



A VICTIM
LOST
IN
SAQIFAH

VOL 4 OF 4

xkps

Ali Labbaf

Part 1
Allegiance of Amirul Momineen
(a.s.) to Caliphs

Motive of this research

Ali's *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr is repeatedly mentioned in various styles and used in different ways to bring out Abu Bakr's Caliphate from its characteristic feature of usurpation that surrounds it.

So they claim:

"It is said that Ali was tied by a rope round his neck and his house was destroyed. I do not know such an Ali. He was not a man of such an insult. He wisely paid allegiance and remained firm on it indicating his satisfaction." **[1]**

"This proves that Ali did not view their Caliphate illegitimate." **[2]**

"After he (Ali) gave Bay'at. He even mended and dressed the shortcomings in Caliphs' proceedings. This confirms the legitimacy of Caliphs." **[3]**

"Ali has given Bay'at to both (Abu Bakr and Umar). Of course he has done this prudently." **[4]**

"The behavior and conduct of Ali and his reverend sons towards Caliphs was such that it could be called an approval and pledge of allegiance." **[5]**

Those who make the claims (that Ali gave allegiance to Abu Bakr) have an aim:

A) Ali's acknowledgment to Abu Bakr serves an umbrella to them, covering illegitimacy of Abu Bakr's Caliphate. Besides it supports their persistence in their design to prove Ali's consent and concurrence.

[1] *Mushgan Ilanlow: In his article in Sharq Daily, Issue no. 14, Abaan 1383*

[2] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Raahi Bi Soo-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Way to Islamic Unity), Pg. 176*

[3] *Ibid. Footnote on the book Shahira-e-Ittihaad, Pgs. 28-29*

[4] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Raahi Bi Soo-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Way to Islamic Unity), Pg. 167*

[5] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Raahi Bi Soo-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Way to Islamic Unity), Pg. 163*

B) To benefit from Ali's acknowledgment by removing from the public mind suspicion of illegitimacy of Abu Bakr's Caliphate. Besides, to pose it as a Caliphate having God's pleasure. In other words, to provide a sanctity under shade of Ali's allegiance.

Therefore we must go through these allegations thoroughly:

In the meantime we would like to scrutinize these two claims:

1) Claims that Ali's *Bay'at* tantamount to public popularity of Abu Bakr's rule.

2) Claims that acceptance of Abu Bakr's rule proves Ali's allegiance to Abu Bakr.

Therefore in this analysis we shall evaluate the sources claiming that Ali gave allegiance to Abu Bakr. They are as follows:

Source One: Divine legitimacy (Legitimacy granted by God)

Source Two: Public Popularity (Standard of public accord)

Source Three: Existence (A fact/occurrence)

We shall again thoroughly investigate historical documents related to these claims to find the extent of Ali's approval to Abu Bakr's rule.

Because the above subject has taken for granted that Ali in fact gave allegiance to Abu Bakr.

Accordingly we can evaluate Ali's belief in legitimacy and popularity of Abu Bakr's Caliphate and thereby gauge its authenticity in the light of History.

Part 2
Absence of Ali's Approval to Abu
Bakr's Caliphate

There is no doubt that if Abu Bakr' Caliphate had been legitimate in the view of His Eminence, Ali in any of these aspects - legitimacy, popularity, entity - he would have never refrained from paying allegiance and would have never tried to overthrow it through armed uprising. So the fact is that there was no approval at all from the side of Ali (a.s.).**[1]**

Historical Documents

Moosa bin Uqbah (d. 141) narrates from Ibne Shuhab Zuhri:

“Some Muhajireen were enraged about the allegiance of Abu Bakr, among them were Ali and Zubair...and they had weapons with them.” [2]

Ibne Mitham Bahrani (d. 679) narrates from the book, *Waqatus Siffeen* by Nasr bin Muzahim Minqari (d. 212) that Ali said:

“Had I found forty men of determination I would have fought.” [3]

Ibne Abil Hadeed Motazalli (d. 656) also has narrated the same words of Ali:

“Had I found forty men of determination!” [4]

After quoting these words in *Waqatus Siffeen* he writes:

“A large number of biographers have quoted this statement.” [5]

[1] *With this aim His Eminence Ali (a.s.) accompanied by Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) went door to door of Ansaar.*

Refer: Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 29; Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 6, Pg. 13 & Vol. 2, Pg. 47

[2] *[His book, Maghazi has not reached us; but some narrators have quoted from it like: Kalai Andalusi (died 634): Al-Iktifa, Vol. 2, Pg. 446; Mohib Tabari (died 694): Riyadh an-Nazarah, Vol. 1, Pg. 241; Dayar Bakri: (died 982): Tarikh Khamees, Vol. 2, Pg. 169]*

[3] *Ibne Mitham Bahrani: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 2, Pgs. 26-27*

[4] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 2, Pg. 22*

[5] *The text mentioned by Ibne Abil Hadeed is as follows: Ali said: I have no supporter except my own family members. I feared their death. Ali always used to say particularly after the death of the Prophet: Alas, if I had forty men of determination! This is mentioned by Nasr bin Muzahim in his book Waqatus Siffeen. Most biographers too have mentioned this. It is clear in the text of Ibne Abil Hadeed that the last part of*

In the same way in his book he has quoted the text of letter Muawiyah had written to Ali in which he has quoted this statement of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.):

“Had I forty men of determination I would have fought them.”**[1]**

The firm determination of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to have an armed uprising was that when - due to some exigencies**[2]** - he became hopeless and confined himself to his house he remarked as follows:

“If I had not feared discord among Muslims and their going back to infidelity and not worried about the destruction of the religion of Islam I would have behaved with them in a different manner.”**[3]**

“And by Allah! If there had been no risk of discord among Muslims as a result of which they would have reverted to infidelity, we would have in every possible way tried to bring down the regime.”**[4]**

According to Shia sources the dissatisfaction of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was to such an extent that he did not accept it for even a moment; so how can it be possible that he gave allegiance to Abu Bakr?

Thus he said:

“By God, if I had the number of supporters that Talut had or supporters the Prophet had in battle of Badr, and they were inimical to you - I would have fought you with sword till you returned to truth. The separation among you would have suited you best and most befitting to you.

O God judge between us with truth and You are the best of judges.

the sentence is missing. So it is not known what Ali would have done had he got forty men of determination. This text reads in the writing of Abdul Salam Muhammad Haroon: Alas, if I had forty men ‘... then Ali said some other matter. So, here to the sentence is incomplete.

(Minqari: Waqatus Siffeen, Pg. 163)

[1] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 2, Pg. 47*

[This letter was written by Muawiyah to His Eminence, Ali (a.s.)]

[2] *Imam Muhammad Baqir (a.s.) explained this matters in a*

way that there was nothing restraining Amirul Momineen (a.s.) from mobilizing people against Abu Bakr except that he feared they would revert to their ignorance and apostize from Islam.

(Thiqatul Islam Kulaini: Kafi, Vol. 8, Pg. 295; Shaykh Tusi: Amali, Pg. 230)

[3] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 307*

[4] *Shaykh Mufeed: Al-Jamal, Pg. 437*

The narrator says: Then he left the mosque and passed through Baseer**[1]** where around thirty sheep were there. He pointed to the sheep and said: By God, if I had men of this number of sheep, sincere and true to God and His Prophet, I would have overthrown him from power.

