 62*

[3] *Abdur Raheem Mahmoodi: Maqaam-e-Sahaaba wa Zindagi-e-Khulafa-e-Raashideen Dar yek Nigaah (Status of Companions and life of Rightly Guided Caliphs in a Glance), Pgs. 36-37*

[4] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 51*

operation with them. Rather the Caliphs did not even do the justice and well being of the Ummah by allowing them to benefit from the Imam's advice. Their behavior with him was such that it isolated him from social and political arenas and he resorted to farming, cultivation and peasantry.

Whenever they sought his advice, they did so because they had no alternative. And if their praise and appreciation of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) has been found in history it is because it was not possible to deny the excellences of His Eminence.”**[1]**

Besides it was ignorance on their part about Islam**[2]** and its laws, rules and legislative questions. They as successors of Prophet had no ground to put forth excuse of their ignorance or not knowing matters. Likewise, they had no excuse to justify their occupation of the office inspite of having no knowledge of the very decrees, commands and holy verses and text. There are 42 cases when Imam Ali (a.s.) clearly proved their inability to handle the office. History has recorded these instances. Ali has saved them from committing blunders. Else they would have gone astray; and others too would have followed them.

The wrong would have become common or a standard. They, in their station of leadership, if be so ignorant it reflects their unfitness to occupy Prophet's place as his successors. Further there are occasions in history when the Second Caliph admitted his inability and Ali's superiority.**[3]** Such views and opinions cannot be impregnated with a good will or good terms between two sides. Beyond this, Muawiyah too has acknowledged superiority of Ali. If such things are indication of good terms can we believe that Muawiyah too was on good terms with Ali?

As we said one of the reasons that impelled Ali to help Caliphs by his advice was to disclose to the Ummah their inability in handling affairs and leading the Ummah. This he did in the best way. But the Ummah had gone somnolent to the extent that it did not wake up. The obstinacy was so deep that the Ummah

[1] *Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Taqi Nabawi: Pamphlet on Astaana-e-Ghadeer (Lecture on the topic of Ghadeer and Imamate, article on the subject of Amirul Momineen in the period of Caliphs - Araaf Noor Cultural Organization - Summer 81), Pg. 19*

This pamphlet was republished in 1382 and in a book form also in 1382.

[2] *"The Second Caliph was not fond of much discussion and religious arguments due to his weakness in knowledge." (Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: Siyasat Imam Ali-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa, Pg. 97)*

[3] *Refer: Ibid. Pgs. 191-220*

required a greater shock to move. There are historical evidences that show the extent of ignorance of the Second Caliph. In one of the divine decrees regarding inheritance, Umar changed the ruling altogether and replaced it by one created by his own ignorance. This ruling is called *Ghowl* and it still is in practice by his followers.**[1]**

Imam (a.s.) considered Umar's verdict in this matter as innovation which showed his ignorance of divine laws; His Eminence (a.s.) in this matter not only opposed the Caliph he also censured the Islamic Ummah and said:

“Reason for such innovations is they surrendered leadership of Islamic society to people who were not worthy of it. If ruling power had been in the hands of those whom Allah had selected, the matter of Ghowl would not have existed today. And there would not have been any difference in divine law; because the knowledge of all this is with Ali.”[2]

In the same way, in crises, sentences like: “Had Ali not been there, Umar would have perished,” would remind that:

“Umar has said this about one against whom he aligned with Quraish and usurped his rights.”[3]

An important point that can be recalled from analysis of confessions of Caliphs is that claims like these have another aim also, and that is to justify and cover their usurpation of the rightful rulership of Imam (a.s.).

Therefore claims of always consulting Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and that also in administrative and military affairs is in fact an exaggeration they voiced in reply to those who objected like Ibne Abbas.

Pay attention to the following historical document:

Umar, during his Caliphate, said to Ibne Abbas: “Ali was more suitable for rulership than me and Abu Bakr.”

Ibne Abbas at once asked: In spite of saying this why did you sideline him?

[1] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pgs. 273-276*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 276; quoting from: Wasaelush Shia, Vol. 17, Pg. 426*

[3] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 55*

Umar answered him immediately: “We do not take decisions without his permission and consultation.”[1]

By this he avoided the censure for usurping Caliphate from Ali.

Such proceedings can be termed as political attitude. This went a great deal to satisfy companions of Prophet as they thought that they were in the scene and having a share in running affairs. This minimized their censure. This same attitude Abu Bakr adopted against Ansaar at Saqifah.

Umar wanted to utilize the presence of the Prophet's companions but he was afraid to give them government posts and considered it unwise. So he limited it to extent of advice and consultation.

"On one hand the Caliph wanted to profit by family of Abbas in matters of governance but on the other he did not want them to be in power all the time. So he refrained from it. When the Governor of Humis[2]died Umar came to Abdullah Ibne Abbas and asked him if he would like to take governorship of Humis. But before everything he revealed his view to him...[3]

Ibne Abbas also replied to the Caliph: I don't want to be your governor... Umar at last said to Abdullah Ibne Abbas: Then at least give me advice." [4]

It seems Umar learned this from Ibne Abi Qahafa Abu Bakr in Saqifah Bani Saada; because as we said it was only through this that Abu Bakr was able to pacify the Ansaar:

"In the end Abu Bakr assured them that in case they accept rulership of Muhajireen they would be their counsels and nothing would be done without consulting them." [5]

[1] Refer: Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pg. 167; quoting from *Mahaazaraat al-Udaba*, Pg. 4, Pg. 478

[2] [A Syrian city]

[3] "He suggested to Abdullah to take the rulership of Humis on the condition that he will not use his position in favor of Caliphate of Ali (a.s.) after the Caliph." (Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob*, Pg. 281)

[4] Asghar Qaidan: *Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)* [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 120

[5] *Yusuf Gholami: Bohraan-e-Jansheeni-e-Payambar (Crisis of Succession to the Prophet), Pg. 27; quoting from: Al-Kamil, Vol. 2, Pg. 329; Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 2, Pg. 243; Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 1, Pg. 582*

The same policy was used with Ali also so that they can tell others - even today - that:

“Imamate and scientific expertise of Ali (a.s.) was already known to Caliphs and they had acknowledged this.”**[1]**

On the other hand the Caliphs were always anxious to obtain legitimacy for their rule and their becoming Caliphs. In this respect, they were willing to lay hand on any opportunity useful to them. So they wanted to draw Imam’s attention to them. They at least wanted people to believe they were on good terms and good relations lasted between them and Imam. These oral confessions and praises came into being for this purpose. Through these tactics they wanted to deceive the people at the same also putting a lid on their own deficiencies.

Because whenever Amirul Momineen (a.s.) interfered and solved difficult problems or replied to complicated religious questions a question arose in the minds of the people that:

“Why should a man so learned not become the holder of an important post like Islamic Caliphate? Instead the responsibility had gone to one who is bereft of all this knowledge.”

In reply to this Umar appeared side-by-side one of the most learned man of his time among the people. So they say:

“According to narrations of both sects, the Second Caliph said: If Ali had not been there, Umar would have perished and he addressed His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) saying: You are my Master. Thus showing that good relations existed between him and Imam Ali (a.s.).”**[2]**

As if the Imam was their minister and consultant?!!

As if the presence of Imam furnished credibility to Caliphs and a justification of their weaknesses and defects.!!

It is thus claimed:

“The Caliphs in numerous matters asked the Imam for his opinion and

[1] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Interview in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 156*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 9, Tir 1381*

consulted him and the Imam supervised the acts of the rulers and guided and advised them.”!**[1]**

During his Caliphate time and again Umar sought Ali’s advice or without his asking Ali (a.s.) mentioned his opinion and Umar accepted it.”!**[2]**

“Umar asked for co-operation of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) in the most difficult situations and through the guidance of Imam solved his problems.”!**[3]**

It was that the revolution of Islam was a religious and cultural revolution. More than armed confrontation it required scientific and cultural weapons. After the passing away of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) Ali (a.s.) took up these important functions.”!**[4]**

“In this way the Imam acted like a minister and guide of the rulers and was like a reliable point of reference for the Muslims and believers in behavior and practice of Islam as the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) was.”!**[5]**

“Imam Ali (a.s.) in that same condition did not refrain from dispensing consultation to the Righteous Caliphs.”!**[6]**

“Imam Ali (a.s.) after the passing away of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) during the period of all the three Caliphs with his divinely bestowed ministership and foresight was the pivot and axis of Islamic revolution and he bore the responsibility of cultural revolution. He maintained Muslim unity and guided the people and the Caliphs.”!**[7]**

The notable point in the explanation and analysis of scientific, religious and jurisprudential activities of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) is that the steps that the

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Mashal-e-Ittehaad (Torch of Unity)*, Pg. 25

[2] Sayyid Jawad Mustafawi: Article quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 139; article quoted in *Mashkoot Magazine*, Issue No. 2, Spring 62, Pg. 52

[3] Farooq Safizaada: Article quoted in *Kayhan Farhangi*, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 81

[4] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Interview in *Kayhan Farhangi*, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 16

[5] Markaz-e-Pazuhashhai Sada wa Seema: Article quoted in *Kayhan Farhangi*, Issue No. 182, Azar 80, Pg. 37

[6] Muhammad Ali Taskhiri: Article quoted in *Kayhan Farhangi*, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 34

[7] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious)*, Vol. 7, Pg. 18

Imam took regarding his judgments on various topics, it became apparent how much the Caliphs would have distorted Islam had the Imam not been present.

For example during the period of the Second Caliph:

“The number of judgments from Ali (a.s.) that in this period remained in force are astonishing. All these were after the time when the Caliph had issued contrary orders and Ali (a.s.) had corrected them.”**[1]**

It was in this manner that all the attitudes of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) were aimed at removing the dust of deviation and ruin from the face of teachings of real Islam and prevention of innovations and illegalities to enter jurisprudential issues and to finally propagate and explain sources of Islamic faith; it had nothing to do with friendly relations, co-operation and cultural support of the rulers who had usurped his Caliphate!

Yet they go on making claims like:

“Attitude of Hazrat Ali (a.s.) during 25 years of rule of the three Caliphs is that of co-operation and support, guidance and

advice, restraining from deviations and removal of the doubts of the Caliphs and prohibition of anything that could destabilize their position. Is all this enmity?"! [2]

"Among the other instances of co-operation! And unity-seeking of Ali (a.s.) in the matter of support! And unity of thought! And consultation and counseling the Caliphs was before it, whether in complicated political and military matters or in complex and difficult social and jurisprudential issues, even in personal affairs,"! [3]

"During Umar's reign also His Eminence remained as the most active and greatest force of social awakening in Islamic society leaving his footprints of helpfulness on the sands of time. He provided consultation and guidance to the Caliph of the time and Umar during his Caliphate referred to him many times or even without his request His Eminence gave his opinion [4] and he (Umar) agreed,"! [5]

[1] *Asghar Qaidan: Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Analysis of political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 125*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 9, Tir 1381*

[3] *Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity), Vol. 1, Pg. 125*

[4] *[There are only 8 instances out of 85 when the Imam (a.s.) expressed his view before the opinion of the Second Caliph can be acted upon as can be seen the tables]*

[5] *Ibid. Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity), Vol. 1, Pgs. 125-126*

"From this angle can be remembered instances of co-operation between our lord, Ali and our lord, Umar and can be described as a relation of sincere friendship and amity beyond description!

They continued to work for achieving the aims of Caliphate together in a co-operative manner! And for its well being."! [1]

"Ali Murtuza was the best advisor and sincere well wisher of our lord Umar..."! [2]

“His Eminence, Ali (a.s.)...always throughout the Caliphate of Abu Bakr was his sincere friend and intimate advisor.”!**[3]**

Theological Reminder

Among the important points derived from the confession of the Caliphs (in proof of truthfulness of Shiite beliefs in discussion of Imamate) is refutation of claim of superiority of the Caliphs and as a result puts a question mark on the legality of Caliphate of Abu Bakr and Umar.

We should know that Ahle Sunnat have different opinions as regard the qualifications of Caliph. Some like Fadl bin Ruzbahan do not consider superiority to be a requirement of Caliphate; but others like Ibne Taimmiyah accepts this condition and then goes out of his way to prove the superiority of the Caliphs and negates all the claims of Imamiyah on the absolute superiority of Amirul Momineen (a.s.).**[4]**

Differences between the Aims of Caliphs and Ali Regarding Consultations

In one bird's eye view, we can separate the line of Caliphs with that of Ali:

“During periods of Caliphates of Abu Bakr and Umar, Imam Ali (a.s.) did not do anything against them. He did not interfere in political and social affairs as if they had reached an understanding that Ali and his family will be left alone untroubled and he in return would have no say in politics. Except when the Caliph should see it as his own good to take advice and help from him.” [5]

[1] Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 7

[2] Ibid. Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 7

[3] Ibid. Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 15, Autumn 82, Pg. 11

[4] Refer: Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: *Imamat-e-Bila Fasl* (Edit. Muhammad Reza Kareemi), Pg. 160

[5] Muhammad Baqir Bahboodi: *Seerah Alawi* (1st Edition), Pg. 41

“In important matters whenever Umar could not take a decision by himself he sought Ali's advice.” [1]

Because: “The main intellectual specialty of the Second Caliph is that being a ruler of the society he considered himself to be having extensive powers. He not only considered himself restricted to political and judicial affairs he also thought that he had the special right to make laws and frame rules of the Shariah. He during his Caliphate, relying on these powers went on to make changes in religion and introduced innovations. And he did not feel that he was bound by any limits except those of his comprehensive understanding of Quran and Shariah. In instances when he found himself helpless he resorted to consultation with Companions (including Ali).” [2]

“...it is not possible to find any Caliph than Umar and Uthman who considered that they had the discretion to make any changes in religion even to the extent of worship acts...

Such freedom of opinion in the matter of worship acts is only part of discretion that was exercised in other matters. The Caliph did not refrain from creating innovations. Expansion of Islamic territories brought them face to face with many new legal problems and therefore mostly they endeavored to solve them even through consultation with Companions. All these solutions were on the basis of Prophet’s teachings[3] and on the other hand consultation with Companions or thirdly from the side of inventive faculty of the Caliph himself.[4] This went on to increase the spread of creations of the regime.”[5]

On the other hand:

“It will seen clearly that co-operation and guidance of His Eminence in removing numerous doubts of the Caliph was to protect Muslim society from the danger of decline and that the foundations of Islam may not be

[1] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 55*

[2] *Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: Siyasat Imam Ali (a.s.)-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa, Pg. 97*

[3] *Although if he could not think of anything he would refer to the Sunnah of Prophet (s.a.w.s.). (Ibid. Pg. 99)*

[4] *These were personal derivations of the Caliph variously based on exigencies. (Ibid. Pg. 99)*

[5] *Ibid. Pgs. 98-99*

destroyed...if His Eminence (a.s.) had not interfered and co-operated, especially in religious and political issues it would have led to deviation of Islam from its true path and created great problems which the Imam could not bear to see.”[1]

Therefore that which the Imam (a.s.) had in his aim was protection of Islam from deviation and destruction and on this way he did not give any importance to the regime or Caliphate. Even then they wish to distort the facts claiming that:

“Did not the co-operation of Hazrat Ali (a.s.) to the three Caliphs continue for 25 years till the last moments of the life of the Third Caliph? Can all these co-operations, support and help in social and political matters throughout this period be without sincerity?”**[2]**

“Indeed we must not forget that he [His Eminence, Ali (a.s.)] even in the field of action and interfering in some matters was only to the extent of consultation; so that the machinery of Caliphate may not benefit by his co-operation and support to strengthen itself and gain a sort of legitimacy. Because he knew that the Islamic Ummah would see contradiction between acceptance and political value of the Caliphs and his (Ali’s) own religious legality. And all the efforts of Caliphate was also to gain legitimacy for themselves by pretending to take advice and co-operation of the Imam. And thus they may get some political and public acceptance. But they were not able to do so. And in the end Ali (a.s.) made clear to the people that the Caliphs were not having any legitimacy; and he did so to defend an important pillar of faith.**[3]** This was a great defeat for Caliphate. Till the very end they could not succeed in reconciling the two.”**[4]**

“Whenever Ali (a.s.) saw that some mistakes of the Caliphs were going to play havoc with the future of Muslims he used to at once interfere and do what was possible. He even risked his life and property to prevent such eventualities. He never refrained to step forward whenever he sensed

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 56*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 9, Teer 1381*

[3] *[This statement requires correction. The phrase “Absence of armed uprising” is more appropriate]*

[4] *Asghar Qaidan: Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pgs. 97-98*

danger.”**[1]** Therefore, “It is not seen in any source that the Caliph asked for his view and he desisted from giving it. Because it is not possible for one who spent his whole life in spread of Islam to see any harm coming to Muslims and that

which was happening in the society. And we see that whenever the Caliph asked for his consultation he did not refuse it even though he saw that his rights are usurped.”**[2]**

[1] *Ibid. Pgs. 103-104*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 109*

Part 7
Criticism and Scrutiny of Ana-
lyses Publicized regarding Ali's
cooperation with Caliphs'
Government

Conjectures Spread in this Regard

Some analyses relate to political attitudes and practical conduct of Imam Ali (a.s.) with regard to Caliphs. Besides they also base their claims on his associates' acceptance of post in military or civil service.

The efforts of unity-seekers to establish for readers that Imam was on good terms with Caliphs have distorted facts. Many historical evidences are overlooked. The reader concludes wrongly for himself that the Imam and his friends entertained agreeable relations with Caliphs. They cooperatively ran governmental affairs. Such close relations do not allow any crevice between the two wings of Islam.

They put forward this argument:

"If he cooperated with Caliphs for 25 years...if he was mild and polite with Caliphs' government... You also do the same in this regard... and follow the behavior of your Imam regarding the Caliphs."**[1]**

"His Eminence (a.s.) did not leave the side of Abu Bakr for even a moment."**[2]**

"When His Eminence paid allegiance to Abu Bakr, he honored all assignment given to him to the best of his capacity and this trend had a good impact on his relations with Caliphs."**[3]**

"And as for co-operation and support of Imam Ali (a.s.) and his associates with Umar, it was not restricted to advice and counsel, they also practically helped in this regard and even accepted governmental posts and also participated in battles without any hesitation."**[4]**

"During the period of the Second Caliph, Hazrat Ali (a.s.) always solved

[1] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 8, Khordad 1381

[2] Fareedoon Islamniya: *Ashra-e-Mubashira* (1st Edition 1380), Pg. 140

[3] Ibrahim Baizoon (Translated by Ali Asghar Muhammadi Seejaani): *Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh* (Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition), 1379], Pg. 38

[4] Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat* (Strategy of Unity), Vol. 1, Pg. 128

religious problems and difficult jurisprudential matters in which the Caliphate asked his counsel. In encounters and military issues...at no time did he (Ali) allow his personal feelings and negative thoughts to deter him from all this.”!**[1]**

What do Historical Documents and Sources Indicate?

To answer such deviation in analysis of historical events we first dwell upon some historical proofs that clearly disprove the deviated analysis:

Imam Ali (a.s.) absolutely and always refrained from accepting a government post in Caliphs' rule; more than this, Caliphs also were well aware of such attitude of the Imam towards them.

Regarding his cooperation with the First Caliph, it can be said:

Documentary Proof A) When some persons like Aswad Ansi, Musailama and Sajjah claimed prophethood and Abu Bakr prepared an army to fight them, he consulted Amr bin Aas regarding the command of forces and asked for his opinion about the choice of Ali. Amr bin Aas told him:

Ali would not cooperate with you;[2] so Abu Bakr gave up the idea.[3]

Documentary Proof B) In the same way the Caliph tried to appoint His Eminence (a.s.) for quelling disturbances of Kinda tribe, but Umar considered it impractical.[4]

The only instance when it could be claimed that Abu Bakr assigned command to Ali (a.s.) was the responsibility of guarding the original road to Medina in a time when he (Abu Bakr) himself had caused the army of apostates to attack the city and they had reached near Medina.

Here the point worth nothing thing is that this case is also narrated only in Sunni sources and there are many doubts in its authenticity[5] an example of

[1] *Muhammad Barfi: Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni point of view), [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 104*

[2] *The later history shows that the reason why Caliph*

referred to Amr Aas was that the latter had a deep understanding of the personality of Amirul Momineen (a.s.). The Qasida of Ghadeeriya also mentions this point.

[3] Yaqoobi: *Tarikh Yaqoobi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 129

[4] Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.) (1st Edition)*, Pg. 198; quoting from *Futuh Ibne Athim*, Vol. 1, Pg. 72

[5] Refer: *Ali Labbaf: A Victim Lost in Saqifah*, Vol. 3, Pgs. 143-144

which is as follows:

“Ibne Athir, in the portion of his history dealing with the campaign of First Caliph against false prophets, mentions: Abu Bakr assigned Ali, Zubair, Abdullah bin Masood and Talha to guard the hilly roads around Medina.

His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) did not accept it because the issue of Caliphate was more important to him than this trifle matter of a person claiming prophethood and in numerous instances he disputed the issue of Caliphate with Abu Bakr...is it right that he should take the command of such a frivolous matter?

Does the narration of Ibne Athir not show how he and his co-religionists try to pose Ali as an agent of First Caliph and even at the price of mentioning the name of His Eminence in few instances!” **[1]**

Or consider the following:

“Beliefs of Shia and Sunni are not at parity on the issue of co-operation of Imam (a.s.).” **[2]** “It is necessary to mention that supposing this case is true, fighting the false claimants of prophethood (which is an important matter) is not something that needs permission of an usurper Caliph; on the contrary, the Ummah and usurper of Caliphate all are under mandate to seek permission of an Infallible Imam and be at his disposal to fight the false claimants. Besides, this issue is also binding on the Infallible Imam himself.” **[3]**

Therefore contrary to the claim publicized about the permanent company of Imam (a.s.) with Abu Bakr it should be announced that:

“Relations between Abu Bakr and Imam were very cold and not worthy of mention.”**[4]**

About Imam’s Co-operation with the Second Caliph it can be said:

“The Second Caliph also was not pleased with the obstinacy and haughtiness of Imam Ali (a.s.) and many times he appointed in-betweens

[1] *Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: Siyasat Imam Ali-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa, Pgs. 84-85*

[2] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 225*

[3] *Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: Siyasat Imam Ali-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa, Pg. 85*

[4] *Rasool Ja’faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 16*

who can motivate the Imam (a.s.) to assist the regime; but Amirul Momineen (a.s.) only looked to the interests of Islam. At the time of need, he forwarded his expert opinion. Commonly he ignored the requests of Caliphs for all-round cooperation.**[1]**

Documentary Proof A) Of course it was not that the Imam always fulfilled their requests. The Caliph asked Ali to accompany him in the journey to Syria, but Ali refused. Umar complained to Ibne Abbas:

I asked your cousin to accompany me to Syria but he refused...

Documentary Proof B) Likewise in the battle of Qadasia, Muslims sought Umar’s help.

The Caliph asked Imam (a.s.) to take the command and go to the battlefield, but the Imam (a.s.) did not accept.”**[2]**

Therefore the Caliph sent Saad bin Abi Waqqas.**[3]**

It is clear that in both cases the Imam rejected the request, still they falsely claim:

“In this way Ali (a.s.) was always by the side of Umar.”!**[4]**

“When Umar asked Ali to take the command of Muslim forces to conquer Iran, Imam did so.”!**[5]**

Attention and contemplation on this matter related to always ‘Absence of acceptance of co-operation and bearing responsibility’ makes every researcher and investigator think His Eminence has not always denied co-operation with the caliphal regime; thus his non-acceptance of co-operation and responsibility in chosen instances must be for some special reason; such that Amirul Momineen (a.s.) had some standard on the basis of which he either chose to

[1] *Hasan Yusufyan: Article ‘Imam Ali wa Mukhaalifaan’ quoted in Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 6, Pg. 216*

[2] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pg. 227; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 12, Pgs. 78-79 and quoting from: Futuh al-Buldan of Balazari, Pg. 264*

[3] *Masoodi in Muruj az-Zahab (Vol. 2, Pgs. 309-310) has also explained that Uthman mediated in this matter but the Imam rejected the commandership.*

[4] *Ibrahim Baizoon (Translated by Ali Asghar Muhammadi Seejaani): Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh (Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition), 1379], Pg. 43*

[5] *Muhammad Ali Taskhiri: Article quoted in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 35*
help or refuse.

Therefore in the first stage it will be seen that the Imam never refused his help. But in the second stage it will be seen that the Imam also in some cases hit out at the chest of the rulers and refused to co-operate in some matters.

Conclusion

The attitude of the Imam in accepting occasional cooperation with government and fortuitous refusal to cooperate leads a reader to conclude that Imam had a particular outlook to the matters. It further leads to interpret the type and kind of relations he had with Caliphs.

Understanding Imam's attitude will lead us to understand motives of both sides - why the posts were offered and why the Imam denied.

In fact after this point is proved that Imam only refused cooperation with the regime under some conditions and accepted responsibility only under some conditions the following two questions arise:

Firstly, what was the aim of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in co-operating with the Caliphs or refusing it?

Secondly, what was the policy Caliphs pursued towards the Imam when some posts were proposed to him in their government?

We shall dwell on these questions in the course of this book.

Part 8
Analysis of Ali's participation in
Caliphs' Government

“A scrutiny into Imam’s dealings with Caliphs shows that when Imam saw his cooperation would reflect his personal support to Caliphs he withheld his cooperation. But when occasions called his attention towards greater interests of Muslims or Islam itself he extended his cooperation without hesitation. Such as we see in the events in early period of Abu Bakr’s Caliphate, which was the start of things going astray from leadership. Perversion and deviation from the right path had already commenced. So the Imam is less seen among the cooperators.”**[1]**

In those days also Ali did not accept any office, which could have reflected his support and he did not desire to be any token or sign of his support to a deviated Caliphate and a perverted power.

Ali was aware of the fact that a peaceful life and security of that society depended on his co-operation with the junta. So he extended his co-operation.”**[2]** “He had an understanding of the conditions prevalent at that time. So he cooperated when necessary although it was very bitter and much painful to him. He was readily available when existence of Islam was in question. But it cannot be said that he supported the system. Or whatever they did was agreeable to him. He also could not forget their incompetence to the post of Caliphate.

They also were aware of this attitude of Ali.”**[3]**

“The point worth nothing is that it was very hard for Ali to accept assignments or an office from those very persons who had occupied the seat, which should have belonged to him. They were usurpers of his right. They were sitting where Prophet in Ghadeer had already made him sit. How could he come to terms with his own oppressors or accept from them what they give while everything was his. He was expected to forego the whole and accept a part.”**[4]**

[1] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pg. 225*

[2] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 50*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 51*

[4] *Asghar Qaidan: Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 104*

“However the isolation of Ali indicates that both sides knew each other and also that he cannot behave towards them that could be an indicator of his approval of their Caliphate. It was a divine post. God should choose. And God had chosen him and the Prophet had conveyed God’s choice. Ghadeer Khumm was a matter of yesterday. Still nobody had forgotten the ceremony.”**[1]**

“During the periods of three Caliphs Ali did not take any active part in government – politically or running its affairs. What he gave was advice by way of consultation, that’s all. He had no membership in their governments. It can be said that he was rather an opposition leader from a distance.”**[2]**

What was Caliphs' Aim in Giving Government Responsibilities to Ali?

On the basis of what is said so far it is possible to sketch the policy of Caliphs in giving these responsibilities to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) as follows:

“For them it would have been far better had Ali taken the command of army under their order. A strong and powerful rival would have been in their row – one well-versed to reason and narrate Prophet’s words.”**[3]**

“Can it be accepted that the Caliph dismissed Khalid bin Saeed bin Aas from post of commander due to his inclination or leniency towards Ali? Their design was to give the post to Ali that could bring credibility and validity to their government. Then to dismiss him declaring among people that he was incompetent for the job. Anyway, in both cases they would have gained.”**[4]**

In the same way the regime by so doing would have satisfied the block of Ali and voices that clamored that Caliphate was right of Ali would have been muted by Ali himself.

“The Kinda tribes including Hadhramaut were pro-Ali. Because Caliphate was drawn away from Prophet’s house, they raised their voice of protest and opposition, which ended in a revolt.

[1] *Rasool Ja’faryan: Hayat-e-Fikri O Siyasi-e-Imamaan-e-Shia (Intellectual and Political Life of Shia Imams), Pg. 60*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 61*

[3] *Sayyid Ja’far Murtuza Amili: Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.), Pg. 199*

[4] *Ibid. Pg. 199; quoting from: Shaykh Ali Ahmadi Miyanji*

So the regime and especially Abu Bakr tried to delegate Ali to quell the rebellion. They wanted to take advantage of Ali’s name. If he were seen in government, their opposition would have subsided.”**[1]**

In conclusion it can be said:

“The Caliph was trying to bring Ali into this matter and he consulted Umar in this regard...Umar was apprehensive about the excellences of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.). He said that Ali is very careful in this matter (he is not inclined in encounter with the apostates) and if he did not attach any formal feature to apostates’ uprising nobody would go to war against them...

In addition to describing the fear of Umar this statement also shows Ali’s moral status in Muslim society. That is such was his influence in the society that if he did not show any inclination in that war no one among the Muslims would go. Therefore because of this fear Abu Bakr was too prudent in his behavior with Ali.”**[2]**

“Indeed Umar had another fear and he did not want Hadhramaut to be an additional front for the new Caliphate.

Though Ali (a.s.) did not go to fight them, the regime of Caliphate even before seeking opinion of Ali (a.s.) was afraid of this matter and they sent Akrama.”**[3]**

From this aspect it can be said:

Caliphs also in every condition were not prone to give any government office to Ali and this was complimentary to ‘absence of inclination to always co-operate’.

In other words, Caliphs wanted an opportunity to strengthen pillars of their Caliphate and gain Ali’s indulgence into affairs, which to them was tantamount to legitimacy of their Caliphate. On the other hand whenever Ali co-operated he did so in a way, which could not be interpreted as his approval to their Caliphate.

These and such efforts continued even after extending the borders of the country.

[1] *Asghar Qaidan: Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 102*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 102*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 102, Footnote 3*

“The Caliph and his friends could not ignore the useful force such as him. They knew the courage and bravery of Ali. In lifetime of Prophet, they had witnessed from close Ali’s battles and fighting. So Ali with regard to battles was a very important element.

The Caliph and his associates also were not unaware of this or were opposed to it.

On the other hand his absence from the wars and his isolation could be a matter of question in the society.

Therefore the Caliph and his associates tried to involve Ali in government responsibilities. They wanted him to take part in military victories. This could have given credibility to their government. Besides, his supporters and Bani Hashim would be pleased and satisfied.”**[1]**

“Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) during these battles kept the same attitude, which he had in the time of Abu Bakr... The Caliph could not remain ignorant about Imam’s cooperation and guidance...He knew very well that Ali was not willing to participate in battles. Therefore he decided to get benefit of his advice. Ali was sensitive about Muslims and Islam. Therefore in the shape of consultations he rendered services to them...

Ali did not like to accept any responsibility, which directly or indirectly could be a helping element to the usurped Caliphate.”**[2]**

As it is seen, the regime was trying its best to establish contacts with Imam which could provide them validity.

When this could not be achieved, Caliphate tried to established indirect relations through consultations.

Abu Bakr wanted to assign Ali the command of army to fight against Ashath bin Qays. He took the advice of Umar, Umar was anxious and anticipated Ali’s refusal, which would lay harmful impact on their Caliphate. Therefore Umar proposed:

“My view is that you must keep Ali in Medina under your care as you are not needless of him and it is necessary for you to consult Ali in country’s affairs.”**[3]**

[1] *Ibid.* Pg. 103

[2] *Ibid.* Pg. 109

[3] *Sayyid Ja'far Murtuza Amili: Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.), Pg. 199; quoting from Futuh Ibne Athim, Vol. 1, Pg. 72*

Indeed, what need the Caliph had of Imam's advice and support?

Why Umar reminded the Caliph to observe that?

The reply to these questions can be found in the carefulness of Umar in rejecting the proposal of making Amirul Momineen (a.s.) the commander of forces. When he said:

"I fear that Ali will refuse to fight these people and he will not do Jihad with these people. And if he does so no one from his side will move except under force and compulsion."**[1]**

Now it must be asked:

How is it possible to attribute good relations between Imam (a.s.) and the Caliphs and also proving that he took an active part of *Wilayat* during their regimes. And it is claimed that:

"The First Caliph was very much in need of his courage and valor in the fields of battle just as he always benefited from the knowledge, wisdom and advice of His Eminence in various matters in Medina Munawwara, the capital of the nascent regime."**[2]**

[1] *Ibid.* Pg. 199; quoting from *Futuh Ibne Athim, Vol. 1, Pg. 72*

[2] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 4, Pg. 17*

Indeed, what need the Caliph had of Imam's advice and support?

Why Umar reminded the Caliph to observe that?

The reply to these questions can be found in the carefulness of Umar in rejecting the proposal of making Amirul Momineen (a.s.) the commander of forces. When he said:

"I fear that Ali will refuse to fight these people and he will not do Jihad with these people. And if he does so no one from his side will move except under force and compulsion."**[1]**

Now it must be asked:

How is it possible to attribute good relations between Imam (a.s.) and the Caliphs and also proving that he took an active part of *Wilayat* during their regimes. And it is claimed that:

“The First Caliph was very much in need of his courage and valor in the fields of battle just as he always benefited from the knowledge, wisdom and advice of His Eminence in various matters in Medina Munawwara, the capital of the nascent regime.”!**[2]**

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 199; quoting from Futuh Ibne Athim, Vol. 1, Pg. 72*

[2] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 4, Pg. 17*

Part 9

Was Ali given a Governmental responsibility during the tenure of the Caliphs?

After this investigation the only thing that is in need of analysis and interpretation is the claim that:

“During the period of Umar’s Caliphate whenever he left Medina, Ali was his deputy. He took the charge of affairs until his return.”**[1]**

Reply to this conjecture can be divided into two parts:

Analysis of Acceptance of Responsibility for Some Particular Instances

“According to Sunni sources there are only three occasions when Ali was appointed in place of Umar in Medina. He took the office and ran the affairs as he administered the country. Indeed, it does not seem probable that Ali should have accepted. How can he accept from one who had usurped Caliphate from him and he (Ali) had repeatedly stressed upon his superiority and competency to the job?

Such claims need to be investigated first. Why such a case is not referred to by any Shia historian?

It could be possible that Ali could have taken charge of judicial affairs not political or administrative ones...”**[2]**

“Shia books do not stress upon Ali’s deputation by Umar.

It appears that Ali, during the office of Umar, could have attended affairs of people and handled matters of justice.”**[3]**

“However the fundamental question is: Why at all Ali should accept to be deputy of Umar or his substitute? On the other hand Ali never agreed or saw any legality in Umar’s Caliphate. It was a thing that never belonged to him (Umar). Then he undergoes to be his deputy, to be his substitute. Why?

The answer lies in Tabari’s and Ibne Athir’s comments, which are congruous with Shia beliefs. As the very Caliphate of Umar from the

[1] Muhammad Barfi: *Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni point of view)*, [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 110

[2] Asghar Qaidan: *Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)]*, Pgs. 123-124

[3] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 282

viewpoint of Ali was short of legitimacy and lacked legal status the posts (if) given to others would also be illegal.

Thus on the basis of this acceptance of these responsibilities in fact would be hindering the qualified ones to get them. Because if in case posts are given to non-qualified persons it would be against divine will and Islamic values and Ali knew better than to have the power to oppose these illegalities to do thus; thus His Eminence (a.s.) is not someone who sees illegal matters and does nothing about it.”**[1]**

Surrendering Responsibility to Ali in Some Particular Items

“During this period Ali was isolated from political arena. He did not occupy any post in Abu Bakr’s Caliphate. In Umar’s Caliphate, also he did the same. He did not even accept the post of commander for invading Iran.

The only exceptional case was when Umar had to leave for Palestine and he took with him senior companions of Prophet to help him in requirements of victory and success, while Ali’s had the responsibility of administration of Medina.

Although it is worth mention that Umar was strongly against Bani Hashim leaving Medina. He feared they would form groups in other areas and stage an uprising against his Caliphate.”**[2]**

The output of the policy of Second Caliph is surprising. He appointed Ali on three occasions in his place as his successor and does not appoint him in the six-person committee?!!

What was his aim in surrendering this responsibility to Amirul Momineen?

To comprehend the nature of relations of Caliphs’ government with Ali we refer to one more case:

“When Muhammad son of Abu Bakr wrote to Muawiyah censuring him for his disobedience to Imam Ali (a.s.). Muawiyah in reply wrote to him that he had only followed the first two rulers.

[1] *Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: Siyasat Imam Ali-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa, Pg. 101*

[2] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 54*

Muawiyah added that those two persons did not intimate him in their confidential matters nor did they open way to him to share with them in affairs...”**[1]**

This shows that Caliphs did not want Ali to take any part in their affairs. Likewise they were not desirous of his advice. Whenever they sought his advice there was some other motive in it. Their motive in anyway was not in the interest of Islam or Islamic unity.

While they claim:

“Mutual relations between Ali and three Caliphs were towards preserving Islamic unity and the very seed of Islam itself.”**[2]**

Our endeavors in analysis of the relations are with the motive to understand the aim of Ali and the aim of Caliphs. Especially with regard to co-operation of His Eminence (a.s.) in administrative and governmental affairs, which shall be explained and interpreted, so that the respected readers will see the difference between the aims of two sides. The outlook of Imam Ali (a.s.) leads the reader to the root of the policy Caliphs held according to the demand of the occasion. But they overlook it and say:

“Until Muawiyah came to power, the successor of Prophet of God, Ali, adopted a policy of patience, tolerance, vigilance. His attitude with three Caliphs was friendly and co-operative. This resulted in good manners, good behavior and good conduct among Muslims. In spite of criticism and censure expressed by Imam Ali (a.s.) which were due to honesty, good manners and Islamic promise.”**[3]**

Yes! Good demeanor and decorum, Islamic commitments and good manners formed the ground of cooperation of Imam Ali (a.s.) with the three Caliphs. Whether the requests of Caliphs and their proposals too were based on same ground?

Let History answer:

“Caliphs’ government was very much in anticipation from Imam Ali (a.s.). For instance, as he finally paid allegiance**[4]** to Abu Bakr he was

[1] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pgs. 136-137; quoting from: *Muruj az-Zahab*, Vol. 3, Pgs.

21-22; *Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 2, Pg. 31 & Pgs. 393-397

[2] *Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 120

[3] *Ibid. Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 120

[4] *[Regarding Bayyat, Refer: Ali Labbaf: A Victim Lost in Saqifah, Vol. 4, Section 1]*

expected to give up or forego the demand for his right to Caliphate. Moreover, he was expected to be seen with sword in his hand to fight whoever opposed the Caliphs.

But the Imam rejected this request. Such an attitude and position of Imam was natural to impel the government to make him more humiliated in the view of people. This policy was able to isolate the Imam more and more.”**[1]**

In the same way:

“Among the complaints of Imam about the Caliphs was that they led a campaign to belittle the personality of Imam, which was highest and most respected one in the view of people during the days of Prophet.”**[2]**

Now when such is the case how can it be claimed that:

“That which this writer has claimed and proved is that there existed friendly relations between Hazrat Ali (a.s.) and the Caliphs.”**[3]**

Some examples of politics of belittling Amirul Momineen (a.s.) are as follows:

“Umar in order to belittle Ali accorded more respect to Ibne Abbas. It was a policy so that Ibne Abbas may narrate traditions and give Tafseer of Quran.”**[4]**

“When Umar appointed the six-person committee he blamed each of them with a defect. He blamed Ali that he was a man having excess humor.”**[5]**

In short:

“The two Caliphs had assassinated the character of Ali among people and assassinated his personality.”**[6]**

The author of Pas az-Ghuroob writes: Even though the Bayyat of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) was effective in

mobilizing forces it is also not unlikely that the Caliph made the attack a pretext to obtain the support of His Eminence.” (Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob*, Pg. 171)

[1] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Hayat-e-Fikri O Siyasi-e-Imamaan-e-Shia (Intellectual and Political Life of Shia Imams)*, Pg. 53

[2] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pgs. 105-106

[3] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 8, Khordad 1381

[4] Allamah Askari: *Saqifah*, Pg. 73

[5] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Momin-aan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)]*, Pg. 14

[6] *Ibid.* Pg. 15

“Jundab bin Abdullah says: After swearing allegiance to Uthman I went to Iraq. There I used to narrate the attributes of Ali to people. The best reply that I got from the people was this: Leave these words. Think of something that may benefit you.

I answered them: These things are beneficial to both you and me. But the people on hearing this got up and dispersed.”**[1]**

“In a society of Muslims, Imam was forgotten. Therefore it was for this reason that Imam during his Caliphate reminded people of his station, services and the battles he fought and won for the sake of Islam, his nearness and relationship with Prophet.”**[2]**

[1] *Ibid.* Pgs. 14-15

[2] *Ibid.* Pg. 16

Part 10
Did Amirul Momineen (a.s.) have
Positive Outlook to Battles of Ca-
liph's Period?

As you know battles in the period of Caliphs particularly the Second Caliph are viewed from different angles, especially by the unity-mongers.

Thus they say:

“Regrettably of our doubts is that Ali (a.s.) did not find any worth of Islamic battles...we see how much he supported these battles?”! **[1]**

For the scrutiny of this claim, we invite you to read the translation of *Political Analysis of the life of Imam Hasan Mujtaba* by Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili. (2nd edition) pages 170-200. Which in fact is to refute the conjecture propagated that Imams Hasan and Husain participated in battles during the rule of Caliphs. **[2]**

That which we wish to remind in this section is their claim that participation of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and his associates in the victories proves their support and co-operation to the Caliphs’ regime. This is same as claim of participation in other matters. Thus they claim:

“If this unity was not preserved by Ali and if there was no co-operation, understanding and tolerance among Caliphs all these battles would have not been attained by the Muslims within such a short span of time.” **[3]**

While it should not be overlooked that in all these types of matters there had always been in existence a wide gulf and crevice between Imam’s motives and those of Caliphs. To consider them to be on friendly terms is a basic and fundamental mistake. We quote here another mistaken claim:

“Our belief is that leaders of truth do not approve participation in these battles. They do not think these battles to be useful to Muslims and Islam.

Imams desired extension of influence of Islam and its expansion as far as the length of globe. But they want it in congruity

with divine laws and the way Caliphs undertook was wrong and detrimental.” [4]

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 34

[2] Like the claim that: The Imam sent his dear son, Hasan Mujtaba to command forces in the area of hostilities. (Zainul Aabideen Qurbani: *Ilal Peshraft wa Inhitaat-e-Muslimeen* (Causes of Progress and Decadence of Muslims), Pg. 88)

[3] Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat* (Strategy of Unity), Vol. 1, Pg. 137

[4] Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.)* (1st Edition), Pgs. 193-194

“Accordingly if we accept and surrender to principle of battles and military action of Caliphs, we cannot deny the fact that most methods of persons in charge of actions from Caliphs’ side were not coherent with decorum of Prophet or warriors of Prophet’s days. But in some cases, they differed greatly so the stance of Ali and Hasan and Husain is different. So it is obvious when Ali and Hasan and Husain did not accept Caliphate and they disputed its legitimacy they of course cannot accept their battles, the motive of battles and consequent battles therefrom.” [1]

Even then it is said:

“They wanted Imam’s co-operation; His Eminence refrained from giving it.” [2]

On the basis of this Imam did not take any initial step with regard to battles. He did not participate in any of them.

“In Shia historical sources we do not find any evidence that could prove Imam’s personal presence in any battles; likewise, presence of Hasan and Husain also. Beyond this, we do not have any Sunni source that could prove for us direct presence of Imam Ali (a.s.) in Caliph’s battles.” [3]

“So history denies their presence. The least we can agree is their presence as consultants and advisors. This they did because they wanted to address their mistakes. We believe that

they (the Imams) having had said not a word that could reflect their approval of Caliphs' government or policies.”[4]

Although in this regard, they have claimed:

“It is evident that if Imam Ali (a.s.) had ill will to Umar or he were displeased with him, and regarded him usurper of his rights, he would always have been awaiting every opportunity to get back his right and for getting rid of the usurper of his rights...advised him to go personally to the battlefield and get killed there.”[5]

[1] Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: *Siyasat Imam Ali-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa*, Pgs. 58-59

[2] Sayyid Ja'far Murtuza Amili: *Tahlili Az Zindagi-e-Siyasi Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.) (1st Edition)*, Pg. 197

[3] Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: *Siyasat Imam Ali-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa*, Pg. 124

[4] *Ibid.* Pg. 130

[5] Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: *Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 7*

“One of the clearest proofs of Ali's sincerity and friendship to Abu Bakr...and support to Caliphate!... was his attitude when Abu Bakr departed...he took charge of the army... God forbid, if Ali had any rancor and malice at heart against Abu Bakr, or had paid allegiance to him by force under dissimulation, this was an excellent opportunity for him. But on the contrary he advised Abu Bakr against going to the battlefield.”[1]

Therefore it can be said:

The only period when Caliphs took to expand borders of country that entailed military actions did Amirul Momineen (a.s.) interfere at the level and to the extent of advice and consultation. He did this to minimize pillage and plunder. This resulted in safety of Islam and Muslims. Although there was a wide difference between the motive of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in dispensing advice and the motive of the Caliphs in seeking the counsel of the Imam (a.s.). They were exactly opposite.

Here we point to one of the political aims:

“To wage wars in name of Jihad in the way of God is the best way to hold differences at home. In those circumstances if one

wanted to knock the door of Justice to regain his usurped right and the applicant, however noblest among the people, was easily blamed as a world loving man or one who is after power.

On the basis of this, it was an excellent opportunity for men of government to achieve their cherished political aims and consolidate their position.”**[2]**

Did associates of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) have Active Presence in Caliphs' government?

Another conjecture repeated in wrong analyses of participation of and support of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) with the Caliphs in administrative affairs is that the special and selected associates and companions of the Imam (a.s.) with concurrence of Imam himself, were in contact with the Caliphs.

In such a way that ultimately these respected persons were put under the command of the Caliph. Thus it is said:

“Companions and friends of Imam followed their leader (Ali) in their conduct and behavior. And they behaved with the Caliphs like Ali did,

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 15, Autumn 82, Pgs. 11-12*

[2] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pgs. 293-294*

during the tenure of the Caliphs as well as after that. The Second Caliph appointed Salman Farsi as governor of Madayn. Ammar Yasir was appointed as governor of Kufa. Others by order of Caliph were sent to battlefield... ”**[1]**

We recommend the translation of *Salman Farsi* by Sayyid Ja'far Murtuza Amili, New Edition,**[2]** page 67-76 to our readers to acquaint themselves with facts. Here we just quote a few points:

Firstly, in all analyses especially regarding motive of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in his acceptance of participation is proved. This applies to his friends also. The informal presence in the scene for protection of religion but with this difference:

“Ali has the same attitude in practice also. He personally did not accept any official post from any Caliph. He did not accept command of army or governorship of a district. He also did not accept administration of Hajj or anything else.

If he had accepted any one of so many proposed offers, it was tantamount to withdrawal of demand of his right and in other words co-operation, while safeguarding unity of Islam was important to him.

Although he himself did not accept any office he did not restrain his friends or family members from accepting posts or offices whatever their desire was or whatever the offer was. He never viewed this as co-operation. In his view, it was never an approval to their Caliphate or his sanction for their occupying his seat.”[3]

“Another important point here is that government of the Caliph was not inclined to utilize services of friends of Ali except in few instances.

In this period, even companions of Prophet were ignored in political and government affairs.

The First Caliph has pointed out that the reason was their own unwillingness. The Second Caliph indicates the reason as restriction he had imposed on them from leaving Medina, i.e. their compulsory stay in Medina.

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in *Kitab Naqd Magazine, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pgs. 24-25*

[2] This book is republished in 1382 in co-operation with *Shirkat Chaap O Nashr Bainul Milal.*

[3] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imamat-o-Rahbari (Imamate and Leadership), Pgs. 20-21*

Perhaps the Caliph feared that if they left Medina since they could not be put under a check or control they might become a pivot of people’s attention and this might lead to problems for the regime.”[1]

In the same way: “During the reign of all three rulers, not one Hashemite was given any post.”[2]

On the basis of this such instances of co-operation can only be called such when there is willingness on both sides.

Otherwise reason must be searched behind policies of Caliphs.

“Ibne Shahar Aashob says about this: Umar appointed Salman as governor of Madayn. Umar’s motive by this act was to spoil Salman’s reputation and destroy his credibility if he happened to make a mistake. But Salman did not accept it before taking permission from Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.).

He went to Madayn and as long as he lived he remained there. He used to gather fuel wood in his outer gown. Half of which was his floor covering while the other half was his outer covering.”**[3]**

Before deceptive and political attitudes of the regime we cannot but say:

“In the instance some senior and sincere Companions took part in these battles it should be remembered that apparently they were unaware of the reality of the matter and their aim was only service to God by rendering service to Imam and Muslims. They were not knowing the view of the Infallible leaders regarding these battles. Because as we have seen it was openly endeavored that people do not come to know the opinion of Ali (a.s.) and most probably the government institutions exercised force to send them to battlefronts.”**[4]**

In the same way:

“It is necessary to mention that the presence of Ali’s friends and followers in battles was not to support the regime and Caliphate. But it was to expand borders of Islam. They were absolutely sincere about it

[1] *Asghar Qaidan: Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 118*

[2] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 282*

[3] *Sayyid Ja’far Murtuza Amili: Salman Farsi, Pg. 85; quoting from: Ad-Darajaat ar-Rafia (Elevated Positions), Pg. 215*

[4] *Ibid. Pg. 200*

and their aim was not to gain spoils of war, such as fertile lands and rich cultivation,**[1]** but it was only to gain God’s pleasure and spread Islam did they participate in these battles.”**[2]**

“There is no doubt that Ali and his sons had no share in any of these battles. People know the brilliant record of Ali and his bravery in battles. So it was not fear of death or his isolation.

The only reason was he did not like to be in service of one who was usurper of his Caliphate. His co-operation would have provided credibility to Governments of those who had occupied his place.

In addition to this his awareness about their motive in these territorial expansion was an impediment to his easy participation in those wars.

What could be said about Imam Ali (a.s.) was that he did not refrain his associates and followers to participate in the campaigns... so that they may stop them from committing tyrannies and inhuman acts in contravention of teachings of Islam.” **[3]**

Conclusion

In a bird's eye view, it can be said about the presence of some prominent associates of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the battles that:

1 - Some of these gentlemen were such that their presence minimized atrocities. Secondly, they could achieve the aims that their Imam had designed and sketched for them.

2 - Some other of these respectable gentlemen were present there because they were forced by the Caliphs due to hidden aims of the Caliphs in sending them to the battlefronts. They were actually exiled by the establishment on this pretext.

It was such an exile that it was hoped that they would not return alive from there.

3 - Dishonest hands of interpolators and falsifiers of historical realities have added the names of these persons in the list of fighters of the Caliphs in order to

[1] [*'Iqta'* is in the meaning of *'Qate-Zameeni'* a piece of land that a king allotted to a person so that he may earn his livelihood from it.]

[2] Asghar Qaidan: *Tahleeli Bar Mawaze Siyasi Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)* [Research on political stands of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)], Pg. 116

[3] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 290 show that the regime of Caliphs was not usurped one and to grant it legitimacy.

The best of these lists are taken from Sunni sources. So perhaps this analysis may be the nearest to reality.

Conjecture mentioned in Haft Aasmaan Magazine[1] - A Reply to it

Based on the premise that the Caliphs held consultations with Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and also that His Eminence Ali (a.s.) and his associates participated in the battles of this period the conjecture says:

“We start this short investigation of ours about the battles during the period of the Caliphs with three questions in this regard:

First question: What do you conclude by Ali’s help to Caliphs in many events and fate-making guidance at critical moments, besides, participation of Imam Hasan and Husain in battles and Ali’s participation in some battles of Caliphs; and also his bearing of responsibilities in the government of the Caliphs? How do you justify them?”[2]

In continuation of these questions, the writer coins three examples. One of them relates to Abu Bakr’s seeking advice of Ali in the first year of his Caliphate about waging war against people of Kinda.

Ali advised him to stay in Medina and send others to combat. Similarly Ali advised Umar to not go himself in war against Romans and Iranians.[3] From these cases the writer derives the following conclusion:

“For the sake of Allah! If Ali had your outlook about Caliphs’ wars he could not have given such useful advice to Umar.”[4]

The article writer in continuation of the first question as another example regarding consultation of the Caliphs with Amirul Momineen (a.s.) further adds:

[1] *Since this reply needs an introduction the readers may once more refer to the prefaces in the second and third section of this book.*

[2] *Sayyid Muhammad Reza Tabatabai: Article quoted in Haft*

Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 225

[3] Refer: Tables in Section Two.

[4] Ibid. Article quoted in *Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 226*

“Many a times Amirul Momineen (a.s.) accepted to substitute for Umar during his absence. Like when Umar had left to supervise the fronts, or he went to Jerusalem, Ali accepted to depute for Umar in Medina.”**[1]**

In continuation of these three instances, which he terms to be ‘many’ he mentions the instance of participation of his associates in the battles and concludes thus:

“These examples truly disprove the idea that Caliphs’ battles were a good pastime for people and a setback for progress of Islam.”

Can this be accepted that men of knowledge and experience and staunch belief like Salman, Ammar, Hujr bin Adi and Adi Hatim were not aware of facts and ignorant of Imam’s opinion?”**[2]**

In continuation of his writing and from that which he is influenced, he concludes:

“Imams of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) had a positive outlook to foreign wars. Some proofs of this are as follows:

A) Anxieties of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) regarding Muslim battles during the period of the Caliphs and his concern for their victory in those battles and also his solving of problems for the Caliphs who were also leaders in those battles.

B) Participation of Hasan and Husain in some wars

C) Participation of some first grade companions of Prophet like Salman, Ammar, Hujr bin Adi in the wars and their administration of the conquered districts. As these could not have been without permission of the Infallible Imam (a.s.)... **[3]**!**[4]**

They mostly quote these narrations in order to defend the battles of the period of Caliphs and the claim that the Imams

(a.s.) were having a positive outlook to foreign wars of Muslims. They are as follows:

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 228*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 229*

[3] *[Arguments of the writer continue]*

[4] *Ibid. Article quoted in Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pgs. 231-232*

Point 1 - Ali's helps to Caliph in solving problems etc. while they were in fact also leaders of those wars!

Point 2 - Ali's counsel and guidance to Caliphs in their most stringent circumstances. Also the fact that Amirul Momineen (a.s.) never refused to heed their request for advice!

Point 3 - Anxieties of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) regarding Muslim battles during the period of the Caliphs and his concern for their victory in those battles. Ali's occupation of Umar's seat in Medina in the days of battles!

Point 4 - Numerous instances of Hazrat Ali (a.s.) substituting for Umar in Medina, and that also during the period of the battles!

Point 5 - Participation of Hasan and Husain (a.s.) in some battles of the Caliphs!

Point 6 - Participation of Hazrat Ali's associates in some battles of the Caliphs supposing their being aware of the view of the Infallible Imam (a.s.)!

Point 7 - Acceptance of responsibilities by Hazrat Ali's associates in Caliphs' government and their participation in administration of conquered regions by approval of Infallible Imam (a.s.)!

Part 11
Criticism and Scrutiny of Ali's
Positive Outlook to Battles[1]

A brief review of discussions that we have mentioned so far will prove the weakness and irrelevance of their arguments and that too with the claim:

“The positive outlook of Imams towards the battles”!

Because such types of conclusions depend on the introduction that we have criticized and scrutinized in the preceding chapters.

If our readers ponder on the results obtained by consultations of Caliphs with Ali and look back to its statistics the number of items or occasions will indicate that there is no such a thing except few occasions mentioned. Else, it is not a historical reality. Similarly, such guidance and connecting it to battles is a thing lacking sense as it is short of reason. It is only a product of their imagination and has no historical reality.

In the same way to say that since the Caliphs consulted Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and he gave his advice and support it shows that he had a positive outlook for battles is wrong. Because to connect the instances of consultation with the battles is not proof enough that Ali (a.s.) also was happy with their battles. Both the things are not having any connection at all.

Because even if it is proved that giving consultation to the Caliphs is proof of positive outlook of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to the battles as at that time they were rulers, before everything else it also included their usurpation of Caliphate of His Eminence (a.s.) because at the time of seeking consultation also the Caliphs were rulers!

Similarly the same scrutinies show that there were only three instances of consultation in military matters and if we pay close attention it will clearly show the motives behind them that none of them had any connection with person of the Caliph or the actual battle.

The important thing to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was his anxiety that mistake must not be committed in those battles that

could lead to total annihilation of Islam and complete domination of infidelity over Muslims.

Therefore from this aspect consultations had no connection with the person of the Caliph of the philosophy of wars in the view of His Eminence (a.s.) that we should

[1] *Criticism and scrutiny of Point 1, Conjecture 4*

conclude from it that it shows positive outlook of Imams (a.s.) to the battles.