By nightfall, three hundred and sixty persons gathered around him and pledged their support to him until death.

Ali asked them to come the next day to Ahjaaris Zait**[2]** with their heads shaved. Ali shaved his head. Among those three hundred and sixty came none except Abu Zar, Miqdad, Huzaifa bin Yamani, Ammar bin Yasir and Salman.

Then Ali raised his hands towards the sky and said:

If a covenant had not been taken from me by the Prophet I would have drowned the opponents in the gulf of their ambitions and brought down upon their heads fatal destructive lightning of death. Of course they will come to know soon.” **[3]**

Conclusion

Says Ibne Maytham Bahrani (d. 679):

“The event of Saqifah, occurrence of differences between companions and Ali’s refusal to pay allegiance is an evident fact which can neither be denied nor concealed. It is from here that eternal differences and rivalry among them followed. The truth is that rivalry remained fixed and alive between Ali and he that seized the Caliphate in his time. The tyranny that resulted is open and clear. It remains at constancy and morally it declares what happened.”**[4]**

Therefore it can be said:

Sayings and behavior of Ali towards Abu Bakr’s Caliphate indicate his harsh and serious opposition. This open opposition they claim to be his acceptance and approval of Abu Bakr’s Caliphate.

Ali’s strong resistance and refusal to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr finally resulted in those atrocities. The armed attack on house of Divine Revelation, then their entrance into the House, the insults on Zahra, the only daughter of the

[1] *[A shed for keeping cattle and sheep]*

[2] *[A locality in Medina]*

[3] *Thiqatul Islam Kulaini: Kafi, Vol. 8, Pgs. 32-33*

[4] *Ibne Mitham Bahrani: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 252*

Prophet, then beatings and physical hurt committed against her, then the miscarriage of her unborn child, Mohsin - what all this represents...?

Even when Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was disappointed of the possibility of armed uprising and possibility of overthrowing the tyrant rule of Abu Bakr, he still did not accept the validity of Abu Bakr’s regime.

It is natural that such denial can never be construed as his approval to Abu Bakr’s Caliphate in any of the aspects we have stated above.

On the basis of this it can be said:

Amirul Momineen (a.s.) neither approved Abu Bakr’s Caliphate nor he accepted it.

As a result:

Abu Bakr's Caliphate, in his view, was illegal and usurped because it did not belong to him. Caliphate was his right according to Prophet's declaration in Ghadeer. It was usurpation. It was not only illegitimate but even short of popularity and identity.

What is the Meaning of Silence?

As mentioned in first chapter of second volume of this book, Amirul Momineen (a.s.) due some exigencies, some of which we listed, changed his stance from planning an armed uprising into sitting quiet at home.

In other words, he became obliged to undergo those sore and bitter conditions prevalent at that time, such as:

A) To forego the armed uprising against Abu Bakr's Caliphate and to ignore any preparations in that regard.

B) To avoid campaigning seriously and abstain from disclosing any confidential matters.

C) To let go without opposition anything having a bearing on Abu Bakr's Caliphate, or anything in relation to it.

While enduring these things was so hard that in his own words it was: "...a thorn in my eyes and a bone in my throat..."[1]

It was bitter and painful.

[1] *"So I adopted patience although there was pricking in the eye and suffocation (of mortification) in the throat."* (Sayyid Razi: *Nahjul Balagha, Shiqshiqya Sermon*)

On the basis of this requirement of the above matter, absence of confronting the rulers which is described as silence can in no way be interpreted to be approval of Abu Bakr's Caliphate in any of its aspects: legitimacy, popularity or factuality.

In the same way 'acceptance of silence and giving up of armed uprising' has no relation and necessity of his taking steps to his paying allegiance to Abu Bakr, though his silence is wrongly interpreted and it is claimed:

*"Ali saw himself more deserving to Caliphate, but for the sake of the interests of Muslims he did Bay'at with Abu Bakr."***[1]**

Now it should be asked:

At what time, at which ground and under what conditions it took place.

Can such acceptance fulfill the necessary requirement of granting legitimacy to the ruler?

Or because of difference between the meaning of silence and paying allegiance does there exist any bearing between the two? The sense and the application of the word “acknowledgment” or “paying allegiance” in such expressions is **wrong**.

What is the Meaning of Allegiance?

In order to understand the meaning of *Bay'at* (that is the matter they claim to have occurred between Ali and Abu Bakr) and to know why the regime was so much concerned about getting the *Bay'at* of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) let us study the following to get a compendious sense and a concise description of this word:

Ibne Khaldun (d. 808) writes in his book *Muqaddima*:

“To pay allegiance (*Bay'at* in Arabic) means a covenant, a fact that commits one to be obedient to the other. One who enters into *Bay'at* with the other (or an Amir, a master) surrenders to his view in relation to himself and Muslims. He has no say in affairs concerning him or others. In short, one resigns to other. This is the sense of *Bay'at*. After accomplishment of *Bay'at*, he must be resigned irrespective of his willingness or otherwise.

It was customary at the time of *Bay'at* that one laid his hand into the

[1] Muhammad Hadi Marefat: *Zahidan Daily*, Issue No. 12, Mehr 1382

hand of Amir or Lord as a token of his submission to him.

This is the general sense and common meaning in religion and common parlance.”**[1]**

In the light of this and other several similar descriptions it can be said:

A) Individuals indicate obedience to one another by means of their actions and conduct. They show their resignation to his orders and authority which is called *Bay'at*.

Bay'at with Caliph means acknowledgement to his being a Caliph and obedience to his orders. This indicates acceptance of his Caliphate and rule.

B) Through *Bay'at* people leave their possibilities, properties and their social interests at the disposal of their leader or Imam or Caliph. By this means and method the leadership or Caliphate is established in society and attains a ground for its legitimacy. Those who enter into *Bay'at* are committed to honor the choice and opinion of the *Bay'at* taker.

C) Through their *Bay'at* people are committed to be loyal and devoted to the *Bay'at*-taker. They also are committed to provide possibilities to strengthen the stand of government and make its foundation stronger. All these activities are reflected in their *Bay'at* to the Caliph.

Conclusion

Bay'at is an act by which one's support, consent to obedience, commitment of loyalty and sincerity and acceptance of his (the *Bay'at*-taker) power or office is expressed.

It is a means through which people display their approval and acknowledgement to the aforesaid items. It is a formal declaration.

Reminder

A) Those who believe in Ali's *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr either do not speak with knowledge or use the word in its dictionary meaning to convey the above connotation.

B) There is a great difference in the meaning of silence and abandoning armed uprising. It is absolutely wrong as it is not possible at all to use the word *Bay'at* even for the sake of reference.

[1] *Abdur Rahman Khaldun: Muqaddimah (Translated by Muhammad Parvin Gunabadi), Vol. 1, Pg. 400*

In other words, the term *Bay'at* carries a particular sense it cannot be used in places which do not fit its sense or do not fall within its range. The word silence is interpreted in a sense of *Bay'at* and then the very word of *Bay'at* is attributed to Ali that he performed *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr because he had maintained a long silence.

Comparison of silence to Bay'at

Three aspects of the topics:

A) Imam Ali's (a.s.) untiring efforts to overthrow Abu Bakr's Caliphate; his belief in overthrowing the regime - even after his getting disappointed that it would be fruitful and beneficial. Though he gave up hope of armed uprising he continued his efforts.