When conditions demand vigilance because of war in which Islam has indulged itself the dire necessity becomes protection and safety of Islam. In such a case Imam would have an immediate and direct contact with the Caliph besides his advice for saving Muslims. But conditions differ. In reality, Umar had started war all by himself without consulting the Imam or taking his advice. The Caliph had done it by his own stubbornness.

In such conditions wherein there is no alternative but to send troops necessity dictates some provisional measures to minimize danger which is certain or to avert uprooting blow from hitting Muslims and Islam. Therefore we see the Imam anxious and worried. Else he has no other reason. It was not and cannot be his approval of battles.

In other words, the wrong, rather insane decisions in military issues cause the Caliph's life to be in the mortgage of Islam, i.e. protection of Islam. In such an event, there is no way out but to dispense the best advice for the sake of avoiding reversion to infidelity and saving religion from being wiped out completely. Imam Ali (a.s.) did not pay any importance to Caliph's life if that life was to bring back past ignorant days of idol worship. Ali had warned Umar: If the Caliph does not repent and does not give up the design to revert masses to the old days of infidelity and idol worship I will cut off his head. **[1]**

There is a great difference between the two attitudes of Imam Ali (a.s.). According to his behavior we come to know that the life of Caliph in ordinary circumstances is not of any extra value or worth. Its value comes to worth only in case of

its having an immediate link to Islam's safety or that its end spells Islam's end too. The dread of returning to infidelity of Muslim society or a likelihood of grip of idol worship upon the society makes a Caliph's life worthy or attaches a corresponding worth to it.

Therefore consultation of Ali (a.s.) in military affairs is not a sign of good relations. It does not establish any good terms on either side. So how can it be drawn in the sense of his approval of their Caliphate, or his acknowledgement of their government?

Thus it is said:

[1] Refer: Najmuddin Askari: *Ali wal Khulafa*, Pg. 120; quoted from *Manaqib Khwarizmi*, Pg. 59

"A correct peep into events and a correct circumspection of Ali's stand during 25 years of three Caliphs' period and about 5 years of his own Caliphate leads us to conclude that Ali tried towards strengthening power of Muslims and pillars of Islam. And he did not fall short of efforts in this ground... "![1]

However the battles - if Ali had a positive outlook towards them and had considered them holy, why he did not take part therein and beyond this why he rejected the office of commander that was proposed to him?

As for public deceiving claims that Ali was Umar's deputy in Medina in itself is enough evidence to show their design to give a legal weight to their unlawful gain achieved at Saqifah. If we revise again what we analyzed earlier it would show clearly the motive of the writer of this article.

[1] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 9, Khordad 1381

Part 12
Participation of Hasan and Husain (a.s.) in battles of Caliphs[1]

In this respect Allamah Ja'far Murtuza has given a detailed sketch of events in his book *Analysis of political life of Imam Hasan Mujtaba*, New Edition, that is translated (into Persian). While we recommend this book and stress on the necessity of its perusal we draw your attention to some points:

Introduction

“Before entering into the theme, we point to the matters in relation to the outlook of Imam Hasan and Husain to government and battles of Caliphs.

1 - No researcher has a right to deny or accept before and after applying historical sources and divine texts. The reason is some books are written with bigotry, which results in deviation, perversion and allegations. This is not our word. Shaykh Shaltut, the last Mufti (jurisprudent) of Egypt and chancellor of Al-Azhar University, who himself by faith, was like author of Al-Milal wan-Nihal, says:

Most of those who have written books on Islamic sects and faiths were influenced by a profane spirit of bigotry. Therefore their writing have always added fuel to existing fire among sons of Ummah. These writers have only one point of view as though other angles are closed to them. They see their adversaries from one point. Opinion of a religion, which they oppose and belief of opposite side, which they do not concur with, is belittled and vilified by them. They attribute blames, which could result in mischief and enhance animosity. Neither any good nor any advantage has ever been in contents of their pages. A man of moderation or little justice should not form an opinion about faith on ground of their books. For every sect it is better that he obtains relative literature to be acquainted with the truth concerned.**[2]** How deplorable it is that in our colleges etc. such books are standard sources. By this they teach the youth students of various lands, who are supposed to learn about true Shiaism without studying their books that are criticisms of such books like the third volume of Al-Ghadeer.

[1] *Investigation of Point 5*

[2] *Quoted from: Asad Haider: Al-Imam as-Sadiq wa Mazahib-e-Arba, Vol. 6, Pgs. 391-392*

2 - As a matter of principle, attention must be paid that historical words are like a raw material in our hand. Historian here has nothing other than to cater or feed information. Now

the thing that matters is reason. When performing scrutiny we should place the bits side by side to complete a form picture. So the consistency, coherence, and concordance should constitute a sense not a sense distorted. Its ugliness could incite disdain while its comeliness would encourage love. If not so how right could be distinguished from wrong?**[1]”[2]**

Criticism and Analysis

Similarly as we know, in no Shia or Sunni source there exists a single case to show the presence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in Caliphs' battles. In the same way no Shia source mentions that Imams Hasan and Husain (a.s.) participated in territorial expansion of period of Caliphs, which itself is a matter worth contemplation.

But some Sunni historians have mentioned the presence of Imams Hasan and Husain (a.s.) in these battles. This has gradually resulted in renown of this matter and historians and even some contemporary Shia scholars[3] and jurisprudents[4] have put it in their writings.

Most Sunni writers, like Ibne Athir and Ibne Katheer have quoted Tabari (d. 310) and made him basis of their writing and used the material in their work - Similar to words of Tabari. We dwell here on a few of them:

Tabari in his *Tarikh-e-Umam wal Mulook* (History of Nations and Kings) writes:

"In the year 30, Saeed bin Aas along with few companions like Hasan and Husain and some soldiers left Kufa for Khorasan." [5]

[1] *And also if an analysis is not logical we cannot accept it.*

[2] *Abdullah Khanaqli Hamadani: Siyasat Imam Ali-o-Hasnain Dar Raabita Ba Hukoomat-o-Futuhaat Kholafa, Pgs. 121-122*

[3] *Refer: Baqir Sharif Qarashi, Hayat Imam Hasan bin Ali [Life of Imam Hasan (a.s.)], Vol. 1, Pgs. 201-202*

Hashim Maroof Hasani: Seeratul Aaimma Ithna Ashar, Vol. 1, Pgs. 282-283 & Vol. 2, Pgs. 15-16

[4] *Refer: Hasan Modarresi Tabatabai: Zameen Dar Fiqh-e-Islami*

[5] *Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal-Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 323*

The above quote is the first thing that Tabari has written. In addition to the lack of narrators' credibility[1] it is also fraught

with more significant aspect which makes it difficult to accept the presence of Hasan and Husain in the battles.

Tabari continues the narration about the victory of a town of Tabristan named Tamisa:

“Saeed bin Aas[2] assured the inhabitants of town that not one of them would be killed but when the gates of the town opened, except for one he killed all the people.”[3]

In addition to this the second narration of also Tabari is also related from the same narrators with the difference that in repeating the names of those who took part in the victory of Tabristan the names of Hasan and Husain are missing.

Another point worth nothing is the year. Sunni sources mention it 30 Hijra. This year coincides with Uthman’s Caliphate. So the presence is during Uthman’s Caliphate while the event has taken place in Umar’s Caliphate.

In other words, it is a period when Ali refused to even give any consultation for the battles. It is impossible that Ali should have agreed to send his sons in a bloody campaign of Bani Umayyah in Tabristan.

More interesting is that Ali restricted the presence of Hasan and Husain in battle of Siffeen because he was much anxious about their safety.[4]

So how could he send the two reminders of Fatima (s.a.) to fight in Tabristan under the command of Bani Umayyah?!

On the basis of this and the analysis of Allamah Ja’far Murtuza it is not possible to accept the presence of Hasan and Husain (a.s.) in the battles of Caliphs.

[1] For example: Books of Rijaal of Ahle Sunnat by Ali bin Mujahid (a narrator of this report) has mentioned him to be a liar and a forger.

Refer: Midhi: Tahzeeb al-Kamaal, Pgs. 118-119;
Dhahabi: Mizan al-Etedaal, Vol. 4, Pg. 72

[2] *[That is the commander of this army under whom were Imams Hasan and Husain (a.s.)]*

[3] *Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal-Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 324*

[4] *Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal-Mulook, Vol. 4, Pg. 44*

Part 13
Scrutiny of Participation of Ali's
Companions in Battles and
Government of Caliphs[1]

It is surprising that the writer of the article has no knowledge of companions with regard to facts and reality of matters and opinion of Imams about battles. This analysis is not based on authentic information but on probability and likelihood of participation of companions. This point is not noted.

Therefore if this probability is not accepted, it cannot be a confirmation of battles. Supposing if companions of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) attended on approval of Ali himself and were under no pressure, it is still not a ground to prove Imam Ali's (a.s.) positive outlook.

While it can be said that they might have taken part on ground of other productive reasons so this cannot be a proof of their approval. It could be that the presence of Imam's friends could be a restriction for Caliph's soldiers from plundering and pillaging conquered regions.

Now we would like to ask: what is the reason that all co-operations are confined to supporting their battles. Why they have simply passed by all reasons and causes?

If we accept positive outlook of Ali to battles, it will contradict his statement:

"A Muslim should not go to a holy war in company of one who has no belief in God's command and does not carry God's orders with regard to spoils of war.

If at all he goes and is killed, he has helped him in usurping our rights and shedding our blood. His death is a pagan's death."**[2]**

Are Battles of Caliphs Worth Defending?

He who foments this conjecture while defending battles of Caliphs raises a question and reminds us the presence of Khalid bin Waleed among commanders of combat:

“What can you say about the appointment of this same Khalid bin

[1] *Scrutiny of objections 6-7*

[2] *Shaykh Hurr Amili: Wasaelush Shia, Vol. 11, Pg. 34*

Waleed by the Prophet himself?” **[1]**

Then he gives examples of his command in the days of Prophet **[2]** by way of defending the record of Islamic army and Caliph’s battles. He writes:

“Actions of Muslims in battles and victories are well worth defending and their trifle mistakes can be overlooked. Such things are common in other places too. So instead of justifying piece by piece we should defend them as a whole.” **[3]**

He continues:

“In wars of Prophet, Ali and Hasan also considerable shortcomings were seen on the part of the soldiers and men under their command.” **[4]**

By quoting some examples of this he derives following conclusions:

“A group of eight or twelve men under command of Prophet’s cousin went on a campaign. They committed crimes such as killing two men in a sacred month without orders of the chief command...

The commander himself did not obey orders of Prophet. He killed a number of innocent men, probably Muslims;

When soldiers under the command of the likes of Ali (a.s.) showed disobedience and looted the public treasury...

What can you expect from soldiers and commanders of Muslim armies that sometimes numbered 60,000?

...after all this can it still be said:

The fact is that the style of the battles of the Prophet was absolutely

[1] Sayyid Muhammad Reza Tabatabai: Article quoted in *Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 229*

[2] Even supposing if this commandership is proved we can say:

The appointment of Khalid bin Waleed (who led forces against Islam in the battles of Uhad) shows the submission of Quraish to the power and domination of Islam.

This appointment has a deep effect on subduing the tribes who sided with the Meccans in their opposition to Islam.

[3] Ibid. Article quoted in *Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 235*

[4] Ibid. Article quoted in *Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 241*

different from these territorial expansions of the Caliphs?**[1]**

As shall be seen in this section we shall try to prove that the style of battles of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) was different from the battles of Caliphs and the attitude of their system. There does not exist any similarity between them. Because if men like Khalid bin Waleed were sent in Caliph's wars, of course the Prophet too had sent Khalid to command the battles. But their wrongs were not overlooked and justified in Prophet's days. The same person in the time of Caliphs wronged openly.

There is one main difference between battles of Caliphs and those of Prophet. It was divine permission. Caliphs did not have this. The Prophet, Ali and Hasan did not take a step without first getting God's permission.

“On the basis of this those who have no permission from God regard themselves successors of Prophet. They are from view-point of Quran liars and most tyrannical of human beings. They deserve hardest punishments. Even if they stand at the

Mihraab or sit on a pulpit inviting people to virtue, piety and God-worship. Or they might have fought pagans and expanded Islamic borders and brought territories under the banner of Quran.”[2]

Secondly:

Another thing that is overlooked in these exaggerations is that they have omitted to say anything about the reaction of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and the Holy Imams (a.s.) as what action they took when such heinous crimes were committed by their men. While in the case of the Caliphs we see that they took no action at all in response to the tyrannies committed by their men.

They have nicely quoted the incident of Khalid bin Waleed during the time of the Prophet how he wrought havoc on the Bani Jazima tribe[3] but the writer has conveniently forgotten to mention what the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) did in response to the misdoings of Khalid.

While historical testimonies show that when:

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pgs. 225-226*

[2] *Refer: Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi: Dar Justujoo-e-Ilm-e-Deen (In search of religious knowledge), Pgs. 170-171*

[3] *Refer: Sayyid Muhammad Reza Tabatabai: Article quoted in Haft Aasmaan Magazine, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 244*

“News of Khalid’s crimes reached the Prophet, His Eminence was very angry and shocked. He raised his hands to the sky and said:

O, God! What Khalid has committed, I hate it and seek refuge with You from his doings. Khalid went to the Prophet and the Prophet was infuriated with him.

The Prophet immediately sent Ali to the tribe (victimized by Khalid) of Bani Jazima to compensate them their losses and pay blood money whatever they say to their satisfaction.

Prophet told Ali (a.s.): Go to Bani Jazima, make amends for acts of ignorance and compensate for what Khalid has committed.

Ali paid their blood money and compensated for what Khalid had destroyed or drawn from them by force. Then finally Ali asked them whether there was anything left uncompensated or any blood unpaid. They said no. But for sake of correctness, whatever money was left with Ali he gave it to them telling them that perhaps something might have been forgotten.

Then he returned to the Prophet and reported all he had done. The Prophet appreciated his performance much and said: I had not given the command to Khalid. I had sent him only to invite them to Islam.

Some narrations say that the Prophet raised his hand toward the sky and said three times:

O, God! I seek immunity with You from whatever Khalid has done.”**[1]**

Regretfully not only have they omitted this reaction of the Prophet we don't understand why the writer has not mentioned all these details? The writer does not miss to mention any wrongs or crimes committed by cousin of the Prophet or soldiers of Ali. But he so easily missed to write about the reactions of Prophet or Ali to these criminal actions, or what they did to redress and make amend for their crimes. Whether he mentions or misses, the truth finally does appear. The facts cannot be hidden for long as the clouds cannot hide the sun. He is only anxious to hold one dimension as if no other dimension exists. Only battles matter to him.

[1] *Mustafa Dilshad Tehrani: Meeras Rabooda (Usurped inheritance), Pgs. 171-172; quoting from: Al-Maghazi, Vol. 2, Pgs. 875-881; Sirah Ibne Hisham, Vol. 4, Pgs. 53-55; Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 2, Pgs. 147-148; Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 3, Pgs. 66-68; Al-Kamil Fit Tarikh, Pgs. 255-256; Sirah Ibne Kathir, Vol. 2, Pgs. 201-202.*

In the same way when he writes about the disobedience of soldiers under the command of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and

their plunder of treasury, he has not mentioned that this took place in the absence of His Eminence (a.s.). When Amirul Momineen (a.s.) learnt of this he was shocked and punished the wrongdoers and announced his dissociation with this act of theirs. But the writer had not mentioned all this. **[1]**

Anyway he does not see such a big blunder committed by Khalid bin Waleed so he does not mention it. Let us remind him about Malik bin Nuwairah and his tribe which was the only quarter which did not acknowledge Abu Bakr's rule as legitimate. So what did Khalid do?

When:

"Khalid killed Malik while he was saying that he was a Muslim. He kept Malik's severed head under the cooking pot and the same night he slept with his widow... " **[2]**

After this terrible crime was committed by Khalid - commander and messenger of the First Caliph;

Abu Bakr said: "I will not stone him. He did Ijtihad and made a mistake...I shall not sheathe the sword that God has drawn out. **[3]**" **[4]**

Although the reaction of the First Caliph in this regard was not limited to this, but as Tabari writes:

"Abu Bakr never punished any of his officers and soldiers. As if in his policy he did not believe in imposing any penalties on his officers and soldiers." **[5]**

The Second Caliph also adopted the same policy with regard to his courtiers, friends, servants, associates and those who were around him. Umar too never punished any religious transgression. One instance is that of Mughaira bin Shoba whom Umar had appointed as governor of Basrah province in Iraq. He

[1] Refer: Sayyid Muhammad Reza Tabatabai: Article quoted in *Haft Aasmaan Magazine*, Issue Nos. 12-13, Winter 80 & Spring 81, Pg. 244

[2] Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Naqsh-e-Aaimma Dar Ahya-e-Deen (Role of Imams in the Revival of Religion)*, Vol. 16,

Pg. 44

[3] [Refer: *Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya*, Vol. 6, Pg. 322]

[4] *Ibid.* Vol. 16, Pg. 45

[5] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 229

committed adultery, which makes one liable for stoning according to Islamic legislation. Umar did not obey God's order in punishing Mughaira; but did a most interesting thing.

Not only the Second Caliph arrested the fourth witness in the case of Mughaira he also subjected the remaining three witnesses to religious punishment at the hands of Mughaira himself. The punishment, which he was supposed to execute against Mughaira because he was the criminal in question.**[1]**

After these two cases how can we expect the Caliphs to punish their men who had been instrumental in earning such important victories?!

Perhaps the article writer regards as trifle and frivolous and worth being overlooked even the crime that Khalid committed in the name of Islam and Islamic government with regard to Malik bin Nuwairah and his wife!**[2]**

But the Prophet never defended his relatives or staff or anyone associated to him in event of their being wrong or having done a wrong. He held them responsible for their mistakes; and imposed upon them punishment relative to that crime or crimes. But did the First and Second Caliph who were sitting in place of Prophet and were supposed to be in track of Prophet and tread the very path of the Prophet also do this? No. Rather they tried all means to cover the mistakes of their men and it also seen that:

Such crimes flourished because of support of Caliphs. If government officials become criminals and government was to turn a blind eye upon their crimes who remains there to check them?! Though these men had committed the most horrible crimes!!

Forced Participations of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) in Caliphs' Government

The last point worth noting at the end of the discussion regarding participation of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the government of the Caliphs is that in some instances the policy of the Caliphal regime was such that it should in any way compel His Eminence (a.s.) to take some steps; for example one case of applying force to enable strengthening of the foundation of Caliphate was as follows:

[1] Refer: Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin: *Ijtihad Dar Maqabil-e-Nass* (Translated by Ali Dawani), Pgs. 340-345

[2] Refer: Ali Gholami Dahqi: *Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar*, Section Six, Pgs. 81-94

“Giving importance to congregation prayers and denouncing and even tagging those who do not attend their congregation as apostates.

Traditions censuring non-attendance of congregation leading to disunity of Muslims were emphasized. Necessity of being in the congregation as a right of the leadership of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) or the Imam was applied to themselves and even traditions in this regard were fabricated... ”**[1]**

In such circumstances, not only the absence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in such customs would have given excuse to the regime to suppress him further;**[2]** but more than that it would have destroyed all chances of Imam’s intervention in affairs of the regime aimed at guarding the religion of Islam.

While the Imam (a.s.) was not in pursuit of such a kind of seclusion from Islamic society.

On the basis of this as has been proved so far there does not exist any evidence that some instances of Imam’s help and advice denote similarity of his aims with the Caliphs. Rather if we pay attention to the narrations we find that there is a wide gulf of difference between the policy aims of both the parties.

Such that they could be considered to be fundamental differences:

Amirul Momineen (a.s.) never allowed that his attitudes be interpreted to be in favor of Caliphate and behavior of the Caliphs or that they may get an opportunity to take advantage of his attitude to help their deviated aims.

What the Imam (a.s.) was in pursuit of is completely different to what the Caliphal regime aimed in obtaining his help and support.

In spite of the fact that wrong interpretations and analyses are propagated to the contrary.

Thus they claim:

“Other notable example of co-operation of Ali (a.s.) is his participation in congregational prayers led by Abu Bakr.”!**[3]**

“On the basis of statements of modern Shia scholars like Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Baqir Hujjati, Amirul Momineen (a.s.)...participated in their congregation prayers so much that people never noticed his absence in

[1] *Dr. Ali Akbar Hasani: Tarikh Tahlili wa Siyasi Islam, Vol. 1, Pg. 354*

[2] *Thus Saad bin Ubadah only because he did not give Bayyat to the Caliph and did not participate in their gatherings he was first exiled to Syria and then killed.*

[3] *Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity), Vol. 1, Pg. 124*

the society. And never imagined that Amirul Momineen Ali was heading in another direction! And that he had severed connection with the society ruled by the Caliphs.”!**[1]**

Although there is another analysis regarding this that in no way talks of any special meaning that could be derived from these actions of Imam (a.s.) because it is believed that:

“In such circumstances going to the Masjid and being present there... was ordinary matter.”**[2]**

This analysis also ultimately does not consider these steps to be construed as support to the Caliphs and their behavior.

“Presence of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in their gatherings was not voluntary and willful. His Eminence spent most of his time in the Prophet’s mosque and the same presence was followed by his presence in their assemblies.

On the basis of this His Eminence did not go there especially to attend their gatherings.”

Moreover, even if he attended their gatherings with intent it was with the purpose of forbidding evil, because they used to refer to His Eminence in many issues.**[3]**

On the basis of this a correct attitude and a firm connection with affairs of religion were the factors of his presence in their gatherings.”**[4]**

Historical documents and sources show that after Abu Bakr emerged from three-day seclusion**[5]** there ensued another debate and discussion at the end of which Amirul Momineen (a.s.) said in reply to another invitation of his associates:

[1] *Muhammad Barfi: Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni viewpoint), [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 130*

[2] *Rasool Ja’faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 20*

[3] *[Scrutinies of Discourse Two show that this was too less for the period of 25 years of the Caliphs’ rule.]*

[4] *Sayyid Murtuza Alamul Huda: Tanziyaul Anbiya (Translated by Ameer Salmani Raheemi), Pg. 227*

[5] *Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article: Saqifah quoted in Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.), Vol. 8, Pg. 458*

“Then by Allah I did not enter the Masjid except like brother Moosa and Haroon when his companions said to him: go

therefore you and your Lord, then fight you both, surely we will here sit down.**[1]**

And by Allah I do not enter except for the Ziarat of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) or to decide a case..."**[2]**

This narration clearly shows the limited aims of the presence of His Eminence (a.s.) in the Masjid.

[1] *Surah Maidah 5:24*

[2] *Tabarsi: Ihtijaaj, Vol. 1, Pg. 81; Majlisi: Biharul Anwar, Vol. 28, Pg. 208*

Part 14
Did Amirul Momineen (a.s.) Always Attend Caliphs' Prayers?

Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani, in this respect has this to say:

“Regarding presence of Imam Ali (a.s.) in Prayers of Caliphs this much can be said: Although it is well-rumored there is no basis to it. There are many matters and subjects, sometimes new and interesting – but without a root or a base to it. Although some have taken for granted these things as sure and certain, but we in spite of our search do not find any documentary proof to it. What document or evidence, valid or otherwise exists to establish that Ali was always present in their prayers?

The only thing that exists is the material written by Abu Saad Samani in his book *Al-Ansaab* that can be regarded as a miracle of Ali with regard to exposing scandals of opponents. We have narrated the case earlier.

The case in question might have occurred earlier to Ali’s acknowledgment to Abu Bakr’s authority. Or his (Ali’s) dissidence with Caliphs should have been already known to public. Else there seems no ground for their decision to kill Imam Ali (a.s.).”**[1]**

The author in another place referring to the actual case says:

“So far we have not found any creditable source to bring this fact home to us that Imam Ali (a.s.) was obliged to be present in Prayers of Abu Bakr or someone else. On the basis of what Samani’s book**[2]** says:

Ali was present in Prayers of Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr had issued orders to Khalid earlier to kill Ali. Abu Bakr was still in Prayers he spoke to Khalid not to do what he had asked him to do.

Of course speaking during Prayer invalidates it, but Abu Bakr regardless to this fact spoke. Because Samani’s is not a book of traditions to be particular for creditability.

And it is the will of God that this case reached to our knowledge although other authors tried to hide it.”**[3]**

[1] *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Imam-at-e-Bila Fasl (Edit. Muhammad Reza Kareemi), Pgs. 223-224*

[2] Samani: *Al-Ansaab*, Vol. 6, Pg. 170, Published by Muhammad Amin Samaj, Beirut, 1400 A.H.

[3] Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: *Imamat-e-Bila Fasl* (Edit. Muhammad Reza Kareemi), Pg.

Deviation in Narration from Shia Sources

It won't be out of place to remind that in order to prove good relations between Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Caliphs they bring two narrations from books of Shia scholars and present them under the title: 'Prayers with Caliphs'...

"Shaykh Hurr Amili writes in *Wasaelush Shia*, Kitabus Saalat, Pg. 534 that Imam (a.s.) says: The Prophet of Allah (s.a.w.s.) established relation with the Caliphs and Ali (a.s.) performed Prayers behind them.

The great Shia scholar, Late Allamah Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin, writes in *Answers to issues of Moosa Jarulla*:

Prayer of Ali behind Abu Bakr and Umar was not a dissimulation. An Infallible Imam cannot worship Allah on a basis of dissimulation. On the other hand a Shia can pray behind a Sunni. His Prayers is correct - not wrong."! **[1]**

In reply to this objection first we investigate the narration of *Wasaelush Shia* and make three notable points:

Point One

The statement that: The Prophet married two daughters of Caliphs and Ali prayed behind them is silent about the cause and description of how this was done. To find the conditions or circumstances governing these attitudes it is enough to look at titles under which Shia scholars have narrated the incidents.

Shaykh Hurr Amili has classified according to his own intelligence and understanding. In fact, the titles chosen by him show his insight in relation to contents of narrations.

It is interesting that the late Shaykh in his book mentions them under the heading: 'Chapter of appreciability of attending Congregation Prayers in dissimulation behind one who is

not qualified to lead prayers and standing with him in the first row'.

In the same way this narration is mentioned in *Biharul Anwar***[2]** and *Mustadrak*

143

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Article: *Nahjul Balagha and Wahdat-e-Islami*, quoted in *Mashal-e-Ittehaad (Torch of Unity)*, Pg. 26; Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 1, Pgs. 124-125

[2] Allamah Majlisi: *Biharul Anwar*, Vol. 103, Pg. 375
*al-Wasael***[1]** under following chapters:

Chapter of marriage of polytheists, infidels and Ahle Bayt-haters.

Chapter of lawfulness of marrying the deprived, those who are doubtful but show themselves to be Muslims and detestability of giving a Shia lady to them in marriage.

Result drawn from contemplating on these headings:

Firstly: The Imam (leader) of prayers in these narrations is not eligible to be followed, i.e. to pray behind him. Besides, from the angle of jurisprudence too he is not fit to the office of leading congregation prayers. He is neither a just man nor conditions in him qualify him to lead prayers for a congregation – no matter, small or large. In other words, the Imam of prayers is impaired with his followers of prayers. As such, to pray behind such a man can only be possible in dissimulation and the reward mentioned for this act is like the value of dissimulation and it has no connection with the leader of prayer.

Secondly: Narrators who have quoted these narrations in the section related to ‘The Prophet married’ in the discussion of marriage, have clearly kept veiled the entity and personality of wife and Imam of prayers. This reflects the conditions prevalent in society, which necessitated dissimulation.

Point Two

To understand a part of a narration we cannot ignore the wordings ahead or behind which would result in making the narration itself deficient.

Such a look would end in a contradictory comprehension in relation to its real meaning. Therefore we write a full extract from, *Wasaelush Shia* (the Aal al-Bait Print). The narration runs as follows:

“Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Isa, in his miscellaneous reports from Uthman bin Isa from Samma that he said:**[2]** I asked him about their marriages and prayers behind them. He said: This is a difficult thing. You cannot do that. The Prophet married and Ali prayed behind them.”**[3]**

In the first part we read the tradition:

“It is a difficult thing that you are asked to do and you cannot cut off relations with them and are compelled to do it.”

[1] *Muhaddith Noori: Mustadrak al-Wasael, Vol. 14, Pg. 440*

[2] *Mustadrak al-Wasael, Vol. 14, Pg. 144*

[3] *Shaykh Hurr Amili: Wasaelush Shia, Vol. 8, Pg. 301, Tr. 10*

This shows there was compulsion and coercion. One is forced to maintain relations with the opponents.

As if the main thing is to keep away but under compulsion one is to remain with them.

Point Three

If we ignore the beginning of this narration and suffice on the part, we conclude that the narration is silent with regard to conditions. To learn about the conditions prevailing at that time we have to seek some other report similar to these narrations.

This tradition is known as the ninth tradition and exists in *Wasaelush Shia* in the following wordings:

“Ali bin Ja’far says in his book narrating from his brother, Moosa bin Ja’far, that Hasan and Husain prayed behind Marwan and we prayed along with them.”[1]

Attention is required here. In the contents it is not clear whether Hasan and Husain, although praying in a group, prayed individually or prayed following the leader of prayers; i.e. Marwan. The contents do not disclose whether Ali too prayed with them. Also not obvious in the contents is whether Hasan and Husain prayed in dissimulation or what the conditions were for their praying. However in the contents there arise great many questions.

Therefore we must search for narrations, which could open doors for us to see prayers, which our Imams performed with opponents and adversaries.

A salient difference exists between congregation prayers of Shias and other than Shia. The leaders of prayers (Imam of congregation) in Shia must be a just man, i.e. a man of probity and piety, virtue and having justice. This clearly proves that if

a Shia prays behind an opponent of Shia faith, it does not mean that he has paid allegiance to him, his opinion, his school or his belief, because in this instance the condition of justice is cancelled.

Alongside this group of narrations, there are also traditions that clarify the matter further as follows:

“Ja’far bin Muhammad narrates from his father that Hasan and Husain used to recite the opening chapter and other chapter when they prayed behind Imam of prayers.” [2]

[1] *Ibid. Vol. 8, Pg. 301, Tr. 9*

[2] *Allamah Majlisi: Biharul Anwar, Vol. 88, Pg. 47, Tr. 5; quoting from: Qurbul Asnaad*

This narration in fact tells us how the Infallible Imams prayed behind their opponents. This not only explains the method of prayers of Hasan and Husain (a.s.) in the narration about congregation prayer under the leadership of Marwan, it also tells us about the way Amirul Momineen (a.s.) prayed behind the Caliphs.

On the other hand Allamah Majlisi has this to say under the explanation of these narrations, which is worth nothing:

“When Imams prayed behind the leaders of tyranny they used to pray under dissimulation and they did not make an intention of following them. They used to recite as if independently; reciting the Surah Hamd and another Surah themselves.

On the other hand it has been much stressed to attend congregation prayers. There are also traditions in this respect. It becomes compulsory in time of dissimulation.

But it is recommended that if possible one should pray at home and then join them in congregation and pray with them. And if not then it is obligatory to recite the opening chapter and another Surah oneself. And according to well known view in their leadership Qiraat is not cancelled. Rather in the book of *Muntaha* it is mentioned that: We do not have an opposing view in this matter, and in these prayers it is not required to

recite the Hamd and Surah loudly and even if it is not possible to recite the Surah only Hamd is sufficient; although in my view it is obligatory to recite the Surah also and apparently in this matter there is no difference of opinions. If the Imam of congregation goes into Ruku (kneeling) before finishing the chapter he can finish the chapter in Ruku. Some say that reciting the Hamd and Surah is exempted in helplessness. In the same way in *Tahzeeb* this absolute view is mentioned and that this same prayer is valid. It is even said that: If one could not catch them in reciting the chapter, he can leave it altogether and join them in Ruku, and his prayer will be correct but it is precautionary to later repeat even the Prayer in which one has recited Hamd and Surah in his heart, under dissimulation.”

The message of this outlook means to say the view of all jurists of Imamiyah sect is at parity. From many aspects it is in the category of response given by Allamah Sharafuddin in his *Answer to the Problems of Jarallah*. We quote the actual text from his book. In the meantime we must point out that Bi-Aazaar Shirazi has clearly and openly distorted the text. The facts and realities are sacrificed for the sake of so-called unity. It reflects a criminal tendency to distort authentic texts of well-known scholars of Imamiyah sect for their own benefits and ends.

According to the extract taken from his book of *Answer to the Problems of Jarallah*, Allamah Sharafuddin believes:

“Dissimulation in worship acts is that the Imam performs an action without intention that it be for proximity to God. It is only based on fear of a tyrant ruler.

And dissimulation in propagation of religion is that the Imam attributes a verdict to the Prophet while in fact, it is not from him. Although it is clear that dissimulation is never practiced by an Infallible Imam. And to consider narrations and worship acts of Imam as being dissimulation is to ridicule his infallibility and honesty.”**[1]**

In other words, Moosa Jarullah from this statement intends to inject the readers mind with belief that dissimulation is a

possibility for an Imam that enables him the performance of a thing not for God's sake but to find a scapegoat from detrimental surrounding imposed by a tyrant. In fact, it does not benefit the Imam to stoop to such a category. If we accept this we have to deny his status of being infallible, which is irrecusable.

Jarallah after this marginal introduction in which he sets dissimulation to face infallibility of Imam prepares the minds of the readers to accept Imam's actions on the basis of dissimulation proceeds further to say:

Allamah Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin (q.s.) says in response to these claims:

"Ali, peace be upon him and his sons, was punctual to perform prayers in their early hours. He was particular to perform prayers in congregation following the three Caliphs. He did this for the sake of God. He also prayed Friday prayers behind all three Caliphs seeking God's satisfaction. His prayers were on the ground of his virtue and piety."**[2]**

By this Jarallah aims to secure credibility and validity for Caliphs. He wants to establish legitimacy of their Caliphate because Ali prayed behind them. So they were men of justice and moral.

[1] *Allamah Sharafuddin: Ajooba Masail-e-Jarullah (Matbatul Irfan - Saida - 1953 A.D., 1373 A.H. 2nd Edition), Pg. 84*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 86*

Jarallah represents dissimulation as an act of show and a trick. So considers prayers of Imam outside circle of worship and bereft of sincere intention to seek nearness to God. On the other hand he refers to prayers of Ali, which he performed behind three Caliphs as remote from dissimulation to establish his own motives and aims.

Allamah Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin against such propaganda says:

"I said: No, never. Ali prayed only to seek nearness with God. He prayed to impart what God has obliged him to do. His prayer behind them was only with aim to please God. We prayed following prayers of Imam and we sought nearness with God.

We too have prayed several times behind Sunni Imam of prayers being too sincere to God. This is allowed in faith of Ahle Bayt. The worshiper, though behind a Sunni, obtains the reward as he does while praying behind a Shia. One who knows our faith, is aware of the condition of justice for the leader of prayers. On the basis of this following a sinner and ignorant Shia was not allowed while these conditions do not exist for the leader of congregation in Sunni sect and they are allowed to follow anyone.”[1]

From the comments of Sharafuddin, we discover that he has corrected the specifications of dissimulation given by Jarallah. In the second place he (Sharafuddin) has explained dissimulation within domain of worship - and not as Jarallah describes it.

According to Sharafuddin, the act of dissimulation represents God’s command within teaching of faith. Sharafuddin regards dissimulation a means of proximity to God. As such he totally rejects the opinion of Jarallah with regard to dissimulation.

Finally, Sharafuddin impedes the way paved by Jarallah to benefit from dissimulation to gain legitimacy and legality for Caliphs. The man who leads prayers in Shia school must be just and of good reputation. This condition invalidates the endeavor of Jarallah. The leader of Prayer must not be profane or a man of no respect among the people. We shall deal with this subject in detail as **“Justice is not a condition for a man who leads prayers in other than Shia sect.”**

He has clearly displayed the worth of prayer behind a Shia and behind a Sunni individual (or Caliphs). The justice of Caliphs or they being men of justice and

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 87*

piety he puts to question and repudiates this quality in them. In the light of this description the reader becomes attentive that the act of Imam Ali (a.s.) and his followers, Shias, does not give any support to them nor do they agree with them. Their dissidence is already concealed in their behavior.

In any case, firstly the response of Sharafuddin to the query of Jarallah is not personal inclination. It reflects the conditions prevalent in society. The direction of thought is an element at a zenith that cannot be neglected but necessarily to conceive the entailing developments.

Secondly: This answer of Sharafuddin refutes the conjecture, which Jarallah disseminates and not that it is to censure deviation of a tradition or taking a part of it for own benefit as it does not need an answer because later the truth is bound to become known.

Because such arrangement of texts is bound to put doubts in the minds of readers with regard to the behavior of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) this group is more dangerous than that of unity-seekers. It is thus said:

“...His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) was always with our chief, Abu Bakr and was present in all prayers behind him.” **[1]**

“Ali (a.s.) himself also joined in Prayer with the Righteous Caliphs.” **[2]**

[1] *Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 15, Autumn 82, Pg. 11*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Interview in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 4, Summer 79, Pg. 60*

Part 15
Scrutiny and Criticism of Ana-
lyses Publicized in Respect of
Relations between Caliphs and
Amirul Momineen (a.s.)

What conjectures are presented in this regard?

The last set of conjectures of unity-seekers with regard to relations between Caliphs and Imam Ali (a.s.) targets good relations between the rulers and the House of the Prophet. They wish to establish that there existed good terms between Caliphs and the Prophet's family.

These conjectures can be divided into two groups.

Group One:

Conjectures are put into circulation to prove existence of good relations. But no historical evidence is presented. A general package of conjectures is set in the course of a rumor which says there existed good relations but does not show a proof.

Group Two:

Conjectures that propagate existence of good relations on the basis of some fixed and widely known historical evidences or events.

So we shall take up the first group in brief and come down to the second group in our analysis and also refute some conjectures propagated in this group:

Generally to prove that there existed good and friendly relations between the three Caliphs and the House of the Prophet statements are issued as follows:

“What is fixed and settled is that all companions especially the Righteous Caliphs behaved with each other like brothers....”**[1]**

“For 23 years in the lifetime of Prophet and 25 years after passing away of Prophet, Ali had friendly relations with Caliphs. He used to visit them in their houses and had family ties with them... ”**[2]**

“Whether in the lifetime of the Prophet or after his death, Ali used to meet and visit the three Caliphs. He had contacts with them and family relations with them.”**[3]**

[1] *Abdur Raheem Mahmoodi: Maqaam-e-Sahaaba wa Zindagi-e-Khulafa-e-Raashideen Dar yek Nigaah (Status of Companions and life of Rightly Guided Caliphs in a Glance), Pg. 36*

[2] *Sayyid Jawad Mustafavi: Article quoted in Kitab Wahdat (Book of Unity), Pg. 131; article quoted in Mashkoot Magazine, Issue No. 2, Spring 62, Pg. 52*

[3] *Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity), Vol. 1, Pg. 125*

To analyse this claim we must first see individually the relations of each Caliph with the House of Divine Revelation during the lifetime and after passing away of Prophet.

Relations of the First Caliph with the Family of Revelation (a.s.)

In this field, we see evidence:

“Abu Bakr Siddiq entertained a particular affection and a deep sincerity towards the family and relatives of Prophet.”**[1]**

To scrutinize this claim we must go back to the days the Prophet lived.

“If it is correct to say that when the Prophet was alive, there existed two political trends among the Muhajireen. Those who were after Caliphate did not have good relations with Ali. Since those days, the two old men – Abu Bakr and Umar – were not friendly with Ali. In biographical narrations there is no mention of any open enmity. Likewise, there is no mention to prove friendly relations between them and Ali.

Ayesha herself has confessed her enmity with Ali even in the lifetime of the Prophet. This could be a proof of enmity of the house of Abu Bakr with Ali – if Ayesha’s words are taken into consideration.

When Fatima died all the widows of the Prophet joined the mourning ceremonies of Bani Hashim, but Ayesha did not attend under excuse of illness. It is narrated from Ali that Ayesha even expressed her happiness at Fatima’s death.

Anyway, immediately after Abu Bakr became the Caliph the insistence of the Imam to prove his rights with relation to Caliphate became a reason for difficulty between their relations.”**[2]**

Perhaps the only memory of friendly relation with Abu Bakr could be this:

“Abu Bakr approached the Prophet to seek Fatima’s hand for Ali in marriage. Then the Prophet gives him the assignment to go to the market and buy for Fatima the dowry (that is the things needed for day-to-day life).”**[3]**

[1] *Khuda Raham Lakzai: Article quoted in Interview in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 5, Spring 80, Pg. 35*

[2] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Momin-aan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 13*

[3] *Sayyid Jawad Mustafavi: Article quoted in Kitab Wahd-at (Book of Unity), Pg. 131;*

“Abu Bakr approached the Prophet to seek Fatima’s hand for Ali in marriage. Then the Prophet gives him the assignment to go to the market and buy for Fatima the dowry (that is the things needed for day-to-day life)... Such relations or such services rendered were a common thing among companions of Prophet. Such services helped in bringing persons closer and making their friendship deeper.”**[1]**

In reply we say:

“Firstly: It was the second year of Hijra when Ali married Hazrat Fatima (a.s.). So this is far behind the developments of Saqifah and other events pertaining to Caliphate. As such, the claim is absolutely wrong.

Secondly: With regard to marriage of Ali and Zahra, Sunni scholars have written from reliable sources that the Prophet said: Indeed, the Almighty Allah has commanded me to give my daughter, Fatima in marriage to Ali (a.s.).

It is when the two of them (Abu Bakr and Umar) had separately gone to him for the hand of Fatima for themselves and got a negative reply...with this detail that in the matter of this marriage that is directly commanded by God Almighty and that also after Abu Bakr and Umar both has been disappointed in their efforts to get the hand of Fatima (s.a.). You wonder whether these two persons or others had design that it should happen or not?”**[2]**

Some Shia sources narrate the development of seeking Zahra’s hand from the Prophet by those two as follows:

“One day Abu Bakr, Umar and Saad bin Maaz were sitting in the mosque of the Prophet. The conversation turned to the marriage of the Prophet’s daughter, Fatima (s.a.). Abu Bakr told Umar and Saad bin Maaz: Get up. Let us go to Ali and ask him to go to the Prophet to seek Zahra’s hand in marriage. If he is hindered by impecunious circumstances we will support him. So they managed to convince Ali to go...Abu Bakr and Umar sent His Eminence as a test**[3]** and themselves waited for him outside. When Ali came out, they asked: what is the news? His Eminence

article quoted in Mashkoot Magazine, Issue No. 2, Spring 62, Pg. 52

[1] Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 125

[2] Engineer Jawad Husaini Tabatabai: *Dar Pasukh-e-Afsana-e-Shahadat*, Pgs. 171-173

[3] *[Because to anyone who proposed for the hand of Zahra, the Prophet gave a negative reply due to divine orders]*

said: His Eminence, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has married his daughter Fatima to me and told me that God has performed our marriage in heaven...when Abu Bakr and his companions heard the news they pretended to be happy...”**[1]**

Another case pertaining to the relations of Abu Bakr with Amirul Momineen (a.s.) goes back to the time of Prophet’s flight from Mecca to Yathrib and their halt at Quba; at that time:

“Abu Bakr insisted that they enter Medina as soon as possible but the Prophet said: I will not enter Medina unless my brother, I mean, the son of my mother, Ali and my daughter Fatima come and join me. So Abu Bakr went alone to Medina in Ali’s jealousy.”**[2]**

Historical sources mention that:

“The Prophet stayed in Quba for fifteen days until Ali arrived.

Abu Bakr told the Prophet: Ali may not come for a month! People of Medina are waiting for you!

The Prophet said: No, it is not so. He will come soon. I too shall not move unless my cousin, my brother, the dearest one among my family and one who risked his life to save me, comes.

This answer of the Prophet pained Abu Bakr. He left the Prophet at Quba and went to one of his friends' house in Sunha locality in Quba.”[3]

To summarize these events we can say:

“Relations between Imam Ali (a.s.) and Abu Bakr were cold and not worth mention.”[4]

Throughout the history of the Prophet, there is not one single incident to show existence of close, sincere, or intimate relations between Abu Bakr and the House of Divine Revelation. Now remains this claim to dwell upon:

“Warm and sincere relations existed between devotees of the Prophet during the rule of the First Caliph, the Siddiq Akbar...”[5]

[1] Allamah Majlisi: *Jila al-Uyoon*, Pgs. 202-208

[2] Dr. Ali Akbar Hasani: *Tarikh Tahlili wa Siyasi Islam*, Vol. 1, Pg. 179

[3] Muhammad Husain Rajabi: Article ‘Imam Ali Dar Ahd-e-Payambar’ quoted in *Danish Nama Imam Ali*, Vol. 8, Pgs. 161-162; quoting from: *Rasooli Mahallati: Zindigani Amirul Momineen (a.s.)*, Pg. 86

[4] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)]*, Pg. 16

[5] Khuda Raham Lakzai: Article quoted in *Interview in Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue

To scrutinize this conjecture we have no way but to revert to the history of conduct and behavior of Abu Bakr toward the House of Divine Revelation. The scale of his affection and devotion to Ahle Bayt can be epitomized in one or two historical documents.[1]

“Balazari writes in *Al-Ansaab Al-Ashraaf*:

When Ali refrained from paying allegiance to Abu Bakr, he ordered Umar to go and fetch Ali by utmost coercion and maximum pressure.

Ibne Abde Rabb writes in Al-Iqd al-Fareed:

Abu Bakr assigned Umar bin Khattab to go and pull those (means Ali) out of their house and bring them to him. And he told him: If they do not come out, fight them.” [2]

Therefore it can be said:

Anyway, immediately after Abu Bakr became the Caliph and the insistence of the Imam to prove his rights with relation to Caliphate became a reason for difficulty between their relations.

Attack on Fatima’s house, Fatima’s anger upon them, absence of permission for Abu Bakr and Umar to attend Fatima’s burial deepened the differences.” [3]

On the basis of this there never existed good relations during the days of the Prophet but immediately after Abu Bakr becoming the first Caliph, harsh and impolite relations started hurting the House where once descended angels and divine revelations. So now how can one say:

“Can one who has such intentions and beliefs about Zahra usurp her rights?” [4]

No. 5, Spring 80, Pg. 30

[1] For sources of attack on Fatima’s house refer to Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: *Muhaziraat Fil Iteqaadaat, Vol. 2, Mazloomiyat-e-Zahra*; Ayatullah Ja’far Subhani: *Al-Hujjat al-Gharra Alaa Shahadat-e-Zahra*; Abduz Zahra Mahdi: *Al-Hujoom Alaa Bait-e-Fatima*; Husain Ghaib Gholami: *Ahraaq-e-Bait-e-Fatima (Arabic)* and also: Sayyid Muhammad Husain Sajjad: *Aatish Ba Khana-e-Wahy*; Masoodpoor Sayyid Aaqai: *Hoor Dar Aatish (Persian)*

[2] Engineer Jawad Husaini Tabatabai: *Dar Pasukh-e-Afsana-e-Shahadat, Pgs. 109-111*

[3] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 13*

[4] *Khuda Raham Lakzai: Article quoted in Interview in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue*

These conjectures are answered by History very clearly:

When Abu Bakr confiscated Fadak ignoring that it was personal property of Fatima and ignoring that it had been presented to Fatima by her father – the Prophet, Fatima demanded her right. He demanded witnesses to prove her claim. By so doing so he reflected that he had no belief in the Book of God – Quran in which the verse of purity clearly attests the impeccability and infallibility of Fatima and her sons – that is Ahle Bayt. Then he rejected the witnesses. It was a plot to deprive her of her own wealth and property. It is clear that he did not want to give back Fadak to her as he did not relinquish the office of Caliphate to Ali. Ali comes forward in defense of Fatima, but Abu Bakr remains adamant. There is exchange of words between Imam Ali (a.s.) and Abu Bakr.

“The Imam after saying this goes home with a heavy heart. A din of voices fills the air. People among themselves say Ali is right. Fatima is right. It is their right.

At that moment Abu Bakr goes to the pulpit and in order to silence the people says: O you people! What is this clamor for? You lend ear to everyone’s word. He (meaning Imam Ali) is a fox. The tail is his witness. He is after mischief. He himself is a malefic. He invites people to chaos. He seeks succor from a weak and takes help from women. He is like Umme Tahal, whose closest relatives were corrupt in her view.

How imperious was the Caliph at the power he held. How brazen faced he is and insulting to the Imam. We can gauge the manners and etiquette of the Caliph and how he debased one whose purity the verse of purification had acknowledged...

Ibne Abil Hadeed was very much surprised by all this insult done by the Caliph to Imam Ali (a.s.) and asked his teacher Ja’far bin Yahya Basri whether the Caliph had meant Ali? His teacher replied: Yes, my son. It is so. Ruling a government was in question...

Yes! The fact is that the Caliphs did not spare anything to debase Ahle Bayt (a.s.) to establish their rule.”**[1]**

No. 5, Spring 80, Pg. 35

[1] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pgs. 202-203; quoting from: Sharh Nahjul Balagha of Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 16, Pg. 214*

Here it must be asked, how inspite of evidence of forgery and false claims they still say:

“In the times of Siddiq and Farooq the financial rights were paid in full to the family of the Prophet.”**[1]**

Historical Reminder

In the end it is observed that:

“Some supporters of Abu Bakr have fabricated reports[2] that Abu Bakr performed prayers on the coffin of Fatima. Fortunately, Ibne Hajar Asqalani has repudiated this as totally false.[3]”[4]

Historical documents show that Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were not present in Fatima’s burial. Thus Bukhari and Muslim (two famous hadith compilers of Ahle Sunnat) in their books, *Sahih Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*, have clearly stated:

“When she died, her husband, Ali buried her at night and did not allow Abu Bakr to come and pray on her bier.”[5]

“When she died, her husband Ali bin Abi Talib, buried her in night and did not allow Abu Bakr to come. And Ali prayed on her bier.”[6]

[1] *Khuda Raham Lakzai: Article quoted in Interview in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 5, Spring 80, Pg. 33*

[2] *[Abdul Aziz Nomani in the article: ‘Fatima Zahra Az Wiladat Ta Afsana-e-Shahadat’ quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, (Issue No. 3, Autumn 79) This forged tradition is quoted from the book, Al-Muntazim fee Tarikh al-Umam wal-Mulook (written by Ibne Jauzi), Vol. 4, Pg. 96, considering it authentic.]*

[3] *Quoting from: Lisan al-Mizan, Vol. 3, Pg. 334*

[4] *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Guftaarhai-e-Peeramoon Mazloomiyat-e-Bartareen Banu (Translation: Masood Shikohi), Pg. 106*

[5] *Muhammad Ismail Bukhari: Sahih Bukhari, Tradition no. 3913*

[6] *Muslim bin Hajjaj Nishapuri: Sahih Muslim, Tradition no. 3304*

Part 16
Examples of statements in Sunni
sources about Zahra's anger on
Abu Bakr

Document no. 1

“Fatima, the daughter of Allah’s Apostle became angry and stopped speaking to him. This anger of hers on Abu Bakr continued till she left the world.”[1]

Document no. 2

“[In the matter of asking for her inheritance, Fadak and what remained of the Khums of the Khaiber booty] Fatima became angry with Abu Bakr and kept away from him and did not talk to him till she died.”[2]

Document no. 3

“Fatima severed relations with Abu Bakr and did not speak to him until the end of her life.”[3]

Document no. 4

“[In the matter of asking for her inheritance, Fadak and what remained of the Khums of the Khaiber booty] Fatima became angry on Abu Bakr, deserted him and never spoke him until she died.”[4]

Document no. 5

“[In the matter of asking for her inheritance] Fatima got angry and left Abu Bakr and remained severed with him until she passed away.”[5]

Document no. 6

“[In the matter of asking for her inheritance, Fadak and what remained of the Khums of the Khaiber booty] Fatima became angry upon Abu Bakr in that (matter).”[6]

Document no. 7

“She said, by God, I shall never talk to you two and she died and did never speak to the two of them.”[7]

[1] Muhammad Ismail Bukhari: *Sahih Bukhari*, Tradition no. 2862

[2] *Ibid.* Tradition no. 3913

[3] *Ibid.* Tradition no. 6230

[4] Muslim bin Hajjaj Nishapuri: *Sahih Muslim, Tradition no. 3304*

[5] Ahmad Hanbal: *Musnad Ahmad, Tradition no. 25*

[6] *Ibid. Tradition no. 52*

[7] Muhammad bin Isa bin Zahhak Sulami: *Sunan Tirmidhi, Tradition no. 1534*

In spite of the fact that it is against all historical proofs it is claimed:

“In authentic documents we do not trace any sign of referring to Caliphs by the term of enmity by Ali or Zahra or any of the Infallible Imams. Therefore I conclude that they treated this as a difference between companions of Prophet during the total period of Caliphs and even during the period of Ali’s rule. And after that during the time of the Purified Imams (a.s.).”!**[1]**

[1] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 8, Khordad 1381*

Part 17
Aim of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in
taking over the Guardianship of
Muhammad bin Abu Bakr?

Another conjecture concerns relations between the First Caliph and Ali with regard to Guardianship of the widow and his son Muhammad, after the death of Caliph. Their claim goes like this:

“His Eminence (a.s.) showed close affection to Abu Bakr and after his death married his widow and brought up his son, Muhammad Ibne Abu Bakr in his house...”!**[1]**

“Muhammad Ibne Abu Bakr was very dear to Ali. He was brought up along with his own sons. During Caliphate of Ali, he was appointed as a governor of Egypt.”!**[2]**

Now to check this conjecture we must go to Asma Binte Umais, the widow of Abu Bakr and speak about her:

“Asma was Abu Bakr’s wife, but she mostly spent her time at the house of the son-in-law of the Prophet and the brother of her husband (Ali Ibne Abi Talib a.s.) and in the service of Fatima”**[3]**

In this regard it can be said:

“The lady, Asma Binte Umais was a good and virtuous lady. Her early life was as prosperous as the evening of her life. She was the wife of (brother of Ali) Ja’far bin Abi Talib. Finally, she became wife of Ali bin Abi Talib. In the middle for a few years, she was Abu Bakr’s wife. She gave birth to Muhammad son of Abu Bakr. But this great lady brought up Muhammad so purely that the impure sperm turned out a man adhering to the right path of Ali enriched by the love of Ahle Bayt. This lady made Muhammad son of Ali though he was son of Abu Bakr. Indeed, beyond appreciations it is that when she witnesses Caliphate – the right of Ali

- is usurped by her husband and the track perverted, she deserts the house of usurpation and comes to Fatima’s House of Divine Revelation. By this act, she displays her scorn to tyranny to Ali and Fatima and her fidelity and devotion to the Wilayat of Ali and Ahle Bayt...”**[4]**

[1] *Muhammad Barfi: Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni point of view), [1st Edition 1380], Pg.*

[2] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Mashal-e-Ittehaad (Torch of Unity), Pg. 27*

[3] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 201*

[4] *Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani: Fatima Zahra Shadmani Dil-e-Payambar; Translator's*

On the basis of this, marriage of Asma to Abu Bakr is worth pondering upon as:

“Cause and motive of this marriage – inspite of such a wide gulf between wife and husband in thoughts and moral tendencies – from the historical view has put this in the circle of ambiguity.”**[1]**

Therefore the arguments of marriage of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) with Asma and his Guardianship of her son, Muhammad should be sought in the personal excellence restricted to Asma herself – her support for the sanctity of Alawite *Wilayat* and Imamate can be nicely seen in the following steps of Asma:

“Abu Bakr, Umar and their advisory board were so much harassed and disturbed in their thoughts by the campaign of Ali that they were at a loss what to do. Their minds hurried this way and that and made hasty decisions only to be rescinded and made again. In a quandary, they dismissed what was determined. Finally, their thoughts collectively relaxed at one decision – to assassinate Ali. Abu Bakr’s wife Asma learnt of this plot. She immediately sent her maid to Fatima’s House and told her to recite the following verse as soon as she entered the house:

That is these people are plotting (conspiring) against you to kill you. So get out, I advise you.**[2]**

Similarly Asma told the maid: If they do not take the cue repeat the verse...”**[3]**

Likewise, the level of Muhammad (Asma’s son) with the family of his father, Abu Bakr can be judged very well by his stand in the battle of Jamal against his own sister, Ayesha. In this battle in support of his Imam, Muhammad drew his sword

against his sister, Ayesha binte Abu Bakr. At the end of the battle Muhammad addressed Ayesha and introduced himself as follows:

“I am nearest in relation to you and at the same time your most ardent enemy...”**[4]**

Therefore Ali’s marriage with Asma after the death of Abu Bakr and guardianship of her son, Muhammad Ibne Abu Bakr has no bearing on relations of His Eminence (a.s.) with Abu Bakr. It is related to the moral quality of Asma

Footnote: Dr. Sayyid Hasan Iftikharzadeh Sabzawari, Pg. 773

[1] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 201

[2] *Surah Qasas 28:20*

[3] *Muhammad Baqir Ansari: - Sayyid Hasan Rajai: Asrar-e-Fadak, Pgs. 59-60*

[4] *Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Naqsh-e-Ayesha Dar Tarikh-e-Islam, Vol. 2, Pg. 210*

herself as was a lady with belief in the *Wilayat* of Ali (a.s.) and was blessed with affection for the House of the Prophet. Imam Ali (a.s.) not only married her, he even took her son under his own training. Later this Muhammad – the son of Abu Bakr becomes a model among Shias to brighten the Shia school. His (Muhammad’s) son became a special associate of Imam Sajjad (a.s.).**[1]** His (Muhammad’s) daughter became the wife of Imam Baqir (a.s.) and mother of Imam Sadiq (a.s.).**[2]**

Now let us ask the reader himself – do these attributes of Asma binte Umais have any bearing on Abu Bakr, or do they bestow any virtue on Abu Bakr?