B) Imam Ali's (a.s.) adamancy in his denial to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr until (according to Sunnis) firewood was gathered and Zahra's house was set afire.

C) The accurate interpretation of Ali's social and political stand that is regarded as silence:

What was forced upon Ali (a.s.) can be sketched as follows:

1 - Absence of effective efforts to have armed uprising against Abu Bakr's Caliphate and his ignoring it. Since no necessary ground was available to him he had to accept this situation.

2 - He had to forsake stiff opposition and tough steps because of their evil results and unsuitable conditions.

3 - Absence of opposition from all sides to orders of the Caliph and all acts of the regime as a result of bad consequences and unfavorable conditions because of no general support or lack of consent of the society.

So it is clear how difficult it was to undergo such conditions in spite of one's unwillingness. This is termed as silence with regard to Imam Ali's (a.s.) political and social stands. He (Ali) adopted this policy; and this policy had no bearing on his *Bay'at* or no relation to it that it be construed as *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr. This silence did not bind Ali to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr.

Far before these developments, **[1]** His Eminence (a.s.) had occupied himself in collecting verses and chapters of Quran in his house. He had been disappointed of any possibility of bringing the downfall of illegitimate rule. The main

[1] Refer: Shaykh Abdur Zahra Mahdi: *Al-Hujoom Alaa Bait-e-Fatima*, Pgs. 482-488

setback was state of society, which was not yet ripe to foresee the dangers in store if the people betrayed him.

It is obvious that to yield to such conditions and arrange thereon the political and social stands of his own should not create any obligation to give his acceptance and approval to Abu Bakr's Caliphate. Or that it could be used to prove that the *Bay'at* really took place.

Mere occurrence of something cannot be a proof of its legitimacy. To prove the establishment of Abu Bakr's regime cannot be a proof that he had the allegiance of Amirul Momineen (a.s.). Neither can his silence be construed as approval.

To accept a factual happening does not denote one is in agreement to it. So Ali's silence does not call for *Bay'at*.

Conditions of achieving Bay'at

“Placing ones hand into that of other in Arab parlance is completion of a transaction.

But in Islam it is a sign of a covenant which means acknowledgement to one's authority or superiority. It represents obedience of Bay'at giver to Bay'at taker and his submission to him.

The analysis of the word Bay'at in the days of the Prophet shows that it was based on three points:

- 1 - The Bay'at giver
- 2 - The Bay'at taker
- 3 - Commitment of obedience to rules of Bay'at

According to this order, the object of Bay'at must be clearly known and conceived because its performance is committed.

So according to traditions of Prophet, as a token of acceptance one puts his hand into the hand of Bay'at taker. Thus Bay'at is concluded.

So Bay'at takes to it a religious feature[1] and becomes a religious term.

But these days most Muslims do not know the conditions of getting Bay'at on religious basis in Islam. Therefore it is incumbent to explain that:

[1] *[Religious terminology] (Allamah Askari: Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation, Vol. 1, Pg. 125.)*

In Islam Bay'at is sought when the following three conditions exist:

1 - The Bay'at giver should have fitness and eligibility of Bay'at. He must be free and independent.

2 - The Bay'at taker should have fitness and eligibility to take Bay'at from him.

3 - Bay'at must be for a legitimate object and aim.

On the basis of this:

Bay'at must be concluded on the basis of willingness and inclination. Bay'at loses its authenticity and characteristic if it is obtained by force.

As such, if it is performed under coercion or tyranny it is illegitimate and invalid.

Bay'at is wrong and invalid if concluded with one who is a known sinner or if Bay'at will lead to disobedience to God or to commit a sinful act. In all these cases it has no validity.

So Bay'at is an Islamic term and Islam has framed its rules and regulations.

The above can be summed up as follows:

Bay'at in Arabic means giving hand into the hand of another as a token of completion of a transaction. In Islam it means that the Bay'at giver shall endeavor to perform obligations to the interest of Bay'at obtainer. If relative conditions do not exist, Islamic Bay'at cannot be accomplished.

Conditions of Bay'at are:

1 - Bay'at of a mad or an immature is not valid.

2 - Bay'at obtained by force and from an acknowledged sinner is not correct.

3 - Bay'at to perform things, which go against religion, is of no value.

Bay'at in the light of above is like a business deal. It takes place with mutual consent and agreement. It loses its strength if obtained by force or fraud.

Likewise, Bay'at could not be performed for sin or disobedience to God. Bay'at cannot be done with an open sinner." **[1]**

[1] *Allamah Askari: Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation, Vol. 1, Pgs. 254-255; Pgs. 261-263; Pg. 310*
Imam Ali (a.s.) on this basis has said:

"My Bay'at to them did not constitute any right for them as they had no right to take Bay'at and it does not represent my willingness or consent to them." **[1]**

So according to the words of Ali, his *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr had no validity.

To understand still more accurately the above words we shall scrutinize historical documents related to their demand from Ali to give *Bay'at*. Then we shall see the result against the conditions of obtaining *Bay'at*.

[1] *Dailami: Irshad al-Quloob, Pg. 396*

Part 3
Efforts to Obtain Imam Ali's
(a.s.) Bay'at after the Prophet's
Demise

Narrations in Sunni sources about *Bay'at* taken from Imam Ali (a.s.) can be classified into three categories:

First Category

Narrations under this category indicate that Ali entered into *Bay'at* willingly and openly with Abu Bakr immediately after the latter got Caliphate.

Second Category

Narrations under this category indicate that Ali entered into *Bay'at* willingly and openly with Abu Bakr after six months.

Third Category

Narrations under this category indicate unsuccessful attempts of supporters of Caliph to obtain *Bay'at* from Imam Ali (a.s.) by force and compulsion.

Narrations under first and second categories are in contradiction to one another. Therefore they have neither credibility nor validity, hence they are discarded. **[1]**

On the basis of this there remain only narrations of third category that carry some weight and we shall investigate them thoroughly. These narrations are also mentioned in Shia sources hence we shall refer to them in this section.

In this section with reference to the book, *al-Hujoom alal Baitul Fatima* by Ustad Muhaqqiq Shaykh Abduz Zahra Mahdi we shall explain how the Caliph and his associates made efforts to compel Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to give allegiance to Abu Bakr and Ali's persistent refusal to their demand to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr. So that it becomes clear what value this *Bay'at* has.

Motive of Caliphate in taking Bay'at from Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.)

Even though Amirul Momineen (a.s.) after trying to mobilize help for bringing down the regime retired dejected to his home the Caliphate system was not satisfied. They continued to make all efforts to extract allegiance from him at any cost. Silence of the Holy Imam (a.s.) and his disinclination to take up an armed campaign began to be construed as his approval or rather readiness to give allegiance.

[1] *Details of this can be found in narrations from Shia sources.*

So from this aspect they wanted him come to the Mosque at rate and lend legitimacy to their regime and that *Bay'at* may be taken from him for Abu Bakr.**[1]** And in this way by accepting the silence of His Eminence (a.s.) they may show that it was customary.

Perhaps they also wanted to eliminate Amirul Momineen (a.s.) under the pretext of his refusal to give *Bay'at*.

A Look at Historical Proofs and Documents in Sunni Sources

Waqidi (d. 207)

Document No. 1

“Ali and Zubair were enraged. They did not do Bay’at.

Umar shouted: Come out or we shall burn the house with you.