In spite of these facts they still claim:

“But Imam Sajjad married the granddaughter of the First Caliph. The grand children of Imam Baqir’s mother were in fact the progeny of Abu Bakr. So such relation cannot be created or formed with an enemy.”!**[3]**

“Our Imams from Imam Baqir (a.s.) onwards are the off springs of Abu Bakr’s daughter. Our Imams are closely related to the Caliphs.”!**[4]**

On the basis of what you have seen no scope remains for the claim that:

“Besides the co-operation of our chief, Ali with Hazrat Abu Bakr...these two pupils of the Prophet (Abu Bakr and Ali), like members of one family, were friendly and loving to each other.”!**[5]**

Relations of the Second Caliph with the Family of Revelation (a.s.)

A complete claim exists in this field:

“The policy of Hazrat Umar in relation to Ahle Bayt was composed of love and reverence.”!**[6]**

[1] Allamah Majlisi: *Jila al-Uyoon*, Pg. 870

[2] Imam Ja'far Sadiq (a.s.) said: “My mother was from those who had brought faith and were pious and righteous and Allah loves who are righteous.” (Allamah Majlisi: *Jila al-Uyoon*, Pg. 870)

[3] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Jam-e-Jam Daily*, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379

[4] Ibid. Interview in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 4, Summer 79, Pg. 62

[5] Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: Article quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 15, Autumn 82, Pg. 12

[6] Muhammad Barfi: *Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni point of view)*, [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 110

“Umar’s look to Ali was full of love, concomitant with respect and honor.”!**[1]**

We must go back to the conduct and behavior of Umar towards the family of the Prophet. This will enable us to scrutinize the foregone claims. His looking to Ali with love accompanied by greatness and honor and the scale of his affection, reverence and his own humility towards the House of the Prophet can be epitomized within a few historical documents to see whether there is any veracity in it or this too is full of mendacity:

A glance at historical documents

“Balazari writes in his book Al-Ansaab Al-Ashraaf:

Umar went towards Fatima’s house holding a burning torch.

Fatima came behind the door (of her house) and said: O, son of Khattab! Is it you? Do you want to set the door of the house on fire over me?

Umar replied: Yes, this act will strengthen what your father has brought.

In Tarikh Tabari it is mentioned:

Umar said: I swear by God! I shall burn the house upon you; or you should come out of the house to pay allegiance to the Caliph.

Ibne Abde Rabb narrates in Al-Iqd Al-Fareed:

...Umar holding the burning torch proceeded towards Fatima’s house with an intention to set it on fire.

Fatima asked: O, son of Khattab! Have you brought fire to burn my house?

Umar answered: Yes. You too should join that which the Ummah has entered into (paying allegiance to Abu Bakr)...”**[2]**

Historical documents to prove Umar’s rough behavior and harsh attitude towards the House of Divine Revelation to obtain Ali’s allegiance to Abu Bakr’s Caliphate can be found in these three books: *Attack on Fatima’s house*, *The Burning of Fatima’s house*, *Clear proof on Zahra’s martyrdom*. Details mentioned in these books are all from Sunni sources of repute, which can well establish for you whether these claims are true or false. You can judge how far

[1] *Ibid. Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni point of view)*, [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 87

[2] *Engineer Jawad Husaini Tabatabai: Dar Pasukh-e-Afsana-e-Shahadat*, Pgs. 109-110

these words are correct. For instance,

“Umar always used to call Ali, light of the eyes.”!**[1]**

Similarly we have seen claims that:

“Companions of Saqifah, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman and their supporters formed the government. Ali also cooperated with them to the end. Although he had difference of opinion with them, but he did not entertain enmity with them.”!**[2]**

“In spite of his thinking that it was his right usurped as it is obvious in his speech known by the title of Shiqshiqya, he took shelter in fortitude. His fortitude was not just a show. He sincerely did not launch on enmity with companions of Prophet.”!**[3]**

“The relations of those great men (Caliphs) were brotherly and Islamic towards preserving the worth and regard of Islam. They were never at enmity.”!**[4]**

“Does this meaningful silence not reflect that His Eminence (a.s.) did not want such a thing to be repeated?**[5]** And that the fire of enmity should keep burning forever between him and the Caliphs. Especially during the reign of Second Caliph which was that of battles; that it should be overshadowed by personal feelings?”!**[6]**

Great many efforts are exerted to sketch the behavior of Ali with Caliphs under the friendly strokes of brush to paint a rosy picture of friendship and love. But a bird’s view on the events immediately after passing away of Prophet proves that there existed deep rancor and animosity between the Caliphs and Ahle Bayt. Let us get acquainted with the behavior of Ali with Umar through these historical confessions of Umar himself.

The first example is a tradition mentioned in *Sahih Muslim* and *History of Medina* by Ibne Shubbeh:

[1] Farooq Safizaada: Article quoted in *Kayhan Farhangi*, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 81

[2] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Interview in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 4, Summer 79, Pg. 62

[3] *Ibid.* Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379

[4] *Ibid.* Ittelaat Daily, Issue No. 30, Bahman 1379

[5] [It is the events that unfolded after the passing away of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.)]

[6] *Ibid. Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 9, Khordad 1381*

“In these traditions the Second Caliph blames Ali and Abbas for calling the first and second Caliphs liars, sinners, pact-breakers, tricksters or tyrants and transgressors.” **[1]**

In the narration of *Sahih Muslim* it reads:

The Second Caliph addressed Ali and Abbas and said:

...When the Prophet passed away from the world, Abu Bakr said: After the Prophet I am the guardian of Muslims; you two (pointing to Ali and Abbas) came and demanded your inheritance. You (Abbas) for the heritage from the son of your brother and this Ali for the heritage of his wife from her father. Then Abu Bakr said: The Prophet had said: We are not inherited, what we leave is a charity, but you regarded him a liar, a sinner, a pact breaker, a betrayer and a cheater...” **[2]**

This is the text of Umar’s words regarding Ali’s view about Abu Bakr and himself:

“You both looked upon him as a liar, a sinner, usurper and a betrayer...and I...am associate of Abu Bakr. You two consider me a liar, a sinner, usurper and a betrayer...”

Similarly Ibne Shubbeh in his *History of Medina*, instead of liar, sinner, betrayer and cheat; has mentioned: oppressor and transgressor.” **[3]**

The actual text in his book is as follows:

“In this you considered Abu Bakr an oppressor a transgressor ... and you two considered me an oppressor a transgressor...”

In summary it can be concluded:

“In this current discussion, there is one evidence, which cannot be irrecusable. Umar bin Khattab openly says that Ali bin Abi Talib and Abbas, the uncle of the Prophet, regardless of their being Hashimi were considered prominent companions, regard Abu Bakr and Umar tyrants and cheats? Then how is it possible for one to claim that between Ahle Bayt (a.s.) and the

Caliphs there existed love and friendship? On the other hand the enemy himself acknowledges that the Ahle Bayt had such a negative view of them.

[1] *Reza Salmani: Rawabit Mutaqabil Kholafa Ba Khandaan-e-Payambar, Pg. 42*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 41, quoting from: Sahih Muslim, Vol. 4, Kitabul Jihad was Sayr, Bab Hukmul Fee, Pg. 27, Tr. 49 (3302), Mausisa-e-Izuddin*

[3] *Ibid. Pgs. 41-42; quoting from: Tarikhul Madina, Vol. 1, Pgs. 202-204, Daar al-Fikr*

These texts clearly show that Ali bin Abi Talib and Abbas considered Abu Bakr and Umar to be tyrants, betrayers, liars, sinners and usurpers.

So how can there be friendship and love between Ahle Bayt (a.s.) and the Caliphs after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)?

Thus if under the excuse of some fabricated narrations and those reported by other than Ahle Bayt (a.s.) someone is spreading love of enemies of Ahle Bayt among the weak people, it should be known that the correctness of these traditions is lacking credibility.

With these texts please pay attention...a brief translation of these reports is that Ali bin Abi Talib and Abbas bin Abdul Mutalib during the reign of Umar demanded the property of the Prophet pertaining to Khaiber and Fadak. Umar replies:

You claimed these properties from Abu Bakr too while you regarded him a liar, a sinner, a tyrant and a betrayer. Now I am the Caliph. You are making the same demand from me. Regarding me too, you have the same opinion - a liar, a sinner, a tyrant, a betrayer.

This statement, which contains a confession of the Caliph, is irrecusable because it is present in two most reputed Sunni books and their credibility cannot be doubted.**[1]** So it is unlikely that one who is remote from bigotry and partiality would

accept what the view of Bani Hashim and Ahle Bayt was regarding the Caliphs.”[2]

Even though they claim:

“His Eminence (a.s.) himself never insulted the Caliphs. On the contrary, on many occasions he has praised them.”[3]

But there is another historical document which says:

“In the incident of Umar’s travel to Syria he asked the Imam to accompany him in the journey but Imam (a.s.) did not accept. Umar went to Ibne Abbas and complained: I have a complaint against your cousin, Ali. I asked him to come with me to Syria but he did not agree. I always see him unhappy. Why is he so?

Ibne Abbas replied: It is evident. You also know that. Umar said: Yes, it is because he could not get Caliphate.

[1] *Sahih Muslim, No. 3302*

[2] *Husain Ghaib Gholami: Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) wa Rumuz-e-Hadith-e-Fadak, Pgs. 52-59*

[3] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Ittelaat Daily, Issue No. 29, Khordad 1379*

Thus Imam (a.s.) displayed to others his objection and anger for usurpation of Caliphate till the Caliph and the people became aware of it.”[1]

The exact words of Umar’s statement about Ali’s attitude towards him are these:

“I always find him angry towards me. What in your view is the cause of his anger?”

In view of these two reliable documents taken from Sunni source of repute and mentioned in a prestigious Sunni book, we leave the reader to himself judge the creditability of the claim. Such claims are in rife. But their creditability cannot stand before historical grounds that reflect a contradictory picture to us. For instance, a few more we quote here:

“Behavior and talk of Ali, according to contents of reliable books of both sects show that there never existed enmity etc. between him and Caliphs.”[2]

“I challenge and even prove that Ali was not an enemy of the three Caliphs.”!**[3]**

“He had a mild behavior with this Caliph too. He kept behind his claim against this new Caliph.”!**[4]**

“So doubt vanished from both sides. The distance was reduced between the two. Trust came in with a new title in a new stage.”!**[5]**

“In the era of Caliphs, Ahle Bayt of Prophet did what they could for the expansion of Islam and strength of Islamic government. They sacrificed money and life. This itself is proof and indication of their satisfaction and love.”!**[6]**

[1] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pgs. 227; quoting from *Sharh Nahjul Balagha of Ibne Abil Hadeed*, Vol. 12, Pgs. 78-79

[2] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 9, Khordad 1381

[3] Ibid. *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 9, Khordad 1381

[4] Ibrahim Baizoon (Translated by Ali Asghar Muhammadi Seejaani): *Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh (Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition)*, 1379], Pg. 40

[5] Ibid. *Rafataar Shinashi Imam Ali (a.s.) Dar Aaina-e-Tareekh (Understanding the stand of Imam Ali in the Mirror of History) (1st Edition)*, 1379], Pg. 42

[6] Abdul Hameed Ismail Zahi: *Appeal quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 9, Spring 81, Pg. 71

“When Hazrat Umar died, his body was laid under a shroud. I was present there. Imam Ali (a.s.) came. He removed the shroud from his body. He said: Abu Hafs! May God immerse you in His Mercy. I swear by God, after the Prophet of God, there is no one except you that I was friend of. How I wish that the scroll of your deeds were mine. I could have met God with the scroll of your deeds.”!**[1]**

“Ali behaved mildly and politely with Caliphs’ government.”!**[2]**

“On the basis of this those who think that since they follow Ali they must declare immunity from Caliphs should prove whether he also did Tabarra with them, so that we must also do so.”**[3]**

At the end of this chapter we draw your attention to another historical document:

“When Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) returned home after [from six-member Shura committee] he told the family of Abdul Muttalib:

“O family of Abdul Muttalib! Your relatives are at animosity with you after passing away of Prophet like their enmity with the Prophet in his life. If your people attain power they will never take you into consultation.

By God, they will not turn to the Truth but by sword.”

The narrator says: Abdullah Ibne Umar was also present there and he heard all what His Eminence said as he was entering. Then he entered and said: “O Abal Hasan, do you want to create enmity between your relatives and them?

Ali said: “Woe be on you! Keep Quiet! By God, if your father had not been there and he had not behaved with me in this manner all his life, the son of Affan (Uthman) and son of Auf (Abdur Rahman) would never have challenged me.

At that moment Abdullah bin Umar got up and went away.”**[4]**

[1] *Abdullah Futuhi: Article in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 10, Summer 81, Pg. 78*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 8, Khordad 1381*

[3] *Ibid. Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 9, Khordad 1381*

[4] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 9, Pg. 54*

Conclusion

It is an established fact of history and an acknowledged reality that relations between Ali and Umar were so dark and clouded that it became a useful element to create false narrations within its folds to deviate from reality and pervert the trend to irrigate the farm of their benefits and harvest the crop to their advantage.

For instance: Dishonest historians, pretending to be in pursuit of truth, have fabricated various narrations concerning the second *Bay'at* of Ali to Abu Bakr. They have tried to instill in the minds of readers a false concept that Ali paid allegiance to Abu Bakr with utmost willingness and desire after the death of his wife, Zahra. **[1]**

Great Sunni scholars like Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari has acknowledged the hatred and disdain that existed between Ali and Umar. He narrates that Ali sent a message to Abu Bakr telling him:

“Come to me but another person should not come with you - Umar too tried to evade meeting Ali...” **[2]**

[1] Refer: *A Victim Lost in Saqifah, Vol. 4, Section 1*

[2] Muhammad Ismail Bukhari: *Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 3, Pg. 253, Kitabul Maghazi, Chap. 155, Ghazwa-e-Khaiber, Tradition no. 704 (3913)*

Part 18
**Did the Second Caliph desire Ali
to be Caliph after him?**

Here is one more conjecture that propagates good ties between Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and the Second Caliph:

“Umar in his last speech commits his tongue to a language that he never uttered throughout his life in any of his speeches. In this speech, he opens the window of his heart. In fact, it is his will: “O believers! Faithful ones! I recommend you to select Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) for Caliphate after me.”!**[1]**

Before we scrutinize this conjecture, one thing seems necessary to be pointed out here. Efforts are rife to establish a conjecture alongside this by claiming that:

“Another fact which must not be ignored is that Ali after passing away of Prophet did not succeed to Caliphate. Similarly, after the martyrdom of Umar too did not succeed to Caliphate.”!**[2]**

The mind of the reader is from the usurpation of the Caliphate of Amirul Momineen (a.s.).

While the behavior of the Second Caliph whether in the lifetime of the Prophet in the event of the pen and ink or whether in instituting a six-member committee of Shura is openly opposed to this claim:

“Umar by vesting special powers to Abul Rahman bin Auf weakened Ali’s position and strengthened Uthman’s hand; and indirectly ensured Uthman’s appointment to the office. He was already aware of qualities in Ali besides his knowledge that it was Ali’s right. He neglected all this. In short, he closed the way for Ali. He, in fact, formed that committee with the intention that Ali could be sidelined. The committee itself was an obstacle in the way of Ali to Caliphate.”**[3]**

“Umar made the committee to appease the rancor of Quraish against Bani Hashim progeny. Whether Bani Teem have co-operated with Ali if Ali were opponent of their Shaykh (i.e. chief)?

[1] *Farooq Safizaada: Article quoted in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 82*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 80*

[3] *Jalal Darikhsha: Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 59*

The rancor of Umayyad dynasty was never to be mitigated which had taken root since years long. Their fathers had fed their children with this rancor. Therefore one generation carried it to the next. Umar was in his deathbed. However he designed a plot so shrewdly that he brought forward all the motives of national prejudices against Ali. It was clear that the victim was Ali. Abdul Fattah Abdul Maqsood writes: For the Quraish the principle of age of ignorance was a fixed policy. Further, a staunch attachment to tribal bigotry to limits of worship was their characteristic. Members of the committee were from such a tribe with such an outlook. To break down family unity of Bani Hashim was an ambition and aspiration of Quraish. Umar performed his duty, which was to isolate Caliphate from Bani Hashim. This was already in efforts since passing away of Prophet.

There was no possibility left for Ali to win the contest. Whoever heard the names of the members of this committee became sure of the choice of Uthman.”**[1]**

“How Umar introduced each member of Shura, highlighting their defects and kept them in line with Ali? His motive is clear. He wanted that the man most deserving to this office and most competent to this job should not come to power.”**[2]**

In the same way Umar told Ibne Abbas while speaking to him about Ali refusing him to accompany to Syria unveiling the matter of the pen and paper by confessing that:

“The Prophet during his sickness wanted to introduce Ali as his successor but I prevented him.”**[3]**

On another occasion the Second Caliph says:

“His Eminence, during his illness decided to clarify this matter but I prevented him.”**[4]**

[1] *Ibid.* Pgs. 59-60

[2] *Ibid.* Pg. 66

[3] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaamdaaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pgs. 79-80; quoting from Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 12, Pgs. 77-78*

[4] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 44, quoting from Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 3, Pg. 97*

These confessions nicely disclose the plots he had designed one after another to hinder the way for Ali to attain the Caliphate.

In conclusion, it can be said:

“Not only the behavior of Caliphs was not good with Ali (a.s.) and Ali did not cooperate with him whole-heartedly, the behavior of Abu Bakr towards him was very cold and Umar did not give any office to Bani Hashim.

On the contrary, he used to give key positions to Bani Umayyah and by reviving practices and malice of the days of ignorance he compelled Ali (a.s.) to isolation.

In a gathering Umar told Saeed bin Aas, an Umayyad, in the presence of Ali: You are looking at me as if I have killed your father, while it was Ali who killed your father.” **[1]**

Allamah Askari has narrated the aforesaid conversation in his book *Saqifah*. His source is *Tabaqaat* of Ibne Saad (Vol. 5, Pg. 20-22). His analysis is this:

“It shows his provoking and inciting the people against Ali. Do such words of Umar not excite and provoke to revenge the blood of their nearest ones shed by Ali? Does it not encourage Saeed to take revenge of his father’s death by assassinating Ali?” **[2]**

Scrutiny of the legend of Second Caliph's Marriage with Umme Kulthum

This is an issue of dispute in Islamic societies. It has indulged many into doubt and several others into confusion while to some it is setting out in search of an answer in a barren desert of uncertainty hit time to time by confounding sands of surmise. It is the marriage of Umme Kulthum, daughter of Amirul Momineen (a.s.), with Umar.

It is obvious that the aim by this claim is to obtain specific results. For instance, such as:

[1] *Dr. Ali Akbar Hasani: Tarikh Tahlili wa Siyasi Islam, Vol. 2, Pg. 3; quoting from: Irshad, Shaykh Mufeed, Vol. 1, Pg. 76*

[2] *Allamah Askari: Saqifah, Edited: Dr. Mahdi Dashti, Pg. 135*

The prosperity in the next world for Umar by means of this marriage

Thus it is alleged:

“It is a well-known fact that devotion to Ahle Bayt exercises a positive influence on the fate of man - in this world and the next. Overall, love for the progeny of Prophet ensures mercies from heaven and Divine pardon besides the favorable attention of the Prophet himself. In the year 17 A.H. Umar decided to strengthen his ties with Ali. So with this motive he sought the hand of Umme Kulthum from her father, Ali, in marriage.”!**[1]**

Immunity of Second Caliph about crimes committed against Ahle Bayt (a.s.)

“Hazrat Ali (a.s.) has given his daughter, Umme Kulthum in marriage to Umar. So Ali was the father-in-law and Hazrat Fatima, mother-in-law of Umar. According to this things told about Hazrat Umar have no foundation according to the belief of Sunni Muslims. They are only to create disunity and nothing else.”!**[2]**

“His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) gave his daughter in marriage to Umar and Hazrat Umar was Ali’s son-in-law...therefore all the supposed enmities are also invalidated.”!**[3]**

“But Hazrat Ali (a.s.) had family ties with them. Ali was Umar’s father-in-law. Umar was Ali’s son-in-law. How can such close ties be established between enemies?”!**[4]**

Suggestion of Umar having gained the satisfaction of Ahle Bayt particularly that of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.)

Thus it is alleged:

“Umme Kulthum daughter of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) and Fatima Zahra was married to Umar. This could not have been possible without consent of Imam Hasan and Husain and her sister Zainab and especially her mother, Fatima.”!**[5]**

[1] *Mustafi Shirazi: Article in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pgs. 64-65*

[2] *Abdur Raheem Mahmoodi: Maqaam-e-Sahaaba wa Zindagi-e-Khulafa-e-Raashideen Dar yek Nigaah (Status of Companions and life of Rightly Guided Caliphs in a Glance), Pg. 37*

[3] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Interview in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 4, Summer 79, Pg. 62*

[4] *Ibid. Interview in Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379*

[5] *Ameenullah Kareemi: Ahle Bayt Az Deedgaah-e-Ahle Sunnat (1st Edition 1380), Pg. 89*

Baraat, a principle of Shia belief now is put under question

Thus it is alleged:

“If Ali had approved abuse and insult of the Caliphs how he could have given his daughter in marriage to Umar?”!**[1]**

Enmity and rancor of Umar towards Ali is covered

Thus it is alleged:

“Hazrat Umar loved Hazrat Ali and wanted to express it. So by his marriage to Umme Kulthum he perfected his attachment with Ali.”!**[2]**

To show relations between Ali and Umar to be friendly

Thus it is alleged:

“Hazrat Ali gave his daughter, Umme Kulthum in marriage to Umar. This is the greatest proof of intimacy and sincerity among them. Ali had a great regard for Umar.”!**[3]**

“The friendship between the two was so strong that Ali gave his daughter, Umme Kulthum in marriage to Farooq-e-Aazam.”!**[4]**

Giving legitimacy to Umar's Caliphate and distancing it from the term of usurpation

Hence it is said:

“If Umar had not been the rightful Caliph and had usurped Caliphate from Ali and had opposed the words of Prophet, it would not have been right for Ali to give Umme Kulthum, his daughter from Fatima, in marriage to him.”!**[5]**

“Even if we suppose that Ali inspite of his unwillingness acknowledged Umar's Caliphate, how did he give his daughter from Hazrat Zahra in marriage to Umar?”!**[6]**

[1] Jalal Jalalizadeh: *Article in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 7, Autumn 80, Pg. 63*

[2] Muhammad Barfi: *Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali 1st Edition 1381, Vol. 2, Pg. 57*

[3] Abdul Qadir Dahqaan Siraawaani: *Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 15, Autumn 81, Pg. 8*

[4] *Ibid. Article quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 11, Autumn 81, Pg. 12*

[5] Jamaal Baadroza: *Khilafat O Imamat Az Deedgaah-e-Ahle Sunnat (1st Edition 1381), Pg. 27*

[6] *Ibid. Khilafat O Imamat Az Deedgaah-e-Ahle Sunnat, Pg. 80*

Therefore this matter is of much importance to be checked for authenticity, because it is being used for their undue benefit and made a pretext under which every stain is washed to the extent that Umar too was infallible like them. So it must be made clarified.

Before the scrutiny we would like to clarify a point.

Can only marriage with bin Hashim be a proof of friendship?

A marriage can take place with several and different motives and it can be for convenience also.

“Such marriages are many in history.

For instance, marriage by force took place between Hajjaj bin Yusuf the Thaqafi**[1]** and the daughter of Abdullah bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib. Later it resulted in insult to the family of Bani Hashim. The great jurisprudent of Sunni sect, Ibne Jauzi, writes in his book Akhbaar Al-Nisa:

“Hajjaj married the daughter of Abdullah bin Ja’far. When she entered, he saw her crying – tears flowing down her cheeks. He asked what made her to cry. She said, “The honor getting low and the low getting to honor.”**[2]**

Can marriage wipe out all those crimes and atrocities he (Hajjaj) committed against Ahle Bayt because of this marriage? The crimes of Hajjaj that are so plenty in history can they be forgotten and forgiven?”**[3]**

Criticism and Investigation

Outlook of Shia scholars with regard to the marriage of Umme Kulthum with Umar can be classified into two categories:

[1] *[Masoodi says that shedding blood gave him maximum pleasure...Ibne Kathir says that in the year 68 A.H. it became customary to celebrate the Day of Ashura as Eid. They dressed in new clothes and felt regretful for not being present in Kerbala.*

They dug up 3000 graves to bring out the last remains of Ali (a.s.).

During the long period of his rule no one could name his child Ali, Hasan or Husain...

In his time disbelief was not as serious an offence as Shiaism, it was better to say: I am a Kafir than to say I am a Shia.

(Dr. Ali Akbar Hasani:: Tarikh Tahlili wa Siyasi Islam, Vol. 2, Pgs. 81-82)]

[2] *Ibne Jauzi: Akhbaarun Nisa, Pg. 65*

[3] *Engineer Jawad Husaini Tabatabai: Dar Pasukh-e-Afsana-e-Shahadat, Pg. 178*

View of the first Category of Shia Scholars

This category of scholars in which there is Shaykh Mufeed also, totally denies occurrence of such a marriage. They consider it a lie and a thing fabricated by enemies of Ahle Bayt.

We quote here the reasoning of the great scholar and authority Shaykh Mufeed, while answering the issue in his book *Masail Sirwiya*:

“First: It is not creditable that Ali gave his daughter to Umar because such a thing is not proved. Its narrator is Zubair bin Bakr. This narrator does not enjoy a good reputation in the circle of researchers. They do not give any credit to his words.

He is known of being inimical to Ali. For this reason, he is not trustworthy. In his narrations, he is always against Bani Hashim.

Second: The tradition he has narrated contradicts itself in its wordings as there is no uniformity in it. [1] For example, in one place he says Ali gave his daughter in marriage to Umar. In another place, he says that Abbas (Ali’s uncle) took this job upon his own responsibility. Somewhere he says that no marriage codes took place that his marriage did not happen. Somewhere he says that there was coercion and threats from the side of Umar. Somewhere else he says that the marriage was the result of sacrifice. Some narrators say that the fruit of this marriage was a son named Zaid. But some narrators claim that Umar was assassinated before he could go into a nuptial bed with her. Some claim that Zaid had sons while some say that he was killed and he had no son.

There is another group that says that Zaid was killed with his mother while some say that the mother outlived her son.

So such narrations by such a narrator with so many contrasts and contradictions within itself are far from any credibility. It cannot be authentic to believe or to accept. The very creation

of such a tradition, which is from its very start is rife with differences, cannot be taken into account.”[2]

“There is difference in this marriage. Shaykh Mufeed has opened an independent chapter for this subject.[3]

[1] [In other words if these versions are compared, their contradictions will become clear.]

[2] Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani: *Fatima Zahra Shadmani Dil-e-Payambar* (Translated by Dr. Sayyid Hasan Iftikharzadeh Sabzawari) Pgs. 875-876

[3] Refer: *Al-Ghadeer*, Vol. 2, Pg. 396

Shaykh Mufeed, Abu Sahl Naubakhti and Ibne Shahar Aashob – all these scholars have denied this marriage. Muhammad Ali Dokhaiyyal in his article: ‘Life of Umme Kulthum’ has discussed the subject and rejected its authority as well as its authenticity. Shaykh Muhammad Jawad Balaghi (d. 1325 Hijra) has denied this marriage in his lengthy article. Besides these, scholars like Abdul Razzaq Mukarram and Sayyid Nasir Husain of India (Lucknow) died in 1361 Hijra have flatly repudiated this marriage from its base.[1]”[2]

The confusion that surrounds this subject had impelled Ali Muhammad Dokhaiyyal to dwell on the matter in his book *Elaam al-Nisa*. He writes:

“Among the imaginary marriages which are not few, there is this marriage too – daughter of Ali, Umme Kulthum, with Umar.

Ibne Abdul Barr and Ibne Hajar and others mention that Umar asked Ali to give her to him.