They still refused to come out. So he pulled both of them out by force and dragged them to Abu Bakr till they paid allegiance.”[2]

Some narrators of this report are:

Tabari Imami (4th century): *Al-Mustarshid*, Pg. 378

Ibne Shahar Aashob (d. 588): *Mathalib*, Pg. 419

Ibne Tawoos (d. 664): *Al-Taraif*, Pgs. 238-239

Nasr bin Muzahim (d. 212)

Document No. 2

“Muawiyah wrote to Ali: Against all of them (means Caliphs) you committed tyranny (rebelled). This we came to know through your enraged looks, your words laced with scorn and rancor, sigh of your breast and unwillingness to co-operate with them. You were taken to each of them as a camel is dragged by its reins[3]till you paid allegiance while you hated.”[4]

[1] *By Bayyat a person submits to another in unequivocal terms so that there should not remain doubt for anyone.*

[2] *[Most probably the title of his book is Saqifah wa Bayat-e-Abu Bakr, but we could not have access to it.]*

[3] *[Regarding the meaning of the word ‘Khashshaash’ experts say: “It is a piece of wood placed in the nostril of a camel to have greater control on it.” (Ibne Athir: An-Nihaya fee Ghareebul Hadith, Vol. 2, Pg. 33)]*

[4] *Minqari: Waqatus Siffeen, Pg. 87*

Some narrators of this report are:

Ibne Athim Kufi (d. 314): *Al-Futuh*, Vol. 2, Pg. 578

Ibne Abde Rabb (d. 328): *Al-Iqd al-Fareed*, Vol. 4, Pgs. 308-309

Shaykh Mufeed (d. 413): *Al-Fusool Al-Mukhtar*, Pg. 287
Khateeb Khwarizmi (d. 568): *Al-Manaqib*, Pg. 175
Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656): *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 15,
Pg. 74 & 186
Qalaqshandi (d. 821): *Subh al-Ashi*, Vol. 1, Pg. 273

Document No. 3

"[His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) wrote in reply to Muawiyah:] I was dragged like a camel by its reins till I gave allegiance."

Some narrators of this report are:

Sayyid Razi (d. 406): *Nahjul Balagha*, Letter 28
Ibne Hamdoon (d. 562): *Al-Tazkeratl Hamdonia*, Vol. 7, Pg. 166
Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656): *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 15,
Pg. 183
Nuwairi (d. 737): *Nihayatul Arab*, Vol. 7, Pg. 236
Qalaqshandi (d. 821): *Subh al-Ashi*, Vol. 1, Pg. 276
Bawoni Shafei (d. 871): *Jawahir al-Matalib*, Vol. 1, Pg. 374

Document No. 4

"[Muawiyah wrote in reply to Muhammad bin Abu Bakr.]
Then the two (Abu Bakr and Umar) invited him (Ali) to their Bay'at. But he ignored and refused. So they designed great plots for him." **[1]**

Some narrators of this report are:

Masoodi (d. 346): *Muruj az-Zahab*, Vol. 3, Pg. 12-13
Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656): *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 3, Pg. 190
Ibne Qutaibah Dinawari (d. 276)

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 120 [It is interesting that in the continuation of this letter Muawiyah says that Abu Bakr and Umar did not give Ali any share in their regime neither did they divulge their secrets to him.]*

Document No. 5

"Ali's refused to do Bay'at with Abu Bakr:
Umar said to him: you are not free unless you give Bay'at.
They pulled him out of the house and took him to Abu Bakr.
Abu Bakr said: Give the Bay'at:
Ali said: What if I don't?"

They said: By God! We swear, we would cut off your neck.”[1]

Some narrators of this report are:

Ibne Athim Kufi (d. 314): *Al-Futuh*, Vol. 1, Pgs. 13-14

Ibne Shahar Aashob (d. 588): *Matalib*, Pgs. 138-139

Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656): *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 6, Pgs. 11-12

Balazari (d. 279)

Document No. 6

“Abu Bakr sent Umar bin Khattab to Ali when the latter refused give allegiance telling him: bring him to me with utmost force.”[2]

Some narrators of this report are:

Sayyid Murtuza (d. 436): *Ash-Shafi*, Vol. 3, Pg. 240

Shaykh Toosi (d. 460): *Talkhees Shafi*, Vol. 3, Pg. 76

Document No. 7

“Abu Bakr sent some people to Ali to take his Bay’at. But he did not give the Bay’at. Then Umar went to Ali carrying fire.”[3]

Some narrators of this report are:

Sayyid Murtuza (d. 436): *Ash-Shafi*, Vol. 3, Pg. 241

Shaykh Toosi (d. 460): *Talkhees ash-Shafi*, Vol. 3, Pg. 76

Ibne Shahar Aashob (d. 588): *Mathalib*, Pg. 419

Muhammad bin Jurair bin Yazid Tabari Shafei (d. 310)

[1] *Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah*, Vol. 1, Pgs. 28-29

[2] *Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf*, Vol. 1, Pg. 587 (Vol. 2, Pg. 269 *Dar al-Fikr*)

[3] *Ibid.* Vol. 1, Pg. 567 (Vol. 2, Pg. 268 *Dar al-Fikr*)

Document No. 8

“Ali and Zubair did not give Bay’at. Umar went to them and brought them by force.”[1]

Document No. 9

“Umar bin Khattab came to the house of Ali and said: By God, I will burn (it) over you, or you come out to give Bay’at”. [2]

Some narrators of these two reports are:

Ibne Shahar Aashob (d. 588): *Mathalib*, Pg. 419
Ibne Abde Rabb (d. 328)

Document No. 10

“Those who did not do Bay’at with Abu Bakr were Ali and... Abu Bakr sent Umar bin Khattab to pull them out of Fatima’s house. He enjoined Umar to fight them if they refused. Umar came to the house with fire to burn the house together with them.”[3]

Some narrators of this report are:

Ibne Tawoos (d. 664): *Al-Tarayif*, Pg. 239

Abul Fida (d. 732): *Al-Mukhtasar Fil Akhbaar al-Bashar*, Vol. 1, Pg. 156

Ibne Athir (d. 630)

Document No. 11

“And Ali and Bani Hashim refused to give Bay’at... then came to them Umar and took them to give Bay’at.”[4]

Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656) narrates from Abu Bakr Jauhari (d. 323)

Document No. 12

“Then Umar entered and said to Ali: Get up and do Bay’at.

But he did not pay attention and did not come out from the house. Umar held him by his hand and again said: Get up. Ali again refused to get up. Umar held him by force and threw him. In the same way, he behaved with Zubair too. Then Khalid caught both of them. Umar and his men took them to Abu Bakr in a very bad manner.”[5]

[1] *Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook*, Vol. 2, Pg. 203

[2] *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 203

[3] *Ibne Abde Rabb: Al-Iqdul Fareed*, Vol. 4, Pg. 242 (Beirut)

[4] *Ibne Athir: Kamil*, Vol. 2, Pg. 325

[5] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 6, Pgs. 48-49

Document No. 13

“Some Muhajireen were enraged...Ali and Zubair were also angry and they entered Fatima’s house. Umar came to them with his men...Then Umar pulled them out and took them forcibly to give Bay’at.”[1]

Conclusion

The most prominent conditions under which *Bay'at* was demanded from Amirul Momineen (a.s.) are Ali's refusal to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr and the atrocious and inhumane behavior of Umar and his men for obtaining the *Bay'at*. Thus all Sunni sources have highlighted these points.