Ali told Umar that she was still a girl.

Umar said that he would keep her better than others.

Ali told him that he would send her to him. If he is pleased he (Ali) would tie her in marriage to him. Ali gave a cloth to Umme Kulthum and sent her to Umar. Ali told her to tell Umar that the cloth was the same he had told about. She did the same.

Umar said her to tell her father that he was satisfied. Then Umar touched her leg, uncovering it.

She was shocked and asked him why he was doing that. She also told him if he were not Lord of Believers, she would have knocked down his nose. She came out of the house, went to her house and asked her father why he sent her to a bad old man.

Ali told her: Daughter, he is your husband.” (Ref: Al-Isaabah Vol. 4, Pg. 492; Al Istiab Pg. 490)”**[3]**

[1] *[The view of Shaykh Mufeed is that the Sunnis cannot prove this marriage on the basis of their books.]*

[2] *Dr. Ali Akbar Hasani:: Tarikh Tahlili wa Siyasi Islam, Vol. 2, Pg. 57*

[3] *Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani: Fatima Zahra Shadmani Dil-e-Payambar, Pgs. 872-873*

He has similarly said:

“All who have mentioned this marriage have said: Her marriage took place after assassination of Umar with Aun. Aun was killed in the battle of Tustar**[1]** in the year seventeen Hijra during Umar’s Caliphate. So it cannot be accepted that he**[2]** married her**[3]** after Aun was killed?...

The most surprising thing, which has incited a group to believe this story, is the statement of Ibne Abdul Barr. He says Muhammad bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib is the same who married Umme Kulthum after the death of Umar.

While in the same book he says:

Aun bin Ja’far and his brother Muhammad bin Ja’far were martyred in Tustar district (of Iran). He knows that the battle of Tustar happened during Umar’s Caliphate seven years before his death. Considering the date how can we give credit to this story?”**[4]**

Therefore it can be said:

A group of Sunni sect denies the narrations of marriage because they consider it an insult to Umar as the narrations mention his behavior with Umme Kulthum. Therefore to safeguard Umar’s honor they have no way but to deny it.

Why this Rumor Gained Currency?

Possibly a question may arise, why the rumor has gained such currency among the people if this marriage had not taken place?

“This tradition became famous as Abu Muhammad Hasan bin Yahya has quoted it in his in his book, Al-Nasab. So many people think that since he is a Shia, the report must be correct even though he has taken it from Zubair bin Bukkar.” [5]

Similarly it can be said in reply to this question that:

“Perhaps this misunderstanding arose because one of the wives of Umar was named Umme Kulthum. She was the mother of Ubaidullah bin Umar

[1] *Shushtar*

[2] *[Umar]*

[3] *[Umme Kulthum]*

[4] *Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani: Fatima Zahra Shadmani Dil-e-Payambar, Pg. 873*

[5] *Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani: Fatima Zahra Shadmani Dil-e-Payambar, Pg. 876, quoting from: Shaykh Mufeed*

and daughter of Jurul Khizayia. Since her name was the same as that Ali’s daughter they took for granted that she was Ali’s daughter. When the name Umme Kulthum is mentioned, the minds naturally go to Ali’s daughter. For this reason many have believed that Ali’s daughter was Umar’s wife.

On the other hand there was another Umme Kulthum also, who was Abu Bakr’s daughter and Ayesha’s sister. Umar had approached Abu Bakr to marry his daughter - Umme Kulthum. This story is like this:

Abul Faraj Isfahani (a Sunni scholar) writes in his book, *Aghani* [1] (songs): A man from Quraish asked Umar bin Khattab why he should not marry Umme Kulthum, daughter of Abu Bakr to preserve his position after Abu Bakr’s death and creep into his family through this link.

Umar appreciated the proposal and asked him to go to Ayesha and inform her and bring back the answer.

So he did. Ayesha pretended as if she received the news with happiness and got pleased by it. The man left her. Immediately after his exit Mughaira bin Shoba came to Ayesha and found her out of sorts. He inquired for the reason and she told him the whole story and added that her sister was still too young for him and that she wanted her to live in ease, calm, peace and a mild life better than Umar. What she meant was that Umar could not provide her such a life when he himself was a harsh and rough man.

Mughaira told her to leave the matter to him and that he would resolve the difficulty. Then Mughaira went to Umar and told him: Be happy and be father of many sons. I have heard you want to enter into Abu Bakr's family through marriage with his daughter Umme Kulthum? Umar answered: Yes, so it is.

Mughaira said that it was good but in one way it was not because she was just a girl, too young and he was too rough and harsh. Occasions would rise when he would treat her roughly and beat her and she would cry calling her father, so all would remember Abu Bakr. Your harsh behavior would remind all of them to remember Abu Bakr afresh. This will increase agony for them. As such the marriage, because of you, would turn into a daily calamity.

Umar asked: Where have you been that you are speaking in such a tone? Mughaira answered: I am coming from Ayesha just now. Umar said: I

[1] *Vol. 16, Pg. 103, Dar al-Fikr Beirut*

swear by God and I witness that they (the House of Abu Bakr) do not like me. So you assured them that you will make me forgo the matter and ignore it. Well, it does not matter. I too desire her no more.

Mughaira again rushed to Ayesha and informed her of the fresh development, which he had promised her to do. Umar too did not contact them in this respect.

So dear readers! You might have grasped that there were two women by the name of Umme Kulthum (mother of Ubaidullah bin Umar and daughter of Abu Bakr). So people mistake her to be Ali's daughter."**[1]**

Outlook of second Category of Shia Scholars

Many Shia scholars believe that the marriage took place because of force and coercion. Umar used to threaten Ali, time and again. Ali had no way but to agree to this marriage.

The second category of scholars fall back upon proofs to establish what they have concluded. We refer to few of them here:

“The late Kulaini, the great traditionist, has written in his book Kafi: Hisham bin Salim narrates on the authority of Imam Ja’far (the sixth Imam). The story is such:

When Umar went to Ali to seek Umme Kulthum’s hand in marriage, Ali told him that she was still a young girl. Then Umar went to the uncle of Ali - Abbas who asked him what was wrong with him (Umar)?

Abbas asked: What is the matter?

Umar replied: I had been to your nephew, Ali, to seek his daughter’s hand. He refused me. But you know I will pour out the well of Zam-Zam until it goes dry.**[2]** I shall destroy all of you. I shall keep no honor, no distinction for any of you. I shall produce two witnesses that Ali has committed theft. Then I’ll cut off his hand.

Abbas went to Ali and informed him about the whole matter and asked Ali to leave the matter to him. Ali did so.**[3]**

[1] *Fareed Sael: Afsana-e-Iztiwaaj (Investigation about the marriage of Umme Kulthum with Umar in Shia and Sunni sources), Pgs. 20-22*

[2] *Since the honorable post of providing water in Masjidul Haraam and distributing Zamzam water was held by Abbas, Umar wanted to destroy this honor and ridicule Abbas.*

[3] *Thiqatul Islam Kulaini: Kafi, Vol. 5, Pg. 346, Tr. 1; Hurr Amili: Wasaelush Shia, Vol.*

There is another narration in this text:

Umar sent Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib to Ali with an errand to get Umme Kulthum in marriage for Umar. Abbas went and conveyed to him the message. Ali refused.

Abbas hurried back to Umar and informed him of Ali's refusal.

Umar said to Abbas: By God! If he (Ali) does not accept and persists in his refusal I would kill him. **[1]**

Abbas again went back to Ali and reported Umar's words.

But Ali repeated his negative answer.

Abbas informed Umar accordingly. Umar asked Abbas to come to mosque on Friday and hear directly what he says there and see for himself that he (Umar) could kill Ali if he wished.

Abbas went to the mosque on Friday. Umar after finishing prayers and the lectures told the audience that in the town, there exists a companion of Prophet who has committed fornication in spite of his married status. Of course no one knew it except himself. So what do you say?

All from various directions cried: If the Caliph knows, it suffices. No need for others to know it. **[2]** The judgment of God must be carried out against that fornicator.

After this Umar told Abbas to go and tell Ali what he heard and saw. He further added that if Ali still persists tomorrow he would announce among the people that the person he meant yesterday was Ali. **[3]**

Abbas went to Ali and narrated the details.

Ali said: Yes, these things are easy to him. He can do that without any hesitation and fear of God.

14, Pg. 433, Tr. 2

[1] Sharif Murtuza: *Ash-Shafi*, Vol. 3, Pg. 282

[2] [The point worth noting is that according to Islamic Shari-ah if four witnesses testify the accused will be punished. If three do and the fourth is proved wrong all the three are punished with 80 lashes. The Second Caliph used this in the matter of Mughaira. Instead of punishing him he lashed the three witnesses.] Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin: *Ijtihad Dar Maqabil-e-Nass* (Translated by Ali Dawani), Pgs. 340-345]

[3] *[This same document proves that Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was not always present in the congregation prayers in the Masjid and other similar rituals.]*

But Abbas told him if he could not agree, to leave the matter to him and he told Ali not to interfere. Then he (Abbas) went to Umar and told him that he would do what he wanted.

Umar called for a public meeting and announced: This is Abbas - uncle of Ali Ibne Abi Talib. Ali has given the responsibility of his daughter (Umme Kulthum) to his uncle, Abbas to perform her marriage with me. Thus he informed the people about the marriage that was to take place in the near future. He wanted to make the event familiar to them. He was circumspect to avoid the thing from being a surprise. After a period of time Abbas performed the marriage. **[1]"[2]**

This story is also narrated in a different version, which runs thus:

"Umar at the close of his Friday's last sermon said: O, people! If the Caliph knows that one of you has committed fornication, but he has no witness at all; what would you do?

They said: The word of Caliph is an authority to us. If he commands, we shall stone the fornicator.

So Umar fell silent and came down from the pulpit and taking Abbas to a corner whispered into his ear: Did you see?

Abbas said: Yes.

Umar: By God! If Ali persists on his refusal I would tell the people tomorrow that the man I spoke about was Ali. Execute him! **[3]"[4]**

On the basis of this it should be said:

On the strength of evidences and proofs it is an established fact that the marriage took place by force - neither Ali nor Umme Kulthum herself was in agreement with this marriage.

Umar had always fulfilled his desire by every means possible ignoring whether it was prohibited or the means adopted were good and reasonable. Whether God would be pleased or it would incur His displeasure, it least mattered to him. What

mattered was to satisfy himself. Therefore he took advantage of his position as Caliph and the power, which was at his disposal, so he always swore

[1] *Bahrani: Awalim al-Uloom, Vol. 2; quoting from Al-Motatul Baiza, Pg. 139*

[2] *Fareed Saael: Afsana-e-Iztiwaaj, Pgs. 23-26*

[3] *Bahrani: Awalim al-Uloom, Vol. 2; quoting from Al-Motatul Baiza, Pg. 139*

[4] *Fareed Saael: Afsana-e-Iztiwaaj, Pgs. 28-29*

because he was sure of his act and therefore nothing stood to hold him to see whether his desire would incur God's wrath or please Him.

For the house where descended angels with God's Messages such tyranny was rather too much. To see these things against the sacred house of prophethood saddens one and foments such feelings that one does not know what to call such a tyranny.

So we can guess how lonely Ali was! And how alone he was among all those cruelties and tyrannies! Not a friend to him to hear his heart and be consolation for him. Not one there that he could trust him in his agony. Not an intimate one to wipe away his tears. As such he was the first victim of Islam. So it is not odd that he used to lean into the well and complain of his pain to draw comfort and ease. How the agonies crushed his breast; and how bitter was the aggression upon him. Imam Sadiq (the sixth Imam) says:

"This was a sanctity taken from us by force."**[1]**

The point worth noting here is what when late Shaykh Hurr Amili wanted to write about this marriage in his book *Wasae-lush Shia*, he first put it under the title: 'Permission for marriage with enemy under need and dissimulation'.

Regarding the threats of Caliph it can be said:

“Shia and Sunni are unanimous that Umar threatened Ali when he persisted on his refusal to demand of Umar to marry Umme Kulthum. Sunni scholars have mentioned it in *Tabaqaat Ibne Saad*, *Zurriat al-Tahera of Dolabi* and *Majma az-Zawaid*.**[2]** In these two books the cane of Umar**[3]** is referred to.”**[4]**

Therefore if there be truth in this marriage and there be a reality in the whole incident then it is self-evident and self-explanatory about Ali’s victimization. Further, it explains the political conditions ruling over Muslims at that time. It shows a plot designed by Ayesha, Umar and Amr Aas for this marriage to take place.

“Many Sunni sources, including Tabari, have written: Umar bin Khattab

[1] *Kulaini: Kafi, Vol. 5, Pg. 350; Hurr Amili: Wasaelush Shia, Vol. 3, Pg. 129*

[2] *Tabaqat Ibne Saad, Vol. 8, Pg. 462; Ad-Dhariatut Tahira, Pg. 160, Tr. 210; Majmauz Zawaid, Vol. 4, Pg. 499*

[3] *[Ibne Abil Hadeed in Sharh Nahjul Balagha, (Vol. 1, Pg. 181), has considered the whip of Umar to be more terrifying than the sword of Hajjaj.]*

[4] *Fareed Sael: Afsana-e-Iztiwaaj, Pgs. 26-27*

first went to Abu Bakr to ask his daughter, Umme Kulthum, in marriage. Ayesha conveyed this errand to her sister (Umme Kulthum). Umme Kulthum in reply said that she has no business with him.

Ayesha asked her whether she (Umme Kulthum) did not like the Lord of the believers.

In reply, Umme Kulthum said: Yes, I don’t like him. He is harsh and hard to live with. Beside he has a negative behavior and a very rough conduct with women.

Ayesha sent a message to Amr Aas to inform him about the development.

Amr Aas assured her that he would adjust the things. Then he went to Umar bin Khattab and told him that he had heard news, which he wished from God to be not true.

Umar asked what it was.

Then he replied that he had heard that he (Umar) had asked for Abu Bakr's daughter in marriage.

Umar said: Yes. Do you think me not fit to her or she to me?

Amr Aas told Umar (bin Khattab): No, nothing of these two. Umme Kulthum is too young. She is treated by her sister (Ayesha) too mildly and affectionately. On the other hand you are extremely hard and harsh. We are afraid of you because we cannot change any of your habits...I will direct you to one better than her. Another Umme Kulthum - daughter of Ali bin Abi Talib.**[1][2]**

Opinion of Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani[3]

“As of scrutiny and research on the second matter, that is marriage of Umme Kulthum, daughter of His Eminence, Amirul Momineen (a.s.) with Umar bin Khattab, it must be said:

[1] *Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 3, Pg. 421; Al-Iqdul Fareed, Vol. 6, Pg. 91; Kamil Ibne Athir, Vol. 2, Pg. 213; Al-Bidaya wan Ni-haya Ibne Kathir, Vol. 7, Pg. 157*

[2] *Engineer Jawad Husaini Tabatabai: Dar Pasukh-e-Afsana-e-Shahadat, Pg. 175*

[3] *Those who are interested may refer to detailed discussion on this topic in his books: Ar Rasail al-Ashar fil Ahadith al-Mauzoo fee Kutub as-Sunnah and Muhaziraat fil Itiqaad.*

This case must be seen from two angles:

- 1 - Through Shia narrations.
- 2 - Through Sunni narrations.

Through Shia narrations, this story rests within three narra-tions. **[1]** Let us see one by one:

Umar bin Khattab asked Ali bin Abi Talib to give his last daughter, Umme Kulthum, to him in marriage. Because she was young and not ready for marriage he rejected the request. After some days, Umar met Abbas - uncle of the Prophet. He asked Abbas if there was any stain on his morals or conduct to be cause for disgrace? Abbas was amazed and asked what the matter was. Umar told him the story then threatened Abbas and all bin Hashim in these words: I swear by God that I will destroy the greatness and glory of Bani Hashim in Mecca and Medina from its root. Further, I will provide two witnesses to the effect that Ali has committed theft and carry on him the punishment prescribed in Quran.

Abbas came to Ali and told him what he was told by Umar and requested Ali to leave the task of Umme Kulthum's mar-riage to him. Ali finally accepted his uncle's proposal. Then Ab-bas performed the marriage of Umme Kulthum with Umar bin Khattab. When Umar was assassinated, Ali brought his daugh-ter home.

When Imam Sadiq was asked about this marriage he answered: That honorable lady was usurped from us. **[2]**

That which comes to hand from Shia sources is nothing other than what is narrated.

Prior to entering into the scrutiny of Sunni narrations, there is a point to consider:

The marriage in question is not mentioned in any of the six books, called Sihah which are of much credit among Sunni sect; besides this marriage is not found in any other book of repute also.

It is questionable as to why this marriage which is important to them because it goes a great deal to provide a confirmation to Caliphate of their Caliphs must be ignored or overlooked, what must be the reason for it?

[1] *Kulaini: Furu Kafi, Vol. 5, Pg. 346, & Vol. 6, Pg. 115*

[2] *It is worth mention that some senior scholars like Shaykh Mufeed and Sayyid Murtuza have rejected the marriage totally.*

But it appears that this marriage is bereft of a base. Else, a marriage of so much importance is not possible to be missed by the pen of historians. In our belief (as Shia), the issue of Imamate and Caliphate cannot be established by an event such as this if at all this could be true, though the case is doubtful.

After this reminder it can be said that:

This incident by adversaries is narrated in their books in two ways:

(1) Way of Ahle Bayt of Prophet. **[1]**

(2) Way other than of Ahle Bayt. **[2]**

Within these two ways, scholars and researchers have treated this incident too lightly. They have not given any credibility to it.

The conclusion is that: firstly there appears confusion and disturbance in its text, which goes to make it discreditable and shaky. Furthermore there appears no proof of Ali's willingness to this marriage. Those who have narrated this marriage have not mentioned any source relative to it, or a tradition to support its occurrence!!

Secondly: In all their other books which have mentioned this event through both channels there is no tradition on which they have unanimity on its authenticity.

Thirdly: There is a strange anxiety in the text of this story. Researchers have rejected many incidents if they find anxiety far less than which exists in this event in question. **[3]**

On the basis of that which is mentioned above it will be said:

So nothing comes to hand from these narrations. According to its phase from Shia narrations if we accept its having taken place, still it is liable to a deeper search. What is possible to lay hand upon is:

[1] *Tahdhib at-Tahdhib: Vol. 1, Pg. 44; Vol. 11, Pg. 382; Vol. 4, Pg. 106*

[2] *Tabaqat al-Kubra: Vol. 8, Pg. 462; Al-Mustadrak: Vol. 3, Pg. 142; As-Sunan al-Kubra: Vol. 7, Pg. 63 & Pg. 114; Tarikh Baghdad: Vol. 6, Pg. 182; Al-Istiab: Vol. 4, Pg. 1954; Usud al-Ghaba: Vol. 5, Pg. 614; Ad-Dhariyatut Tahira: Pgs. 157-165; Majmauz Zawaid: Vol. 4, Pg. 499; Al-Musannif Sanaani: Pg. 10354*

[3] *At-Tabaqat al-Kubra: Vol. 8, Pg. 463, Printed in Beirut; Al-Isabah: Vol. 4, Part 8, Pg. 275, No. 1473, Darul Kutub al-Ilmiya - Beirut; Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya: Vol. 5, Pg. 330, Darul Ahya Turathul Arabi - Beirut; Ansaab al-Ashraaf: Vol. 2, Pg. 412, Darul Fikr - Beirut; Al-Mustadrak: Vol. 3, Pg. 142, Darul Maroof - Beirut*

Umar might have contacted Ali with the request of marriage. It could be possible that he might have insisted upon his request besides having had repeated his contacts either by visits or approaches. Such persistence on his part could be the reason for change in answer of Ali from negative to positive. In addition to this, there is another element very much efficacious in this matter. Umar had sought the good offices of Aqeel (Ali's brother) and Abbas (Ali's uncle). So their recommendation in between seems to have played an effective role in making Ali change his stand. By the way, Sunni sources attest that Aqeel was in between. In a long run, Umar succeeded in creating compelling conditions for Ali. Finally, there remained no option for Ali but to accept. His acceptance was not on his will or inclination. Finally, he personally does not undertake the responsibility. This is further proof of his unwillingness. He leaves the whole matter to his uncle (Abbas). What could be a better sign of his unwillingness? Abbas performed the

marriage and took the girl, Umme Kulthum, to Umar's house. After this marriage, a short span of time passed and Umar was killed. Then Ali brought back his daughter home.

However this is the reality of the case and the background of the story. Now in view of this background and conditions that prevailed and the circumstances created for Ali, how could it be said that close, friendly and brotherly relations existed between Ali and Umar? A dim ray of reason will suffice to see the facts, a little wisdom is enough to judge the things and a least justice is sufficient to speak the truth far from selfish aims or motives. Shias have repeatedly stated with proof, logic and reason that Caliphate is a divine office as Prophethood. As we cannot appoint or choose a Prophet we cannot choose or appoint a successor to him. It is entirely and absolutely God's choice and His responsibility. The office of Imamate is sacred and too holy and too high. To occupy this office, everyone, no matter whatever his qualifications, is impaired unless he is chosen by God and is infallible.

Regarding this marriage, the narrations have several stories within a story to weave such as the children born of this marriage and the material used to enhance the beauty of the bride. All these things are false and without a ground.

If at all, anything could be proved it could be this:

The insistence of Umar bin Khattab and nothing else. There is a tradition of the Prophet that: on the Day of Judgment there will not remain any

family link or relation except that of mine. **[1]** To explain, the ties or links with the Prophet, that is the birth ties or links by birth that originate from the Prophet are not breakable. So Umar wanted to attain a family link with Fatima (daughter of the Prophet) and through her enter into family ties with the person of the Prophet to get that distinction.

But the real motive of Umar by this marriage is something else.

This motive can be found in the narration of Muhammad bin Idrees Shafei: When Hajjaj bin Yusuf Thaqafi married the

daughter of Abdullah bin Ja'far. Khalid bin Yazid bin Muawiyah told Abdul Malik Marwan: Have you left Hajjaj on his own on this matter of marriage. Abdul Malik replied: Yes, is there any problem in it? Khalid said: By God, this creates great many problems. Abdul Malik asked how and why. Khalid in answer said: By God! O Caliph! From the time I married the widow (daughter of Zubair) all the hatred and rancor that was rankling in my breast towards Zubair has now gone. By these words of Khalid, Abdul Malik woke up as if he was in sleep. He immediately wrote to Hajjaj to divorce the daughter of Abdullah. Hajjaj did the same. In other words, he obeyed the orders of Caliph. **[2]**

Of course there is no doubt that through marriage one enters into other's families and new links come into being. Also the inimical relation changes into friendly by a marriage. But the ill-will that Bani Umayyah had towards Bani Hashim always instigated them towards revenge instead of friendship. Bani Umayyah clan was always waiting for any opportunity to cool the fire of hatred burning in their hearts generation after generation.

But the case differed with Umar bin Khattab. By entering into the clan of Bani Hashim and particularly the House of Ali through this newly created link he wanted to change public opinion. He thought that the painful occurrence of Saqifah and his atrocious conduct along with his colleagues that entailed against Zahra could be redressed in the public view." **[3]**

[1] *At-Tabaqat al-Kubra: Vol. 8, Pg. 463, Printed in Beirut*

[2] *Mukhtasar Tarikh-e-Damishq: Vol. 6, Pg. 205*

[3] *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Imamat-e-Bila Fasl (Edit. Muhammad Reza Kareemi), Pgs. 227-235*

How many daughters did Ali have named Umme Kulthum?

Allamah Muhammad Taqi Shushtari writes in *Qamoos ar-Rijal*:**[1]**

“Umme Kulthum - Daughter of Ali:

It is said about her that her title was Zainab al-Sughra. This is drawn from the book *Irshad*.**[2]** About the number of children of Ali, the book mentions:

Zainab al-Sughra known as Umme Kulthum was the daughter of Ali and Zahra.

However Shaykh Mufeed writes that she was daughter of Ali. Her mother was not Zahra but a slave girl.

Supposing, if Zahra’s second daughter’s name was Zainab then in such a case the lady in question would have been called Zainab al-Osta not al-Sughra.

In fact, from other’s narrations we can conclude that Umme Kulthum had no other name.

About the daughters of Zahra, it is mentioned they were Zainab al-Kubra and Umme Kulthum al-Kubra.

The other two girls, Zainab al-Sughra and Umme Kulthum al Sughra, were from a slave lady. Refer to the book *Nasab Quraish* by Musayyab al-Zubairi and also *Tarikh Tabari*.

In brief, Ali had two daughters by name Umme Kulthum. Umme Kulthum Kubra from Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) and Umme Kulthum Sughra from slave wife and for none of the two are there distinctive names.**[3]”[4]**

Probably due to the mistakes of historians the biography and marriage of these two Umme Kulthums are mixed and it led to the false conclusion that Umar bin Khattab married Umme Kulthum the elder, daughter of Hazrat Fatima. (s.a.).

[1] Extract from Arabic text quoted in: *Fatima Zahra Bahjat Qalb-e-Mustafa*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 655-656

[2] By Shaykh Mufeed (q.s.)

[3] According to Late Muhaqqiq Shustari we can arrange this as follows:

[a) Umme Kulthum Kubra; daughter of Fatima Zahra (s.a.).

b) Umme Kulthum Sughra; daughter of slave-wife.

c) Zainab Kubra; daughter of Fatima Zahra (s.a.).

d) Zainab Sughra; daughter of slave-wife.]

[4] Refer: Muhaqqiq Shushtari: *Qamoos ar-Rijaal*, Vol. 10, Pg. 205

Outlook of Ayatullah Marashi Najafi

“Another research is that Umme Kulthum, wife of Umar bin Khattab, was the daughter of Abu Bakr and Asma Binte Umais. Asma was wife of Ja’far bin Abi Talib. When Ja’far was martyred, Abu Bakr married her. When Abu Bakr died, she became wife of Ali bin Abi Talib. Umme Kulthum was an infant. When Asma came to Ali’s house this infant baby too came along with her mother.

This girl too like her brother, Muhammad bin Abu Bakr, was brought up by Ali. Ali treated her as his own daughter like Muhammad bin Abu Bakr. Later this girl, Umme Kulthum, was married to Umar bin Khattab.

In reply to the inquiry, the great Ayatullah Marashi Najafi answered and the reply of the great Ayatullah Marashi Najafi bears date Rabi al-Awwal 1407 and signed by him under his stamp. The text is as follows:

Umme Kulthum was a stepdaughter of Ali. She was married to Umar bin Khattab. She was daughter of Asma Binte Umais and Abu Bakr. When Abu Bakr died she, (Umme Kulthum) was just an infant. She came to Ali’s house when her mother (Asma) married Ali. She was brought up by Ali as his own daughter. Later she was married to Umar. Mostly she was known as Ali’s daughter...”**[1]**

Another Analysis about the Marriage of Umme Kulthum with Umar

Historical documents point to the meeting of two shrewd and astute personalities of Arab with Umar bin Khattab.**[2]** They were Amr bin Aas and Mughaira bin Shoba. In this meeting, two points are detected:

A) Those two exerted their efforts to prevail Umar bin Khattab to forego his lust for Umme Kulthum to marry her; because she was yet too young and besides she was under immediate guardianship of her sister, Ayesha.**[3]** There are

[1] *Dr. Ali Akbar Hasani: Tarikh Tahlili wa Siyasi Islam, Vol. 2, Pg. 59*

[2] *Refer: Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili: Zalaamatu Umme Kulthum, Pgs. 127-131*

[3] *Historical sources have mentioned that: Umme Habiba daughter of Kharja bin Zaid Ansari - wife of Abu Bakr - after his death, gave birth to a daughter who was named Umme Kulthum. (Nuwairi: Nihayatul Arab, translated by Dr. Muhammad Damghani, Vol. 4, Pg. 117)*

Historical sources also say that Umar also asked for the hand of a daughter of Abu Bakr named Umme Kulthum. (Ibne Qutai-bah: *Al-Maarif*, Pg. 175; Maqdasi: *Al-Bada wat Tarikh*, Vol. 5, Pg. 92)

In the same way in all the above documents it is clearly mentioned that:

The Umme Kulthum mentioned in these documents was married to Talha bin signs one could predict thereon the social, political and periodical conditions that prevailed which necessitated relations with the house of Abu Bakr.

B) Ayesha after the death of her father (Abu Bakr) took the responsibility (the leadership) of her father's party and its supporters. She was strongly against this marriage.