But the matter is that these two points have put a question mark on the validity of Abu Bakr's *Bay'at* due to the following:

Illegitimacy of the very subject of *Bay'at*

The entity of *Bay'at*-taker was in a position of tyrant and usurper of another's right.

Unwillingness of *Bay'at*-giver

Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656) writes:

"Narrations about Saqifah are different and contradictory. But what Shias say and some traditionists have also narrated is as follows:

Ali refused to give *Bay'at* till it was taken by force." [2]

As for Ali's refusal to *Bay'at* that resulted in horrible way he was pulled out is mentioned in traditions and biographers have also recorded it. [3]

As for Jauhari's saying in this regard, we have already said: Jauhari is a man of tradition. He is trustworthy and of confidence. Many others (trusted and reliable people) have also stated the incident.

Most traditionists have narrated that after the happenings of Saqifah Ali endured great many atrocities as he was taken against his will to enter into *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr. He shouted in protest. He called for help. He lastly gestured to the Prophet's grave and said: Son of my mother! Surely the people reckoned me weak and had well-nigh slain me." [4]

[1] *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 50 & Vol. 6, Pg. 47

[2] *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 21

[3] *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pgs. 59-60

[4] *Ibid.* Vol. 11, Pg. 111

It is interesting that in spite of historical documents they still claim:

"Whatever happened among Muslims in the early days of Islam, particularly after passing away of Prophet between Ali

and companions of Prophet, was friendly and cordial type of dispute.”**[1]**

“Differences between companions of Prophet were internal differences but friendly...”**[2]**

Further, it is more surprising that when contemporary historians come across these historical documents they claim:

“These narrations are liable to suspicion and to more pondering. Some simple-minded people have launched these things in order to indicate that Imam Ali (a.s.) was victimized. On the other hand it is imaginable that Ali perhaps saw himself responsible towards those who were in the house. So he came out and went to Abu Bakr to avoid any danger to them.**[3]**”!**[4]**

Where did the efforts of Emigrants for taking forced Bay'at from Ali end?

Document No. 1

Ali bin Husain Masoodi (d. 346) quotes a document about Ali extending his hand to Abu Bakr.

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

[2] *Ibid.* Interview in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue No. 4, Summer 79, Pg. 61

[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. 86

[4] This writing was published with the support of Dr. Sayyid Ja'far Shahidi and Dr. Sadiq Ainawand. It is a good analysis yet short of scientific worth. In some way or other it is avoiding to acknowledge the ill treatment of Caliphs towards Ali. But the writer openly denies the tyrannical conduct against Imam Ali. On the contrary he paints a picture showing peaceful environment in which Ali's was invited to give Bayyat. In order to hide similar behavior towards Zahra, he writes thus:

On the other hand the Caliph and his supporters could not behave with Zahra as they did against the opposition and stubbornness of Ali.

We must ask the writer of this text: whether you accept the inimical conduct of Caliphs towards Ali that now it can be expected from you to acknowledge the tyrannies and atrocities committed towards Zahra?

It were better had the writer benefited from the analysis of Ali's political stand in the book (Analysis of Political Stance of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a.s.)). The unity seekers deny the historical facts such as assault on Zahra's House and the events that followed.

He writes:

"They rushed to his house and attacked it and burned the door. They pulled him out by force.

They crushed the sacred person of Zahra behind the door and she miscarried the unborn child, Mohsin.

They took him (Ali) to give Bay'at but he refused.

They said: We shall kill you.

Ali said: If you kill me you would have killed a God's servant and His Prophet's brother.

They pulled his hand. His fist was closed. They tried to open his fist, but they could not.

Then touched Ali's closed fist over Abu Bakr's hand." [1]

Document No. 2

Sayyid Abul Abbas Ahmad bin Ibrahim Hasani Zaidi (d. 352) quotes a document as follows:

"They told Ali (a.s.): Do Bay'at.

Ali said: What if I don't?

They replied: We shall kill you - and then they pulled his hand.

He closed his fingers tight and raised his head towards the sky, saying: O God! Be a witness!

Then they touched his hand to Abu Bakr's?" [2]

[1] Masoodi: *Asbat al-Wisaya*, Pg. 155

[2] Hasani Zaidi: *Al-Masabih*, manuscript in Great Public library, Sanaa, Yemen, Serial no. 2185; Ibne Hamza Zaidi (died 614) in his book, *Ash-Shafi* has mentioned this from the book *Al-Masabeeh*.

Similarly, Husaini Zaidi also mentions this in his book *Anwar al-Yaqeen*. His source is also *Masabeeh*. The photocopy of this document is in *Markaz-e-Aqaid*, Qom. The text is as follows: "Umar kicked at the door and it broke. It was made of branch and leaves of date palm. Then they entered. He (Umar) tied a rope around the neck of Ali and pulled him out. Then they took him; Umar enjoined Ali to do Bayyat. Ali asked: What if I don't? Umar: I swear by God, I will cut your throat. Ali said: In that case, you'll kill a servant of God and brother of Prophet. Umar said: Servant of God - yes. But brother of Prophet, no. He repeated this thrice."

Document No. 3

Muhammad bin Masood Ayyashi (d. 320) after narrating the attack on Zahra's house and pulling out of Ali for Bay'at of Abu Bakr [1] and the threats to kill him, [2] writes:

“Abbas heard the news and he ran out shouting: Leave my nephew. I will take from him Bay’at for you.

Then Abbas came forward, took Ali’s hand and put it over Abu Bakr’s hand. Then they let Ali (who was enraged) to go.” [3]

On the basis of this narration, in order to save Amirul Momineen (a.s.) Abbas took the hand of His Eminence (a.s.) and kept it on the hand of Abu Bakr.

Document No. 4

Allamah Majlisi (d. 1111) narrates similar to that which Tabarsi has mentioned in book *Ihtijaaj*. [4]

“Then he said: Get up! O Ibne Abi Talib and do Bay’at.

(Ali) asked: What if I don’t?

(Umar) said: If so by God, we shall kill you.

He (Ali) protested to them three times. Then he extended his hand while his fist was closed. Over his fist, Abu Bakr hit his hand. This was the Bay’at they could get from Ali but they were content at this much.

Before doing this Bay’at Ali shouted while the rope was round his neck:

Son of my mother! Surely the people reckoned me weak and had well-nigh slain me.” [5]

[1] Husaini Zaidi: *Al-Masabih*, copy available in Great Public Library, Sanaa, Yemen, No. 2185; Ibne Hamza Zaidi (died 614) in his book, *Ash-Shafi* (Vol. 4, Pgs. 171-172) has quoted this from *Al-Masabih*. In the same way Husaini Zaidi (died 670) in his book, *Anwaar al-Yaqeen* (Pg. 9) has quoted this from *Al-Masabih*. The facsimile of this text is present in *Markaz-e-Aqaid*, Qom.

[2] The text quoted in his book is as follows: Umar kicked at the door of date branches and broke it open. Then he went inside and brought Ali (a.s.) out with rope around his neck.

[3] Ayyashi Samarqandi: *Tafseer Ayyashi*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 66-68

[4] We shall refer from this quotation in the coming pages also.

[5] Allamah Majlisi: *Biharul Anwar*, Vol. 28, Pg. 276

In another document, which is very much similar to the above, the text runs thus:

“...Then he extended his hand without opening the fist. Abu Bakr hit over it by his hand. Abu Bakr was content at that. Then (Ali) went home.” **[1]**

Document No. 5

Sayyid Murtuza (d. 436) writes:

“Adi bin Hatim narrates: I was sitting with Abu Bakr when Ali was brought in.

Abu Bakr told Ali to do Bay’at.

Ali replied: What if I don’t?

Abu Bakr said to him: I will behead you.

Then Ali lifted his head towards sky and said: O God! Be witness! Then he extended his hand and gave Bay’at.” **[2]**

Document No. 6

Shaykh Ahmad Tabarsi (6th century) mentions a document as follows:

“Abu Bakr said to Qunfudh: If he (Ali) comes out, it is all right. If not, attack him. Again if he refuses to give allegiance, burn the house with its occupants.

Qunfudh set out with his associates as ordered, attacked the house without warning, entered it and put a black rope around Ali’ neck.

Then they took Ali to Abu Bakr. The black rope was around his neck. Umar was standing with a naked sword. Around Abu Bakr were sitting with his companions holding swords.

Umar threatened him and said: Do Bay’at.

Ali answered: What if I didn’t?

Umar answered: We shall kill you disrespectfully.

Then Ali before doing Bay’at shouted: **[3]** Son of my mother! Surely the people reckoned me weak and had well-nigh slain me.

Then he extended his hand and did Abu Bakr’s Bay’at.” **[4]**

[1] *Ibid. Vol. 28, Pg. 301*

[2] *Sayyid Murtuza: Ash-Shafi fil Imamah, Vol. 3, Pg. 244*

[3] *[It means bringing the hand of Abu Bakr to touch the closed fist of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)]*

[4] *Tabarsi: Ihtijaaj, Vol. 1, Pgs. 83-84*

Document No. 7

Tabari Imami (4th century) writes:

“A group was sent after Ali. They brought Ali with a rope around his neck.

Then they told him to do Bay’at.

He asked: What if I don’t?

They said: We shall kill you.

Ali said: Then you would have killed a servant of God and a brother of the Prophet.

They said: A servant of God, yes! But a brother of the Prophet, no!

The narrator says: On that day Ali returned without giving Bay’at.”**[1]**

How Sunnis narrate this event?

Document No. 8

Ibne Qutaibah (d. 276) writes under the title: Ali's denial to do *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr:[2]

"Afterwards Ali was brought to Abu Bakr. He was saying: I am God's servant and brother of Prophet of God. He was told: Do *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr.

Ali said: Rather I deserve to take *Bay'at*. I won't do *Bay'at* with you. It is you that must do *Bay'at* to me.

Umar said: Unless you do *Bay'at*, you are not free.

Ali told Umar: By God, O Umar! I do not accept your word and nor would I give *Bay'at*.

Abu Bakr said to Ali: If you don't do *Bay'at*, I will not force you."

The writer says under the heading: **How was the *Bay'at* of Ali with Abu Bakr:**

"They pulled out Ali and took him to Abu Bakr and said to him: Do *Bay'at*.

Ali asked: What if I don't?

They said: By God, except Whom there is no god! We shall kill you.

[1] *Tabari Imami: Al-Mustarshid, Pg. 380*

[2] *Refusal of Ali from Bayyat of Abu Bakr.*

Abu Bakr was silent. He did not utter a word. Then Umar said Abu Bakr: Why don't you issue any orders to him?

Abu Bakr replied: I don't order him as long as Fatima is by his side." [1]

This historical document has an explanation. Fatima's house was attacked. It was set afire. Ali was pulled out by force against his will and inclination. He was taken to the mosque and threatened with death. Because of Zahra's presence in the mosque and her defense of Ali, he returned home without doing *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr.[2] He even pretended to having done *Bay'at* to be free from the tyranny of the regime.

In other words, according to a historical document, which is from a reliable source, acknowledged[3] by Sunni sect, no hand shaking or ceremony of placing hand

in the hand of Abu Bakr took place. Because of the presence of Prophet's daughter in the mosque, he (Ali) was set free.

Conclusion of the Eight Documents

Paying attention to:

1 - Ayyashi has also mentioned in the beginning of the document that we quoted from him: The presence of Zahra in the mosque and the threat that she will curse the Caliph and his supporters.

2 - Majlisi too before the document we related from him has referred to the above incident. It emphasizes that Ali was freed because of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.).

The text of the document in question reads as under: "Then she took his hand and set out with him." [4]

3 - Tabarsi has also referred to this in the document we have mentioned from him. [5]

So we conclude:

There appears no contradiction between the narration of Ibne Qutaibah and other historical documents. If reconciled with one another it leads us to conclude that:

[1] *Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pgs. 28-31*

[2] *Ahle Sunnat cannot deny this statement.*

[3] *Refer: Ibne Arabi: Al-Awasim Minal Qawasim, Pg. 248*

[4] *Allamah Majlisi: Biharul Anwar, Vol. 28, Pg. 252*

[5] *Refer: Tabarsi: Ihtijaaj, Vol. 1, Pgs. 86-87*

A) Abu Bakr saw Zahra entering the mosque. So he sufficed on that much military action [1] against the Family of Prophet considering it a commitment on the part of Ali to do *Bay'at* and to not take up arms against the system of Caliphate.

B) The hand of Imam Ali (a.s.) reaches the hand of Abu Bakr while Ali's hand was closed in a fist. It happens at a time when the attack over Zahra's House was parallel to rushing out of Abbas, the uncle of the Prophet. As such, it is obvious that it took place against the wish and will of Imam Ali (a.s.).

C) The Imam Ali's (a.s.) hand reaches the hand of Abu Bakr and Zahra too reaches the mosque. It happens simultaneously. It was a tyranny applied most wickedly on Ali. Then Zahra threatened to curse the Caliph (Abu Bakr) and his supporters.

Therefore Abu Bakr was content with that much and as a result of curse of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) freed His Eminence, Ali (a.s.).

D) Some audiences, particularly supporters of Abu Bakr, have narrated the event in a way that it reflects that Ali did *Bay'at* willingly without any force or pressure and that he willingly put his hand into the hand of Abu Bakr.

E) Ibne Qutaibah refrains from narrating detailed facts such as attack on Zahra's house and exercising every possible atrocity and force against Ali to get his *Bay'at*. There events happened simultaneously with the advent of Zahra to mosque. He wants to exculpate Abu Bakr and pose him as innocent. He relates in such a way as if Abu Bakr waited for the arrival of Zahra to mosque to set Ali free. Further, he shows as if Abu Bakr was not pleased with the deeds of his colleagues.