Her opposition was to the extent that necessitated her to ask help from Mughaira and Amr Aas:

We refer to the outlook of the Great Ayatullah Sayyid Shahabbuddin Marashi Najafi[1] with regard to important points here: Asma Binte Umais (wife of Abu Bakr) had a daughter by Abu Bakr by name Umme Kulthum. This much is enough to guess that Umar wanted to marry any daughter of Abu Bakr. Amr Aas detected the intention of Umar bin Khattab. He (Amr Aas) wanted to foil the hidden desire of Umar bin Khattab. So he tried in this regard.[2] Amr Aas persuaded Umar bin Khattab to ignore her and to go after her sister, Umme Kulthum, brought up by Ali and known among people as his (Ali's) own daughter. Besides, he incited him that he would not cross Ayesha because she had no truck or any business with her.[3] This appeased and assuaged Umar to a great extent. So he immediately shifted from this girl to that. The attraction to Umar was the possibility of establishing a family link with Bani Hashim. Again, in this marriage he foresaw a possibility of deviating public opinion as they would see him in a different pose in a family tie with Ali and Zahra. This new relation would make them forget his harsh behavior towards Ali and Zahra and his attack on Zahra's house. So this marriage was a source of moral advantage to him. And also by forcing Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to this marriage he would be able to insult and weaken him.[4]

Ubaidullah (Cousin of Abu Bakr and a strong supporter of Ayesha).

Therefore it must be said: In the beginning Umar asked for the hand of Umme Kulthum daughter of Umme Habiba.

[1] Refer: Dr. Ali Akbar Hasani: *Tarikh Tahlili wa Siyasi Islam*, Vol. 2, Pg. 59

[2] *Even if we do not agree to the view of Ayatullah Marashi we can still say that the suggestion of Amr Aas to marry the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) created a new motive in the Second Caliph.*

[3] *On the basis of this it is known that Abu Bakr had two daughters named Umme Kulthum.*

[4] *Ustad Ja'far Murtuza believes that the intention of Umar in*

*trying to marry the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)
[whether it be Umme Kulthum, the elder, from*

Relations of the Third Caliph with the House of Divine Revelation

The claim of friendly relations between Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and the Third Caliph is related to the historical event connected with public attack on Uthman.

So they say:

“People used to come to Ali and complain to him about Uthman. And Ali conveyed people’s complaints to Uthman as he maintained a respectful position among the Caliphs.”**[1]**

A Glance at Historical Documents

History indicates that relations between Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and Uthman were not friendly as claimed, because we see that:

“Saeed bin Musayyab says: I have seen a very harsh exchange of words between Ali and Uthman. It went to the extent that Uthman lifted the whip on Ali. I came in between and pacified them.”**[2]**

In the case of Abu Zar’s exile by Uthman, Ali went to see him and bid him goodbye inspite of the fact that Uthman had prohibited it.

“People came to Ali and reported that Uthman was angry by his send off to Abu Zar. Ali did not care and said: His anger is like the anger of a horse from its reins.

At night when Uthman censured Ali for his farewell to Abu Zar inspite of his orders to the contrary.

Ali answered him absolutely emphatically: We shall not follow you in that which is against truth and pleasure of God.**[3]**

Similarly in the same matter Uthman said to Amirul Momin-een (a.s.):

Her Eminence, Zahra or Umme Kulthum, the younger, from slave wife or her step-daughter] was to insult His Eminence (a.s.). (Refer: Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: Zalaamatu Umme Kulthum, Pgs. 78 & 110)

[1] Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 133

[2] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Momin-aan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)]*, Pg. 21; quoting from: *Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 4, Pg. 132

[3] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pg. 219; quoting from *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadid*, Vol. 8, Pgs. 254-255 & *Muruj az-Zahab*, Pgs. 359-360

“By God, to me you are not above Marwan!”**[1]**

Again in the case of Ali’s support to Ammar Yasir:

“A harsh exchange of words took place between the two, which turned into a fracas. Little by little, Uthman could not tolerate the brawl. He said to Ali: You too deserve to be expelled.”**[2]**

The reason for such rows was that:

“Uthman considered Imam’s support to victims and oppressed as a direct war and an insult to him. Imam knew this but he did not forgo helping the victims.”**[3]**

So the difference went along between the two and became too serious that Uthman told him:

“I don’t know whether I like to see you dead or alive.”**[4]**

Then during the general riots:

“Marwan and Bani Umayyah used to whisper into the ears of Uthman that Ali was instigating the people against the Caliph to riot. The Egyptians were under Ali’s directions. Therefore Uthman expelled Ali to Yanbuh.”**[5]**

While this expulsion, in spite of historical evidences in support of it, has been distorted as follows:

“As Ali was more sympathetic to Uthman because of the riots against him, Uthman sent message to Ali to go out of Medina. Ali did so and this happened several times.”**[6]**

There is another example of such conduct towards Ali:

“Uthman too followed his predecessor Umar and prohibited the Hajj. Ali

[1] Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset)*, Pg. 337; quoting from: *Muruj az-Zahab*, Vol. 1, Pg. 689

[2] Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: *Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers)*, Pg. 198; quoting from: *Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 5, Pgs. 54-55

[3] *Ibid.* Pg. 196

[4] *Ibid.* Pg. 196; quoting from: *Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 5, Pg. 48

[5] *Ibid.* Pg. 246; quoting from: *Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 5, Pg. 62

[6] Sayyid Jawad Mustafavi: Article quoted in *Kitab*

Wahdat (Book of Unity), Pgs. 139-140; article quoted in Mashkoot Magazine, Issue No. 2, Spring 62, Pg. 53

objected because openly it was wrong. He stood against Caliph in word and deed. He took such a strong stand that his assassination seemed too likely to occur at the hands of Caliph's men.

Abdullah bin Zubair says: A man from Damascus said, which I will never forget: See the man how he argues with the lord of believers (Uthman). By God, I will kill him if the Caliph orders me."**[1]**

There is another incident. Ali objected to the Caliph when Uthman wanted to buy endowed land.

"The argument became a dispute the dispute became a noisy quarrel and the quarrel enraged Caliph so much that he lifted the whip upon Ali and Ali raised the cane which was in his hand. Prophet's uncle, Abbas came in between and calmed the two."**[2]**

[1] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pg. 282; quoting from: Tarikh Damishq, Ibne Asakir, Vol. 6, Pg. 24*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 297; quoting from: Majma az-Zawaid, Vol. 7, Pg. 226*

Part 19
**Publicized Analyses about the re-
lation of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)
with Caliphs**

Ali's criticism of Caliphs

The sermon of Shiqshiqya and his other stands prove Caliphs' deviations and perversions from the right path.

"Whenever Ali witnessed any wrong from Caliphs or any of their colleagues, he openly criticized them." [1]

Here it must be asked how they can claim:

"History does not mention that His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) uttered a sentence or a word against the other Caliphs."! [2]

That which is worth noting in this debate are the social conditions so blindly and ignorantly prevailing on the people in those days that made totally impossible for any voice of criticism to rise against Caliphs. So to criticize was neither easy nor tolerable to the people. Such an environment gave a free hand to Caliphs without fearing any opposition.

As a result, the silence of Imam Ali (a.s.) was due to the conditions prevailing then. It should not be attributed to fear; or seeing eye-to-eye from the side of Imam Ali (a.s.).

Ibne Abil Hadeed writes in this regard:

"Ali had very painful matters at heart as regards the Caliphate. But the tyranny of Umar restrained him from expression to his feelings during the periods of Abu Bakr and Umar." [3]

This was the reason for Ali's silence, which was too hard and heavy to him. He saw the Caliphs going astray and deviated from the right path but the conditions forced him to keep quiet.

[1] *Ali Muhammad Meer Jalili: Imam Ali (a.s.) wa Zamaam-daaraan (Imam Ali and the Rulers), Pg. 101*

[2] *Farooq Safizaada: Article quoted in Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 170, Azar 79, Pg. 80*

[3] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 193, quoting from Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 9, Pg. 25*

In any case:

"To oppose the government was not easy for Imam Ali (a.s.). In the early years, it was very hard to Ali. So he tried to take refuge in isolation to avoid face-to-face situation.

The fate of Saad bin Ubadah was a very painful example. He did not give Bay'at to Abu Bakr. In the period of Abu Bakr or Umar news came that Jinns have killed him in Damascus.

Some sources[1] indicate that his murder was political.”[2]

In the same way:

“Opinion of Imam about Caliphate of the three Caliphs remained confined to himself. The stringent conditions deprived him of any freedom of expression. Caliphate of the first two (Abu Bakr and Umar) receded into the annals of history. As for the third (Uthman) again Ali did not find an opportunity to express his judgment.

The handicap was Imam's soldiers in Kufa were those who had acknowledged the authority of Abu Bakr and Umar. So in their presence Imam could not speak freely. Only once he got the opportunity. He gave expression to his agonies suffered at the hands of those two. Then all of a sudden he stopped and shifted to some other subject.”[3]

Because:

“Although he had a multitude of political supporters during his own Caliphate mostly they had belief in competency of Abu Bakr and Umar. So it was difficult for him state the facts about them or do anything contrary to their attitude as it would have created difficulties for him.”[4]

In short it can be said that:

Amirul Momineen (a.s.) had to face insurmountable difficult conditions.

“Any change in political trend from the past two Caliphs was, for Ali, a change from a norm to which the people had become familiar and habituated for a quarter of a century. A multitude of people had come

[1] Refer: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 17, Pg. 223*

[2] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Mominaan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 17*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 18*

[4] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 239*

under Ali's banner because they were critics of Uthman as to why he was not following in the footsteps of Abu Bakr and Umar. (It shows how hard it would have been for Ali himself.)"**[1]**

Therefore before dwelling on analysis of Imam Ali's (a.s.) speeches, it would be interesting to see the trend of the people:

"People of those days...came after Ali to persuade him to become Caliph. But they expected him to follow the track of Umar."**[2]**

"Some people clearly told the Imam (a.s.) that he must act on the practice of the past Caliphs."**[3]**

"Ezzat-al-Din Abu Hamid Motazalli has gone a step forward and says: People's getting accustomed to Umar was the main reason for their opposition to Ali bin Abi Talib. Ebb and flow of their opposition kept playing for long, Sometimes it caused Ali's anger and anguish. He used to ask whether the tradition of the Prophet was better or that of Umar?!... **[4]**

Ali himself says that innovation in religion had taken a deep and strong root. If I were to disclose the real ruling or decree of faith in such regard, people would have left me and dispersed from around me.

Imam Ali (a.s.) further says: I told the people that in the month of Ramadan except for daily prayers they must not come for any other congregation prayer and announced that praying collectively in recommended prayers is innovation.

Some soldiers who had fought under my command shouted: O, Muslims! Look, the tradition of Umar is altered. Ali wants us to give up recommended prayers of Ramadan.

So with such mentality of the people, Ali says that he feared mutiny.**[5]"[6]**

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 240*

[2] *Rasool Ja'faryan: Tarikh wa Seerah Siyasi Amir-e-Momin-aan Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.) [History and political biography of*

Ali (a.s.)], Pg. 230

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 232*

[4] *Quoting from: Daimul Islam, Vol. 1, Pg. 384, Nahjus Saada, Vol. 1, Pg. 229*

[5] *Quoting from: Rauza Kafi, Pgs. 58-63; Tarikhul Khulafa, Pg. 136*

[6] *Yusuf Gholami: Pas az Ghuroob (After Sunset), Pg. 240*

Circumstances such as these also did not allow Ali to restore Fadak during his own rule.**[1]**

Anyway, from time to time at an opportunity whether short or long, Ali utilized to express his victimization and the tyranny done against him. Ibne al-Hadeed writes:

“Narrations that have reached us in continuity inform us about the situation of Ali. He has told something like this:

I have been oppressed since passing away of Prophet right till this day.”**[2]**

Historical documents show that the people were also exercising a severe force on Ali. When such an opinion prevails generally Imam Ali (a.s.) refers to them (Abu Bakr and Umar) with great circumspection. This widely disseminated opinion snatched from him the possibility of criticizing them openly.

To be acquainted with the necessity that forced Ali to accept the past as it preceded him refer to the third volume of this series.

A little attention to historical documents indicates the elements that existed during Ali’s Caliphate which impeded him to criticize or censure his predecessors, particularly Umar.

The following document, for example, shows the stringent conditions that ruled over Ali. From this, we can grasp the tight and narrow possibilities that were at Ali’s disposal:

Muawiyah in his letter to Ali writes:

“I have heard the news of your remembering them (Caliphs preceding Ali) with mercy and kindness. This could be either of the two reasons – to which there is no third. This might be due to dissimulation because you are afraid that your soldiers with

whom you fight against me would desert you. And the second reason is what you say is false and wrong.

Also I have come to know that you have told your Shias who have gone perverted and astray: I have named my three sons: Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. So whenever you hear me send blessings on Imams of perversion you should know that I mean my sons.”**[3]**

[1] Refer: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 16, Pg. 231*

[2] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 9, Pg. 306*

[3] *Muhammad Ismail Ansari Zanjani: Translation of Asraar Aale Muhammad, Pg. 435*

What Muawiyah says in his letter so openly and frankly shows that Ali was obliged to maintain some outward symptoms of affection towards the three Caliphs. This will also refute another conjecture that is claimed:

Why Ali named his sons after Caliphs?

What Muawiyah says in his letter so openly and frankly shows that Ali was obliged to maintain some outward symptoms of affection towards the three Caliphs. This will also refute another conjecture that is claimed:

“Another sign of his affection for the three Caliphs is that He named his sons Abu Bakr bin Ali, Umar bin Ali and Uthman bin Ali.”!**[1]**

“The leader of Friday prayers of Zahidan (Iran) who is a Sunni spoke to his audience that three brothers of Imam Husain were martyred in Kerbala, as they fought along with their brothers. This shows the ties of affection between the family of Ali and the Caliphs (Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman).”!**[2]**

Anyway, it should be noted that:

“Such arguments from early Islamic days and in the run of historical events have played a part and given a trend to the political status of the Prophet’s House. Further, these events just give a deluding face to the actual facts that existed behind the events. There is nothing tangible in it – except a public-deceiving device. In other words, to use the common term we should say that they are far from being real. Therefore they are nothing more than a guise to provide a show to public.

Those who have a little information about history, Islamic civilization, culture and something regarding Arabs they certainly know that names such as Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were already current among the people prior and later to Islam. People were called by these names. They have no bearing on the personalities. Nor these names came into being because of the personalities.

In a social culture, no matter whichever society, inimical or intimate relations do not cause one to be named or not named after the names of either friends or enemies. Names have nothing to do with mutual relations. Names cannot be prohibited.

In the norm of today's society, too expression of love or hatred cannot be based on a name. Because of name of one family there exists enmity, which ends in a murder of another.

[1] Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 135

[2] Abdul Hameed Ismail Zahi: *Appeal* quoted in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 9, Spring 81, Pg. 71

If the name of the murderer happens to be Abdullah the family of victim could be angry or demand compensation etc. to assuage its hurt and grievance. But its hatred with the name Abdullah is not justifiable.

Far beyond this, there is no one who does not know the enmity and its extent between Muawiyah and Bani Umayyah with the Prophet's House and its Shias.

*But a brief look at History and biographical books will show that the Bani Hashim and Shias**[1]**continued to name their children Muawiyah and even Yazid for centuries. Here we present a few examples:**[2]***

Name of Muawiyah in use

- Muawiyah bin Abdullah bin Ja'far bin Abi Talib (from Bani Hashim)

- Muawiyah bin Harith and Muawiyah bin Sasaye from Shias and companions of Ali.

- Muawiyah bin Ammar, Muawiyah bin Wahab (among Shias and companions of Imam Baqir (a.s.);

- Muawiyah bin Saeed, Muawiyah bin Salma, Muawiyah bin Sawade, Muawiyah bin Sahl, Muawiyah bin Tareef, Muawiyah bin Abdullah, Muawiyah bin al-Ala, Muawiyah bin Kulaib, Muawiyah bin Maisarah. All of them were Shia and among companions of Imam Sadiq.

Muawiyah Ja'fari was a Shia and among companions of Imam Moosa Kazim (a.s.).

- Muawiyah bin Hakam and Muawiyah bin Yahya were among companions of Imam Reza (a.s.) and...

Name of Yazid in use

- Yazid bin Muawiyah bin Abu Bakr bin Ja'far (his mother was Fatima Binte Husain bin Hasan bin Ail);**[3]**

[1] *Arabic speaking*

[2] *[For more information most books of Shia Rijaal can be referred like: Rijaal Toosi, Rijaal Barqi, Rijaal Kishi, Mojamur Rijaal al-Hadith of Ayatullah Khui.*

[3] *[Father and son, both from Bani Hashim were named Yazid after the tragedy of Kerbala.*

Yazid bin Muawiyah bin Abdullah bin Ja'far bin Abi Talib had two more brothers named Hasan and Salih. All three were from the same mother and they participated in the uprising of Nafs-e-Zakiyyah

(Refer: Abul Faraj Isfahani: *Maqatil at-Talibiyyin*)

- Yazid bin Ahnaf, Yazid bin Jibelleh, Yazid bin Tomeh, Yazid bin Qays, Yazid bin Nowaise, Yazid bin Hani. All these were Shias and companions of Ali (a.s.).

- Yazid bin Laheet, Yazid bin Haseen, Yazid bin Ziyad. All these three were Shias companions of Imam Husain. All these three were among the martyrs of Kerbala.

- Yazid bin Hatim was among companions of Imam Zainul Aabideen (a.s.).

- Yazid al-Kannasi, Yazid bin Khyam, Yazid bin Ziyad, Yazid bin Abdullah, Yazid bin Abdul Malik Jofi, Yazid bin Muhammad Nishapuri, Yazid bin Abdul Malik Nofekhi. All these were Shias and companions of Imam Baqir (a.s.).

- Yazid bin Awar, Yazid al-Qamat, Yazid bin Esbaat, Yazid bin Ishaq, Yazid bin Khalid, Yazid bin Khaleel, Yazid bin Umar bin Talha, Yazid bin Farkhad, Yazid bin Haroon al-wasti. All of them were Shias and companion of Imam Sadiq.

- Yazid bin Hasan, Yazid bin Khalifa, Yazid bin Saleh. All of them were Shias and companions of Imam Moosa Kazim (a.s.).

- Yazid bin Uthman, Yazid bin Umar. Both of them were Shias and companions of Imam Reza (a.s.).

It can be noted how this name was common among Shias.

On the basis this can we conclude that relations between Muawiyah bin Abi Sufyan and Ali bin Abi Talib and Bani Hashim and Shias were very close and good? Who can even for a moment think that Yazid bin Muawiyah did not commit any wrong or did not kill Imam Husain and his family?

What is certain is that names do not reflect the kind of relations that exist between the bearers of those names.

In every society names come into fashion and later get out of date by losing attraction or text of its contents. Besides they depend on personal taste or cultural vicissitude. Even in Sunni societies names of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman are less in circulation because they are selected. For instance, I have myself searched among the writers of Nida-e-Islam but I did not find one bearing any of these three names. However in the early centuries of Islam, this was not the case. These names were familiar and customary.

However getting these names out of norm particularly from Shia circles must be due to general will and intention of the people during the past centuries.

Besides the wars that took place between Ottomans and Safavid rulers (of Iran) took a religious pretext to itself. This too could be the cause for the names receding into oblivion.

During the centuries - not too remote, Shias[1] created a far-reaching and widely embracing cultural movement, which ultimately covered all aspects and angles. This movement rather winnowed and sifted the names leaving only those of Infallible Imams. Shias began to use names of Imams. Therefore Shias completely eschewed the names, which remind them of enemies of Ahle Bayt (a.s.). Little by little this Shia practice took to itself a look of 'enemy to the enemies' and 'friend to the friends' of the Prophet's House. In other words to hate the enemy and befriend the friend of Ahle Bayt of Prophet. In the earlier centuries, such an understanding in selecting the names did not exist.

According to the foregone details now in this present age after lapse of fourteen centuries, names cannot be the gauge of relations between two sides. Other grounds should be searched to find the reason of enmity or friendship. **[2]**

In that age too there was not any proof of good relation by means of the name. These names perhaps were common among Arabs in those days.

In other words:

According to their taste or choice they used to select a name for their newborns. There was nothing bad in these names. We do not find in any books of opponents even in recent times; that is since fifty years onward, that through the commonality of these they have argued that the Imams were at good terms with the Caliphs. **[3]**

In the same way it is narrated from Amirul Momineen (a.s.) that he said regarding the naming of his son, Uthman: I have named him after my brother Uthman bin Ma'zoon. **[4]**

[1] *[Especially non-Arabic-speaking]*

[2] *Engineer Jawad Husaini Tabatabai: Dar Pasukh-e-Afsana-e-Shahadat, Pgs. 181-184*

[3] *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Imamat-e-Bila Fasl (Edit. Muhammad Reza Kareemi), Pg. 237*

[4] *Abul Faraj Isfahani: Maqatil at-Talibiyyin, (Translated by Rasooli Mahallati), Pg. 80*

Another Outlook about these Namings

“Naming the children itself, is an issue of irrecusable importance. Such it has been since ancient times. The magnitude of this issue depends upon social status of the person. More serious the issue if greater the position of the person. There are many incidents in history. After having had named their children they have changed and chosen some other names because the first names were not approved by the Prophet or did not meet his taste. Or with regard to Imam Hasan, Imam Husain and Mohsin, they were named first with names which were changed later.

There are cases that show the tyrant rulers, Caliphs, from social and political aspects, dictated the names for the persons they liked. In those prevailing conditions, no one could oppose the chosen name.

With regard to son of Ali whose name was Umar, Sunni sources have explained:

“Hafiz Midhi,**[1]** Ibne Hajar Asqalani**[2]** and other writers have written:

When Saha Binte Rabiya wife of Imam Ali (a.s.) gave birth to a male child, Umar bin Khattab named the child after himself!!

In our opinion, this too should be the same ground as the issue of marriage with the daughter of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) under compulsion.”**[3]**

Are narrations attributed to Ali about his Praise of Caliphs Correct?

Answer to this question can be on two divisions:

Narrations in Sunni Books

“In books of people opposed to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) it is attributed that: Ali (a.s.) has praised the two Caliphs in different words. Like:

“The best of the men after the Prophet is Abu Bakr and after him it is Umar.”**[4]**

Rather Ibne Taimmiyah writes in his book Minhaj al-Sunnah: Ali often used to say: If a man comes to me and says I am superior to Abu Bakr and Umar I would carry God’s decree against him for lying and lash him.

[1] *Tahdhib al-Kamal: Vol. 21, Pg. 467*

[2] *Tahdhib at-Tahdhib: Vol. 7, Pg. 411*

[3] *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Imam-at-e-Bila Fasl (Edit. Muhammad Reza Kareemi), Pgs. 235-236*

[4] *Sharh al-Mawafiq: Vol. 8, Pg. 367*

We have spoken in the past regarding this subject referring to the words of Ibne Abdul Barr.**[1]** Now we wish to dwell on details.

First: Such matters attributed to Imam Ali (a.s.) are mostly and only mentioned in the books of Sunnis; such things are never found in Shia books. The logic of argument is lame here. They always trod over norms and trespass the standard formulas whenever Amirul Momineen (a.s.) comes into question.

Second: No books of repute among Sunni authorities have mentioned these things. If at all anything is mentioned, it is mentioned not as an established fact. They mention under a guise of: It is told of Ali or: Having had told of Ali...Such a tone of narration eschews responsibility. It does not establish the narrated matter as solid truth. Such type of narration either in history or by any authority in itself loses credibility. They are deprived of any strength that a document or a reality should have.

Third: Existence of words and plenitude of narrations besides the multitude of narrators about superiority of Ali and about

the best qualities in his person, in addition to the constant sayings of Prophet regarding the worth and highly dignified status of Ali repudiate praise for Caliphs. There remains no room to any praise for any Caliphs. It is invented to bedim the widespread glitter of Prophet's praise of Ali: There was no need for Ali to praise Caliphs.

Fourth: There are evidences in excess that prove attributions such as these as false and absolutely lie. We suffice with one:

Ibne Abdul Barr in his book *Al-Istiab Fil Marefat-al-Ashaab* writes on the authority of reputed personalities such as Salman, Miqdad, Abu Zar, Habbab, Jabir bin Abdullah al-Ansaari, Abu Saeed Khudri and Zaid bin Arqam:

Ali bin Abi Talib is the first one to embrace Islam. After that he writes: They all gave Ali priority over others. **[2]**

Here it is necessary to point out that those who had such a belief in Ali or they viewed Ali at such a station, were in all twenty persons. They were themselves companions and enjoyed a good reputation in society.

The author of *Al-Istiab* has avoided many others and only refers to these

[1] *[This statement will be repeated further in this text.]*

[2] *Al-Istiab: Vol. 3, Pg. 109, Edit. Bajawi*

twenty persons that he deems fit. The question who was the first to become Muslim has a great bearing on worth or reputation in Sunni books. Its answer is Ali. Therefore this very element singly brings much credit and worth to Ali. Sunni sources have narrated that Abu Bakr embraced Islam after fifty persons **[1]** had become Muslims. Therefore they created such baseless stories to stain Ali's reputation because of the realities of his personality, which cannot be denied. More strange is that they have created stories to say that it was Abu Bakr who embraced Islam first though they have no evidence to prove it. There are several such false stories but don't have to argue their worth. The theme of our argument is the saying of a highly reputed scholar among adversaries of Shia. He is Ibne Abdul Barr Qurtubi. He says in his book that many among the

Prophet's companions have acknowledged Ali's superiority over Abu Bakr. We all know this but Ali during all the periods, including when he was in power did not punish any for this matter.

Here we see Ibne Hajar Asqalani helpless and seeking to rescue himself. On the other hand they attributed Ali having told that he would punish those who say Ali was better than Abu Bakr and Umar. If it was true why Ali did not punish anyone? Ibne Abdul Barr adds: And they preferred him upon others. So contradiction is quite obvious in his saying.

We have evidences that say similar things attributing it to the past scholars and some to recent ones - each trying to establish his claim." **[2]**

In the end it is noted that Caliphs themselves have admitted superiority of Ali in learning and knowledge. In many cases, Ali went to their help. He solved their problems and clarified many issues. This aspect of knowledge is very important for a Caliph. This itself is enough to refute what Ibne Taimmiyah has claimed.

Narrations mentioned in Nahjul Balagha and Al-Gharaat

They say:

“As Umar loved Ali and showed his deep affection to him, Ali also reciprocated. Ali helped him as much as he could. When Umar was martyred, Ali used to remember him saying: May God bestow good on him as he straightened the crooked.”!**[3]**

[1] *Tarikh Tabari: Vol. 2, Pg. 316*

[2] *Ustad Sayyid Ali Husaini Milani: Imam-e-Bila Fasl (Edit. Muhammad Reza Kareemi), Pgs. 237-241*

[3] *Muhammad Barfi: Seemai Ali Az Manzar Ahle Sunnat (Portrait of Ali from the Sunni*

“On many occasions Ali has praised them. Among such utterance is his statement about the Second Caliph in Nahjul Balagha...”!**[1]**

Dr. Muhammad Asadi Garmarudi says in reply:

“It is said that in Sermon 228 of Nahjul Balagha**[2]** the Second Caliph is referred with admiration and appreciation.

In this respect we should know that:

First: Does this sermon contradict matters of other sources, even Shiqshiqya sermon and letters of His Eminence in criticism and objections against the Caliphs or not?

Second: If we pay attention to moderation, preference and accuracy in principle not in hearsay, with this attitude if we glance at the lecture in question, can we still say it is in praise of the Caliph? Mr. Hujjati Kermani claims that there is a reasoning weakness.

Third: Whether by principle this lecture is attributed to Ali. Is it not doubtful to researchers?

In Tarikh Tabari - a reputed book among Sunnis - it is mentioned:

When Umar died, daughter of Abi Khathima wept and said: Ah! Umar! Straightened the crooked; and cured the sick.

Mughaira Ibne Shoba said: When Umar was buried, I came to Ali. He had just taken the bath. His head and beard were still wet. He was wrapped in a wide towel. He was sure that Caliphate would reach to him. He said: May God send His mercies on him. Daughter of Abi Khathima spoke the truth. He gained the good and is saved from the evil of the world. By God! She did not say these words. But she was told to say these words ...**[3]**

The foregone text in lecture No.228 (219 Faizul Islam) runs: May God bestow on him the good. He made straight the sinuous and cured the ill. He attained good of the world and is rescued from its evil.

There is a similarity in both.

Now, Tabari narrates the incident of the year 23 A.H. The text too is said

point of view), [1st Edition 1380], Pg. 115

[1] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Ittelaat Daily, Issue No. 29, Khordad 1379*

[2] *Sermon 219, Faid al-Islam Edition.*

[3] *Tarikh Tabari: Vol. 3, Pg. 285, Account of Year 23 A.H.*

by Ali in the same year. Its reason is also obvious. Ali says the words do not belong to the daughter of Abi Khathima but were dictated to her.**[1]** Ali might have repeated those words out of astonishment.