Remark

In the end we remind:

Some Sunni historians have veiled the conduct of Caliph. They use mild words like:

“Abu Bakr did not want Ali to do Bay’at. He did not force him.[2]”[3]! [4]

[1] *Details of these conditions can be seen in the books of Ayyashi, Masoodi, Tabarsi and Majlisi.*

[2] *Insistence on the version of Ibne Qutaibah instead of the versions of Ayyashi, Masoodi, Tabarsi and others is due to this aim only.*

[3] *Regretfully Asghar Qaidan on page 87 has also propagated the same view.*

[4] *Refer: Ibne Hazm: Al-Fisal Fil Milal wan Nihal, Vol. 4, Pg. 235*

Historical documents openly prove the attack, setting fire to the house, calling for firewood, pulling out of Ali and all the things with their minute details.[1]

In the end we remind:

Some Sunni historians have veiled the conduct of Caliph. They use mild words like:

“Abu Bakr did not want Ali to do Bay’at. He did not force him.[2]”[3]! [4]

[1] *Details of these conditions can be seen in the books of Ayyashi, Masoodi, Tabarsi and Majlisi.*

[2] *Insistence on the version of Ibne Qutaibah instead of the versions of Ayyashi, Masoodi, Tabarsi and others is due to this aim only.*

[3] *Regretfully Asghar Qaidan on page 87 has also propagated the same view.*

[4] *Refer: Ibne Hazm: Al-Fisal Fil Milal wan Nihal, Vol. 4, Pg. 235*

Historical documents openly prove the attack, setting fire to the house, calling for firewood, pulling out of Ali and all the things with their minute details.[1]

Final conclusion about attack on Zahra's house and efforts for taking Bay'at from Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.)

Paying attention to:

1 - The strict and strong denial of Ali to do *Bay'at* is recorded in history and narrated by all historians.

2 - This denial itself is a proof of Ali's dissatisfaction and invalidity of Caliphate. It rescinds credibility of Abu Bakr's Caliphate.

3 - Illegitimacy of Caliphate entails two consequences:

A) Abu Bakr in spite of his incompetence had become a Caliph.

B) The issue of *Bay'at* is also illegal and out of order.

4 - The pressure at such a level over Imam Ali (a.s.), then the atrocities and tyrannies exercised against him themselves prove that the person from whom *Bay'at* was obtained by trick was not willing to pay it. Had he been willing he would not have had to face this force and threats? All historical documents clearly establish this fact.

On the whole it can be said:

The story refusal of Ali to do *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr represents:

That he (Ali) regarded Abu Bakr's Caliphate illegitimate and invalid.

Therefore Abu Bakr comes in a man incompetent for the office. Neither suitability adjusted, nor competence concurred, nor the eligibility determined the office for him.

On the other hand efforts of his associates of Caliphate in taking *Bay'at* from Amirul Momineen (a.s.) by force failed and thus the *Bay'at* of Abu Bakr had no validity because it fails to fulfill the necessary conditions.

From this aspect, it can be said:

"To prove *Bay'at* of Abu Bakr is impossible. A show of it or a feigned *Bay'at*

[1] Refer: *Shaykh Husain Ghaib Gholami: Ahraaq Bait-e-Fatima (s.a.)*

is in vain - inefficacious and of no effect. In obtaining Bay'at, supporters of Abu Bakr applied force, threats and

atrocities against Ali. The *Bay'at* was taken when the conditions were not favorable. As such, the *Bay'at* loses its validity.

On the basis of this the only thing that can be proved is that it was a forced *Bay'at* and hence it was no *Bay'at* at all.

Final Conclusion

The most important result that comes out of these historical documents is Ali's displeasure with Abu Bakr's Caliphate and his denial to it.

Ali's displeasure can be detected in his efforts to overthrow Abu Bakr's rule by means of an armed uprising. Further, his continued denial to do *Bay'at* is also another proof of his unacceptance.

Abu Bakr's Caliphate was always shown by Ali as not rightful.

In the same way by paying close attention to documents and sources that have recorded the attack on Fatima's house clearly proves that the atmosphere that reigned at the time of demanding *Bay'at* from His Eminence (a.s.) was laced with forceful actions, threats and unwillingness.

So it is impossible to prove completion of *Bay'at* of Abu Bakr by this.

Therefore it is possible to conclude that:

It is not possible to prove the completion of *Bay'at* of Abu Bakr and its mere pretension has no effect.

Part 4
Lack of Public Satisfaction from
Abu Bakr's Caliphate

Historical Documents

Ibne Abil Hadeed Motazalli (d. 656) narrates from Abu Bakr Jauhari (d. 323):

“When the refusal of Ali to do Bay’at with Abu Bakr became a topic of public discussion and Abu Bakr and Umar became harsher on Ali (a.s.) Umme Mossattah bin Athatha came out to the grave of the Prophet and recited the following verses:

Unpleasant, dreadful things have occurred;
Had you witnessed, little you would have uttered.
We miss you as the earth is of rain deprived,
See your Ummah in confusion, alas, if you had lived.”[1]

Amirul Momineen (a.s.), in order to prove the lack of people’s approval for Abu Bakr’s Caliphate and their lack of satisfaction from that rule says as follows:

“If you have taken their (people’s) affairs in hand on the basis of consultation, then how it is that the very consultants themselves are absent.”[2]

The norm of general popularity is that the approval of people should precede the takeover of affairs.

But even though in Saqifah, only a few had accepted.[3] the government was announced formally and took on legitimacy. After that others were forced to give *Bay’at*.

When one is at power, to get *Bay’at* from people or any particular person becomes easier. The conditions of *Bay’at* are freedom, liberty and choice. If these elements are absent the *Bay’at* is worthless. *Bay’at* must be the right of masses – to accord. *Bay’at* is not the right of rulership to be obtained from the

[1] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 2, Pg. 50 & Vol. 6, Pg. 43*

[2] *Sayyid Razi: Nahjul Balagha, Saying No. 190*

[3] *Mawardi (died 450) has explained it to be equal to the number of fingers in a hand and he writes: “The Bayyat of Abu Bakr was effected through the unanimity of five persons.” (Mawardi: Al-Ahkaam as-Sulataniyah, Pg. 6)*

people by force.

“The fundamental discussions regarding Saqifah are about identification of opponents of Abu Bakr. The most important

result of it is that the claim of consensus disappears and loses its worth.

Names of opponents are not recorded in history. Generally, names of reputed personalities are paid attention to. Prominent personalities come to mind. The common ones glide into oblivion. Those personalities have a following to whom opinion of their role models is acceptable.

Some have been mentioned in groups. For instance, in the early stage Bani Hashim refrained from Bay'at. **[1]**

In fact, Kinda tribe refused to pay the Zakat. They did so because they opposed Abu Bakr's becoming Caliph.

So opponents of Abu Bakr's selection are many in number. A multitude of them cannot be mentioned here.

Most opponents of Abu Bakr later were either killed or bribed or promised future gains, so their number diminished. They later did the required Bay'at. It needs a separate chapter to discuss this.

We could gather the names of following fifty opponents:..." **[2]**

After that he has listed these names in alphabetical order.

Another look at Historical Documents about Public Allegiance to Abu Bakr

Document No. 1

In *Sahih Bukhari*, which is the most reliable source of Sunni sect, it is mentioned from Ayesha that people were threatened to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr.

This document is most important testimony that establishes incredibility and worthlessness of peoples' *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr. When *Bay'at* is wrong and of no worth it overruns peoples' acceptance or their acknowledgment of Abu Bakr's Caliphate.