On the other hand the principle of accuracy obliges one to be attentive of Mughaira bin Shoba. He is not trustworthy. Narrations from him are bereft of credibility. Therefore how can this narration be worthy to accept its authenticity? When the narrator is Mughaira how can we accept it as saying of Ali?

Besides, in the lecture of Ali where is that part that compels us to believe that he means the Second Caliph?

Ibne Abil Hadeed Motazalli in Vol. 12 of Sharh Nahjul Balagha while explaining the sermon 228 refers to this subject too. Hajj Mirza Habeebullah Hashimi Khoei the famous commentator of Nahjul Balagha says in Vol. 14 Pg. 371 onward of Minhaj al-Baraya fee Sharh Nahjul Balagha that after such a criticism against Caliphs how could he have said so? We can ignore all these things.

The Late Ustad Mutahhari in his essay Sairi Dar Nahjul Balagha says:

“Ibne Abil Hadeed believes the story that there are sentences in Nahjul Balagha in praise of Umar.

But there are some contemporaries who have narrated in different form. It runs thus: Ali came out of his house and saw Mughaira. In a tone of interrogation, he asked Mughaira whether was it true what the daughter of Abi Khathima said in praise of Umar?

Therefore as such this cannot be confirmed that it was Ali’s saying or Ali’s acceptance of the words of the speaker that Sayyid Razi included in the text of Nahjul Balagha by mistake. **[2]**

Of course through careful attention, study of the text of Tabari’s saying Abi Khathima’s daughter and text of the sermon 228 we can distinguish the subject matter.” **[3]**

Thus it seems Imam Ali (a.s.) has repeated the words of the girl by way of surprise. There is another point to be paid attention to:

[1] *That is there were such people who publicized such things and introduced the Caliphs as such.*

[2] *Seeri Dar Nahjul Balagha, Pg. 164*

[3] *Dr. Muhammad Asadi Garmarudi: Haqeeqat Sookhte, Pgs. 49-54*

In the closing sentences, Ali says:

“The astrayed cannot be guided and the guided one cannot retain certainty nor could he rest assured.”

The Researcher Shushtari's Outlook

Perhaps in the end it would still be hard to believe the mistake committed by Sayyid Razi. Because it is said:

“Shias accept Nahjul Balagha and whatever is in its text. The relation between Ali and Caliphs as indicated in the text is acceptable to a Shia because it is the most creditable book among Shias. If any narration any book happens to be in contrast with Nahjul Balagha they (Shia) prefer Nahjul Balagha.”! [1]

But it must be said:

“The past commentators because of extraordinary reputation of Nahjul Balagha were fond of Sayyid Razi and took it for granted to be perfect and without any error since it was the work rendered by Sayyid Razi.

Therefore no one dared to criticize or venture thereat. All considered it the saying of Ali.

But the researcher Shushtari has shown in his other works such as Qamoos ar-Rijaal and Al-Akhbaar ad-Dakheela that he is a skilled commentator; a traditionist and a narrator. Likewise, he is daring to the extent of getting appreciation in literary circles and has gained worldwide reputation. In the town of Shushtar in a corner, he retired from propaganda and was mindful of his own work. He has thoroughly scrutinized the work of Sayyid Razi in compiling Nahjul Balagha. As he appreciates his labor so he criticizes too. He does not see the compiler who is Sayyid Razi but he sees into the quality of his work. In his view, knowledge is more important than the person who holds it.

Now we dwell on some of his criticisms:

One:

Statements under the title of ‘Book 62’ are only a letter of Imam Ali (a.s.) to Malik Ashtar in Egypt. It is the text of the speech delivered after the martyrdom of Muhammad bin Abu Bakr. Martyrdom of Malik Ashtar was before Muhammad bin Abu Bakr. The letter was read in Kufa. Imam Ali

[1] Sayyid Jawad Mustafawi: Article quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 139; article quoted in *Mashkoot Magazine*, Issue No. 2, Spring 62, Pg. 58

(a.s.) had written it and wanted it to be read out to the people.**[1]**

Two:

The sentence 'do not kill the Khawarij after me', itself says that it is not of Ali. We do not find any proof by Sayyid Razi. Had Imam issued such an order his followers would have not killed them. On the other hand we see followers of Ali, at their head Sa'sa bin Sauhan, then Ma'qel bin Qays and Adi bin Hatim and Shareek bin Awar and Shia of Kufa and Basrah all of them exerted their efforts to kill them.**[2]**

Three:

Sermon 168: The statement '...O brothers! I do not ignore that you know. But how can I be powerful when the people draw their greatness upon us to possess us and we don't.' This is not of Ali. It is composed by Muawiyah in imitation to Ali.**[3]**

Four:

Letter 58: Shushtari does not consider it to be of Ali. This letter is also invented. Sayyid Ali Razi has included it unknowingly. Anyway, it is attributed to Ali wrongly.**[4]**

Fifth:

Sermon 228: According to research, which Shushtari has carried, it is impossible to be of Imam.**[5]** Ibne Abil-Hadid and his followers are wrong who consider it to be of Imam.

Sixth:

Sermon 8: According to Shaykh Mufeed, Sayyid Razi attributes this to Imam Hasan.**[6]**

Seventh:

Sermon 92: 'Leave me alone and request other than me. If you leave me I will be one like you...' is not from Imam Ali (a.s.). This too is invented

[1] Bahjus Sibagha: Vol. 4, Pgs. 369-373

[2] Ibid. Vol. 5, Pg. 473

[3] Ibid. Vol. 9, Pgs. 448-465, especially Pgs. 428 & 449

[4] Ibid. Vol. 9, Pgs. 466-480

[5] Ibid. Vol. 9, Pgs. 480-509

[6] Ibid. Vol. 9, Pg. 536; quoting from: *Al-Jamal*, Pgs. 322-327 and inserted into the contents**[1].[2]**

Eighth:

Sermon 169: 'God has sent a Prophet...' too is a creation of others. It does not belong to Ali, or its contents are distorted. **[3]**

Ninth:

In Sermon 27: There is difference in one sentence. **[4]**

Tenth:

Saying 289: 'To me in the past was a brother in way of God.' This saying is of Imam Hasan and not of Ali.

Eleventh:

Saying 22: 'He who is detained by his work...' Sayyid Razi attributed this sentence to the Prophet in another book of his **[5]** but now he is attributing it to Ali. **[6]**

Twelfth:

Saying 296: Is among the saying fabricated and presented by Saif. **[7]**

We suffice here only with these twelve items. There are several other items also that we refer as follows according to *Bahjus Sibagha*:

Vol. 4 / Pg. 67, 401, 519

Vol. 6 / 369, 371, 401, 443

Vol. 7 / 334, 598

Vol. 8 / 82

[1] *Ibid. Vol. 9, Pg. 564*

[2] *[It is necessary to mention that this statement of Nahjul Balagha is used to show separation between Imamate and Caliphate and in the end to make rulership of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) valueless.*

(Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 7, Pg. 17)]

[3] *Bahjus Sibagha: Vol. 10, Pgs. 40-44*

[4] *Ibid. Vol. 12, Pgs. 90-91*

[5] *Sayyid Razi: Al-Majazaatun Nabawiyyah, Pg. 401, Tr. 317*

[6] *Bahjus Sibagha: Vol. 14, Vol. 477*

[7] *Ibid. Vol. 14, Pg. 573*

Vol. 9 / 59, 360, 362, 423

Vol. 10 / 339, 562, 577

Vol. 11 / 526

Vol. 12 / 59-60, 94-95, 217, 541, 574

Vol. 13 / 23, 355, 361

Vol. 14 / 330, 552, 595

These are the examples we came across while turning the pages of Bahjul Sibagha. Each one of it might seem trifle and trivial, but it attains magnitude while explaining, commenting, translating and researching Nahjul Balagha.

It goes without saying that Shushtari appreciates the work of Sayyid Razi.

He has dwelled more on preface in which he has made a research in the work of Sayyid Razi. This is not repeated in his other works.[1]

In the same way the claim that Ali has praised Umar is reflected in this text:

“Ibrahim bin Muhammad Thaqafi in his book *Al-Gharaat*, Pg. 307 has mentioned that Ali said about Umar: “We heard and we obeyed. He was our advisor. He took over the charge. His conduct was satisfactory...”[2]

We can investigate and analyze this in the following points:

Point One:

The matter taken from the text of *Al-Gharaat* is a portion from letter of Ali to his followers. This is mentioned in the book also beneath the heading.

It should be reminded here that the letter exists in other sources too.[3] Likewise, in *Al-Mustarshid fil Imamah*[4] by Muhammad bin Jurair Tabari Imami Kabeer (died around year 310 A.H.) Reference to the text makes clear the matter.

[1] Muhammad Sahati Sardarudi: Article quoted in the book, *Mashal-e-Javed*, Dalil Publishers

[2] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in *Kitab Naqd Magazine*, Issue No. 19, (Vol. 2), Summer 80, Pg. 31

[3] Refer: Ali Akbar Zakiri: *Hukoomat O Siyasat (Letter of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to Shias about Caliphs)*, Pgs. 29-36

[4] Research: Ahmad Mahmoodi: *Mausisa Thaqafatul Islamiya*, Pgs. 409-427

Point Two:

What Ali has mentioned in the letter is in connection to his previous sayings about Abu Bakr. This should be read after studying the conditions prevalent in society in those times.

On the same page of *Al-Gharaat*, following sentences of Ali are mentioned regarding Abu Bakr:

“...He obeyed God...”[1] Then he repeats about Umar “...We obeyed him.”

Imam Ali’s (a.s.) obedience is to God not to Caliphs. He obeyed where obedience to God was necessary.

Point Three:

Whatever Ali has said about Caliphs, depends on the same circumstances and conditions, which we dwelt in the chapter concerned.

There is an obvious contradiction in *Al-Mustarshid* page 415 in the text. This confirms an idea that whatever said or done was with an aim to protect Islam and hold the people at it. Else, there was a strong likelihood of people’s reverting to ignorance, i.e. the pre-Islamic days – to idol-worship. The words impart such a sense.

Point Four:

The text: a desired conduct and a blessed soul had a great influence on the people of that time which has a bearing on Caliphate. Imam Ali (a.s.), in fact, has sketched a general picture of people’s outlook concerning the Caliphs.

A little attention to the norm and nature of Ali’s statement clearly confirms the said conjecture. In reverting to *Al-Gharaat*, which is newly printed with a commentary and correction of Mir Jalaluddin Husaini known as Traditionist Armavi.

On the same page of the book in Footnote No. 5 he mentioned Allamah Majlisi’s words that the Imam’s words are in keeping with the delicate situation.

Similarly in Footnote no. 6 of the same page he points out the location of some words, which are ahead and some behind.

Imam was then speaking about the general condition of the society.

[1] *This statement is also mentioned in Kashful Muhajja of Sayyid bin Tawoos, al-Mustarshid of Tabarai Imami Kabir and Al-Imamah was Siyasaah of Ibne Qutaibah*

This also applies to the letter of Ali for Egyptians. **[1]**

Late Mirza Habeebullah Hashimi Khoei in his commentary on *Nahjul Balagha* says:

“It seems so with the people and possibly it could be by persuasion of adversaries” **[2]**

Of the indications that attest Khoei’s viewpoint is the difference between text of *Al-Gharaat* **[3]** and *Al-Darajaat Ar-Rafia*. **[4]** Although late Sayyid Ali Khan Madani has copied the letter from *Al-Gharaat*, the text is short of some words of praise, which exist, in the present text of *Al-Gharaat*. This in itself is a proof that the text is altered and added thereon some words. **[5]**

Another thing that confirms the views of Allamah Majlisi and Allamah Khoei is that the Imam had reflected people’s outlook. Therefore his words mirror people’s view about the two Caliphs. The letter is addressed to the people of Madayn. In the end, he adds:

“Then some among Muslims rose and accepted two persons and were pleased to be guided by them and the conduct of the two pleased them. **[6]**” **[7]**

Final Point:

The attitude of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in the six-person Shura committee to appoint a Caliph is quite clear **[8]** as Imam rejects the proposal of Abdur Rahman bin Auf to follow the tracks of two preceding Caliphs. This proves the falsehood of their claims. When he is not willing to follow the policies of the first two Caliphs how can he praise them?

[1] *Sayyid Abul Fazl Barqai in his Preface to the book, Shahira-e-Ittihaad has based his view on this document about good relations of Amirul Momineen (a.s.).*

[2] *Hashimi Khoei: Minhaaj al-Bara-a, Vol. 6, Pg. 106*

[3] *Thaqafi Kufi: Al-Gharaat, Vol. 1, Pg. 210*

[4] *Sayyid Ali Khan Madani: Ad-Darajaat ar-Rafia (Elevated*

Positions), Pg. 336

[5] This possibility is also applicable to the book of *Ad-Darajaat ar-Raafia* as it also contains many praises of the Caliphs.

[6] [For more information refer to Section One of the 4th volume of this book.]

[7] Muhammad Baqir Mahmoodi: *Nahjus Saada Fee Mustadrak Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 4, Pg. 23

[8] Refer: *Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah*, Vol. 1, Pg. 26, *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 1, Pg. 188, *Yaqaobi: Tarikh Yaqaobi*, Vol. 2, Pg. 162, *Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 5, Pg. 22

The denial of Ali to the proposal of Abdur Rahman in itself establishes the illegitimacy of Caliphate of the two.

Had Ali accepted the legitimacy of Caliphs' Government?

A wrong interpretation of Letter No. 6 of Ali (a.s.) in *Nahjul Balagha* addressed to Muawiyah has led to creation of a conjecture in propagating the legitimacy of Caliphate of Saqifah besides separating Imamate from Caliphate. Thus they allege:

“If people had selected a person of authority in consultation with Imam[1] he would have administered better under Imam’s guidance.[2] There would neither have been civil wars nor any differences resulting in separation of the Ummah. After the Prophet’s passing away Ali was, during the three Caliphs’ rule, a pivot of Islam and its revolution...”[3]

Ustad Ja’far Subhani in reply to this conjecture writes:

“Imam Ali (a.s.) was the only Caliph elected by one and all. Muhajireen and Ansaar (Helper) both sides equally agreed on this. In the history of Caliphate, such unanimity was unprecedented. Such a thing never happened again.

In the meantime, Muawiyah had founded his empire in Syria. He had a hidden enmity that was deeply rooted. He was very much upset and worried with Ahle Bayt (a.s.) of the Prophet. When he learned that Muhajireen and Ansaar had chosen Ali to be the Caliph he refused to acknowledge Ali’s authority and instead accused him of Uthman’s murder and his support to murderers of Uthman.

Imam Ali (a.s.), to silence Muawiyah and close all doors of excuse wrote to him: The same persons who had paid allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman have acknowledged my authority and me. Since the Ansaar’s and Muhajireen’s opinion was acceptable to you, they have paid allegiance to me now.

This is the text of Imam’s letter:

[1] *The interesting point is that these people forget their own claims that after the passing away of the Prophet they selected Abu Bakr as Caliph without consulting Ali (a.s.) - Refer: Mashal-e-Ittehad, Pg. 20*

[2] *[Which of the three Caliphs was selected on the choice of the people? Abu Bakr got the Bayyat of just five of his associates in Saqifah, Umar was appointed by Abu Bakr and Uthman was chosen through the trick of Shura.]*

[3] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 7, Pg. 18*

‘Verily, those who took the oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman have sworn allegiance to me. Now those who were present at the election have no right to go back against their oaths of allegiance and those who were not present on the occasion have no right to oppose me. And so far as Shura was concerned it was supposed to be limited to Muhajirs and Ansars and it was also supposed that whomsoever they selected, became caliph as per approval and pleasure of Allah.’ **[1]**

The motive of Ali was to exhaust argument on Muawiyah. Imam wanted to wipe out all grounds of mischief from and before Muawiyah.

Muawiyah was Umar’s governor in Syria. Then he maintained his post in the same office in Uthman’s Caliphate. He maintained them in the public as Caliphs of the Prophet of God and himself as their representative.

Imam Ali (a.s.) reminded him because Ansaar and Muhajireen had chosen the past Caliphs. So in his own case also happened the same without any deficiency. Therefore there was no ground to honor their opinion in one case and reject it in another.

Ali adopted the way of argument as Quran also enjoins that. He proceeded with the argument thus:

Those who had given Bay’at to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman have given Bay’at to me. So why then did you not pay allegiance to my Caliphate? The reality of argument is not other than this. The opposite side should be convinced on its own terms. What it thinks sacred should be brought against it.

Anyway, the letter does not mean that Ali preferred the method of Islamic government on the basis of consultation. Or he preferred the appointment of Caliph by way of elections. The inner belief of Ali was that the Caliph must be elected by absolute majority or public unanimity. But the issue of Imamate is not of election but by divine appointment.

This cannot be Ali's view. Had it been so he should have not started his letter from the past three Caliphs in this way:

Muhajireen and Ansaar have paid allegiance to me. Whomever they paid allegiance to will be the leader of Muslims.

Imam Ali (a.s.) in his subsequent sentences says: And they gathered around a man and named him Imam. In it is God's pleasure. This is a protest against the belief of opposite side. The word 'Allah' does not exist

[1] *Nahjul Balagha (Abduh), Letter 6*

in the original texts of Nahjul Balagha. This discrepancy creates doubt.

In fact, Imam's opinion seems to be this: Whenever Muslims agree for a man to be their leader, it attains satisfaction and acceptance. Therefore such a thing has taken place in my case too. Why you remain stubborn?

The first to argue this statement of Imam Ali (a.s.) from a Sunni angle is Ibne Abil Hadeed. He has ignored the letter and other speeches of the Imam to establish it as a fixed opinion of Imam.**[1]**

Whenever Shia scholars have considered this speech and its interpretation they too have raised our point."**[2]**

The text of the Imam's letter to Muawiyah copied from Waqatus Siffeen

“Another attestation to prove that the letter was a protest is existence of sentences, which Sayyid Razi has deleted. But those sentences exist in other books. The method of Sayyid Razi is that he has deleted text or any part, which he deems not serious or sensitive. He mostly pays attention to the elegance of sentences. In other words, the literary aspect enchants him more.

The letter in question is mentioned by Nasr bin Muzahim Minqari (d. 412) that is 147 years before the birth of Sayyid Razi[3] in his famous book, Waqatus Siffeen page 48. We refer to some of its deleted parts:

1 - Ali starts the letter like this:

“They paid allegiance to me in Medina. You are in Syria. I have completed and exhausted my argument on you. The absent has no right to object to the decision of the present ones.”

2 - In the end of the letter is this text:

“Talha and Zubair paid allegiance to me but afterwards they both reneged and broke their oath. By so doing, they returned to their initial status and I waged a holy war against them. This did not hurt my Caliphate. Anyway, the truth appeared and rested at its place. God's command succeeded while they were not pleased. So you too enter where Muslims have entered.”

[1] *Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 14, Pg. 36*

[2] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Rahbari-e-Ummat (Leadership of the nation), Pgs. 64-66*

[3] *Sayyid Razi was born in 359 A.H. and passed away in year 406 A.H.*

3 - Note the following sentence also:

“And you much said about murderers of Uthman. As Muslims have entered, you too do the same. I guide you and them to the Book of God. But the thing you want is a trick by which a milk feeding baby is deceived.”

What did Muawiyah want from the Imam?

Muawiyah wanted that Imam should surrender the murderers of Uthman. According to Sulaym bin Qays in his book *Asl* [1] Muawiyah wanted the Imam to take revenge from Uthman's murderers and then he will pay allegiance to Ali with his followers. On the other hand Ali was seeing a plot and a trick in Muawiyah's proposal.

The letter from its beginning to the end clearly seems to be a letter of protest against a stubborn party. Imam knew that his adversary is not a man of truth. He was a tricky person. Therefore Imam must base his letter on reason and logic not on what he himself believes. This letter does not reflect the real belief of Imam." [2]

However keeping aside Shia belief and attachment to Imamate and *Wilayat* of Ali, we dwell on the letter itself as it is claimed:

"Liberty of people in choosing Imam and leader of God's command is acceptable. This makes compulsory on all to obey." [3]

"Consultation is the right of Muhajireen and Ansaar. God is pleased with this if they collectively give their opinion to one as their Imam." [4]

"In the foregone statement, consultation and consensus with a majority of opinion of competent men who were Muhajireen and Ansaar in those days give legitimacy to their choice." [5]

"In this letter, Imam agrees to the legality of Muhajireen and Ansaar." [6]

[1] *These letters exchanged between Imam (a.s.) and Muawiyah are quoted in Asl Sulaym bin Qais, Najaf, Pgs. 159-176*

[2] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Article 'Mushawera Dar Quran O Nahjul Balagha' quoted in the book Kawish Dar Nahjul Balagha, Pgs. 195-197*

[3] *Abdul Ali Bazargan: Shura O Bayyat, Pg. 71*

[4] *Ibid. Shura O Bayyat, Pg. 86*

[5] *Ibid. Shura O Bayyat, Pg. 88*

[6] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issue No. 4-5 Pg. 177*

Conclusion

According to what is said above there remains no doubt that Imam Ali (a.s.) referred to the acknowledgment of Muhajireen and Ansaar to silence his staunch enemy and a strong opponent, Muawiyah and to oblige him to surrender to the Alawi government. We refer to another letter of Ali to Muawiyah to enable the readers to understand the case deeply and thoroughly. Allamah Majlisi in volume 33 of *Biharul Anwar* has opened an independent chapter under the title: 'His letter to Muawiyah, his protestations and addresses to him and his companions.' He mentions beneath it under No. 421. In the battle of Siffeen, Muawiyah called for Abu Darda and Abu Huraira. He sent them to Ali with a letter which the Imam read and replied. Some of his statements in reply are as follows:

"The first thing necessary for Muslims is to choose one to be their Imam to administer their affairs. They have to obey him and follow him. In case if it be their right to choose an Imam.

However in this case - to choose an Imam - be a divine right and the right of His Prophet, then the choice of the people is enough. God has ordered them to follow the Imam.

After the assassination of Uthman, Muhajireen and Ansaar after consultations that lasted three days paid allegiance to me. These same had earlier paid allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman; and had confirmed their leadership. The people of Badr and those of the advance rows have paid allegiance to me - among Muhajireen and Ansaar. Earlier they had paid allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman without public consensus. However in my case, they paid allegiance to me with a public consensus.

If God has deposited to the people the right of choosing an Imam for themselves, then they have paid allegiance to guidance. Their Imam is for them an obligation to obey and support. So it is they who have chosen me. They have done so at a consensus and chosen me as their Imam.

If this were only the divine right to appoint an Imam then God has chosen me to be the Imam of the Ummah. He has appointed me as their Caliph. He had enjoined them in His Book to obey me. Traditions of the Prophet also ordered them to obey and support me. This is the strongest proof for my Caliphate. It clearly reflects my right upon the people.” [1]

[1] *Allamah Majlisi: Biharul Anwar, Vol. 33, Pg. 144*

This message of Ali confirms Shia outlook about Imamate being a divine office and its appointment directly by God Himself. In this respect, people have no part to play. If people take this matter in their hands, it creates several questions and loses its glitter of originality and falls short of legitimacy that embraces dispute in each and every age as seen in history. Divine Authority needs no human consultation or plot. Muawiyah was confused and confounded and stood in a quandary. He had no way but to surrender to reality and resign to truth.

He had no answer to Ali’s argument that it is the people who have chosen him if God be disputable to Muawiyah. Again on the ground of Quran and traditions, Ali was the Caliph; so each of the two is irrefutable.[1] What excuse remains for Muawiyah except obduracy?

[1] *Muawiyah considered himself to be appointed by the past Caliphs as the governor of Syria and therefore could not object to the validity of their Caliphate.*

Part 20
Final conclusion Zahra's Martyr-
dom is not Fiction

Some have tried to question the reality of Zahra's martyrdom. They have written:

"Some knowingly or otherwise raise the matter of Zahra's martyrdom. Their motive is to establish victimization of Ahle Bayt of Prophet.

This subject is thoroughly searched. We concluded that there existed friendly relations between Ali and Umar. For instance, Umar married Umme Kulthum, daughter of Ali. Ali named his sons: Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. Besides, Umar used to consult Ali in most important matters. This shows that there existed intimate and close relations between the two."**[1]**

"Imam (the leader) of Friday prayers of Zahidan, Sunni, said in the lecture before prayers that there are many matters written in bigotry to increase hatred.

Whatever is said or written is not acceptable to us. According to our belief, Zahra died in her bed a natural death. No one martyred her.

The Friday prayers leader referred to the affection and friendly relation between Caliphs and Ali and Zahra. He refers to the marriage of Umme Kulthum, daughter of Ali, to Umar. He further said that it is a proof of love that existed between Ahle Bayt of Prophet and Umar.**[2]**

Leader of the Friday prayers of Zahidan in Friday prayer sermon on 16th Murdad 1383 in Zahidan said on the occasion of the death of Abu Bakr and Zahra and the beginning of Umar's Caliphate about Caliphs and their superiorities. He said more and more about the good relations they had with the Prophet's family and the respect they had for them.

He said our lord Ali, our lord Abu Bakr, our lord Umar and our lord Uthman had good relations among themselves and helped each other. He added there was no gulf between them. He said Abu Bakr and Umar gave priority to the family members of the Prophet to their own family members.

[1] Abdul Aziz Nomani: Article 'Fatima Zahra az Wiladat Ta Afsana-e-Shahadat' quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine (under supervision of Hauzatul Ilmiya Darul Uloom, Zahidan), Issue No. 3, Autumn 79, Pg. 68

[2] Abdul Hameed Ismail Zahi: Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 6, Summer 80, Pg. 70

Sunni Friday speaker of Zahidan says regarding Zahra that she died a natural death. Her martyrdom is only a propaganda started in recent years.

Such a propaganda is neither to the benefit of Islam nor to advantage of sects - Sunni and Shia.

This is not my personal view alone. The open-minded Shia scholars also are of the same mind.

Such a thing never existed before recent years."!**[1]**

While researches on these matters have proved their falsehood beyond any doubt.

Warning:

This is a device to invent things like existence of good terms between Caliphs and Ahle Bayt (a.s.) - the House - the descending spot of angels and revelation from heaven. They go on making claims like:

"The writer has claimed and proved that Ali was on good terms with the three Caliphs..."**[2]**

"Tabarra (immunity) from enemies of Prophet's House is a principle with Shias. But it does not imply those with whom Ali had very close relations for 25 years."**[3]**

This will gradually lead to the situation that even in Shia circles the questions:

"What was the cause of Zahra's death? Was it a natural death?"**[4]**

Will be answered through statements like:

"After the death of her father, she was very much sad and depressed for many days that told upon her health. She wept day and night and in a few days became weak and feeble. She became seriously ill and passed away in a few days..."**[5]**

[1] Ibid. Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue No. 18, Summer 83, Pg.

[2] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 8, Khordad 1381

[3] *Ibid.* *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 8, Khordad 1381

[4] Dr. Jawad Muhaddaseen: Article quoted in *Jam-e-Jam Daily*, Issue 3, Shariwar 1380

[This article is in reply to the objections of Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani and it has challenged him to reply to these questions.]

[5] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily*, Issue No. 8, Khordad 1381

Or with regard to congregational gatherings and meetings to commemorate the tragedy of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) as we will explain in the deviated analysis like:

“The British Embassy was indirectly responsible of establishing meeting each day in the mosques after the night prayers in which the side-breaking of Zahra was lamented in excess.”!**[1]**

We close this book with the verdict of Ayatullah Tabrizi about whoever doubts the martyrdom of Zahra (s.a.):

This is the text of the verdict is as follows:

In this exalted Name. It is not allowed to support one who doubts Zahra’s martyrdom. We do not believe such a man to be learned. Had he been so he would have been aware of narration reports about her martyrdom which are obvious and evident and other narrations about the cause of her martyrdom.

May Allah guide to the straight way.**[2]**

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Hambastigi-e-Mazahib-e-Islami (Preface to the 3rd Edition)*, Pg. 20

[2] Ayatullah Al-Uzma Mirza Jawad Tabrizi: *Zulmaat-e-Fatima Zahra (Markaz al-Bahoos al-Aqaidiya, Darus Siddiqatus Shaheeda)*, Pg. 30

ISLAMICMOBILITY.COM
IN THE AGE OF INFORMATION
IGNORANCE IS A CHOICE

*"Wisdom is the lost property of the Believer,
let him claim it wherever he finds it"*

Imam Ali (as)