Ayesha narrated after narrating developments of Saqifah:

[1] Quoted from: Tabari: *Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook*, Vol. 3, Pg. 208; Ibne Athir: *Al-Kamil fit Tarikh*, Vol. 2, Pg. 10 & Pg. 14; Ibne Abil Hadeed: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 2, Pg. 21

[2] Sayyid Hasan Fatimi: Article 'Saqifah' quoted in *Danish Nama Imam Ali (a.s.)*, Vol. 8, Pg. 443

"Umar had threatened the people."**[1]**

Document No. 2

On authority of Abu Bakr Jauhari (d. 323) Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656) narrates: Umar behaved with those who had taken refuge in Fatima's house as follows:

"Then he said: I swear by God in Whose hands lies my life that I will take you to perform *Bay'at*. If not, I will burn this house over you. Then he pulled them out by ropes around their necks. He dragged them by force until they gave *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr."**[2]**

Document No. 3

In the same way he writes about his (Umar's) roughness and atrocities to strengthen Abu Bakr's Caliphate:

"It was Umar who established *Bay'at* of Abu Bakr. He suppressed all those who opposed *Bay'at*, he broke the sword of Zubair when Zubair pulled it out. He hit at the chest of Miqdad. He, in Saqifah plotted against Saad bin Ubadah and shouted: Kill Saad. May God kill Saad. He defeated Bani Habbab Mundhir. He threatened and pulled out those from Bani Hashim who had taken refuge in Zahra's House.

And if there was not Umar, Abu Bakr's rule would have never established.”[3]

Document No. 4

On this matter, historical sources, proofs and documents are so numerous that Shaykh Mufeed (d. 413) writes:

“The incidents of forcing people to do Bay’at with Abu Bakr and taking them to Abu Bakr against their will and pleasure are so numerous that this book would fall short of pages if we were to mention all of them.”[4]

Document No. 5

For instance, Shaykh Ahmad Tabarsi (6th century) narrates:

“Umar belted his waist tightly and started roaming the streets of Medina. He was shouting: Beware! Abu Bakr has been acknowledged as Caliph. So hurry up to do Bay’at with him.

[1] *Muhammad Ismail Bukhari: Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 4, Pg. 195*

[2] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 2, Pg. 48*

[3] *Ibid. Vol. 1, Pg. 174*

[4] *Shaykh Mufeed: Al-Jamal, Pgs. 118-119*

People rushed and crowded at and in the mosque to do Bay’at with Abu Bakr.

Umar knew that some remained in their houses to avoid Bay’at. He attacked them by surprise and brought them by force to the mosque to give Bay’at.”[1]

His support was an armed gang, blacks and nomads from Bani Aslam tribe, who by the admission of Umar himself had a very important role in the success of Saqifah party.

Document No. 6

“Tabari narrates that after their arrival in Medina they gathered in the streets in such large numbers that the streets were jammed and Umar said: When I saw Bani Aslam tribe I became certain of victory.”[2]

Document No. 7

Ibne Athir has mentioned in the book Kamil:

Bani Aslam tribe arrived and its members did Bay'at. Then Abu Bakr became strong and at that time people gave Bay'at to Abu Bakr.[3]

Document No. 8

More eloquent than these two is Shaykh Mufeed in the book of Jamal. He quotes from Abu Mikhnaf that: A group of nomad Arabs came to Medina to buy rations. People did not attend to them because on that day the Prophet of God had passed away.

They also did Bay'at with the new Caliph and accepted his rulership. Then Umar called them and said:

Whatever rations you need, will be given to you free provided you go into the lanes and streets of the town, gather the people and take them to Abu Bakr to do Bay'at with him. You are free to break head or nose of anyone who resists.

The narrator says: I saw those rough Arabs all of a sudden tightening their waists and then without any warning they started hitting people with canes and forced them to do Bay'at.[4]

[1] *Tabarsi: Ihtijaaj, Vol. 1, Pg. 80*

[2] *Quoted from: Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 2, Pg. 459; Qalaqshandi: Nihayatul Arab, Vol. 4, Pg. 35.*

[3] *Quoted from: Ibne Athir: Al-Kamil fit Tarikh, Vol. 2, Pg. 331*

[4] *Quoted from: Shaykh Mufeed: Al-Jamal, Pg. 119 [We would like to add that this narration is related by many. Some among them are Abu Mikhnaf Lut bin Yahya al-Azadi. His source is Muhammad bin Sayyid al-Kalbi and Abu Salih. The green light shown to them by Umar resulted in that the people had no alternative but to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr or to be beaten by the Arabs.]*

That is why afterwards many tried to justify these atrocities to exempt them from shame of desert dwelling and being nomads.

Ayesha by way of thanks for their beneficial service to her father fabricated a saying of Prophet in praise of these Arabs. But the falsehood of this tradition can well be understood by the readers.[1]"[2]

Document No. 9

In the same way Masoodi says in *Athbaat al-Wisaya*, page 116:

“Umar paid allegiance to Abu Bakr. That is he did by hitting by his hand over that of Abu Bakr. Then the desert Arabs who were at that time in Medina did Bay’at with Abu Bakr. Then non-Muslims who were in Medina under protection of Muslims enjoining their hospitality and kind treatment and consideration also performed Bay’at to show their gratitude and to please them. They saw themselves indebted to Muslims for their favors. So they thought it was a proper time and befitting opportunity to return their thanks. After them others did Bay’at.”

Document No. 10

Ibne Abil Hadeed (d. 656) has also narrated from Baraa bin Azib that:

“I saw Abu Bakr with Umar and Abu Ubadah and a group of Saqifah associates coming forward. They had tied their waists tight. Whomever they came across, they beat up and forced to give Bay’at to Abu Bakr. It did not matter to them whether he liked it or not.”**[3]**

Document No. 11

Zubair bin Bukkar in his book *Mawafaqiaat* has quoted from *Sharh Nahjul Balagha* of Ibne Abil Hadeed, Vol. 6 Pg. 287 that:

“Abu Bakr became strong with the Bay’at of Bani Aslam. But it is not known when Bani Aslam turned their backs at him.”**[4]**

More interesting is that ignoring all these historical testimonies regarding the

[1] Refer: *Ibne Saad: Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 8, Pg. 294*

[2] *Masoodpoor Sayyid Aaqai: Chashma dar Bistar, Pgs. 76-78*

[3] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 219*

[4] *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Saqifah, Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pg. 50*

attitude of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) they still claim:

“The reason of this Bay’at was to honor public opinion.”!**[1]**

“When the majority of people concentrate on someone else, it becomes necessary to preserve unity in society by Bay’at.”!**[2]**

In the end, it is pointed out:

“The thought of selecting a Caliph through general consensus is like searching for causes after something has already happened. It is creation of fanciful elements of history and not a justification applicable to the event that has already occurred. Sunni scholars also do not claim thus. They do not think it is necessary for Imamate.

Sometimes a social phenomena appears or takes to itself existence in a way or other, occasionally the base of monitoring movements is geared by a handful of conjectures. It is justified only for the sake of justification. But the very spirit that brought the phenomena into being is ignored.

Justification of the Caliph’s rule by means of public opinion or its being a government of majority over minority is a formula that obviously serves the ground with regard to Caliphs. The issue of public opinion was never applied, nor ever occurred to them.

In order to decorate Caliphate of Caliphs with an outer show of its being with the people or having had come from the people, some writers have tried to justify it. It exists only in the imaginations of those who justify Caliphs. Reality is something else. It is among those causes that come into being after the happening of a thing.**[3]**

Even though it is claimed:

“Imam Ali (a.s.) did Bay’at after a period to guard unity among Muslims.”**[4]**

[1] Abdul Ali Bazargan: *Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance)*, Pg. 90

[2] *Ibid.* Pg. 88

[3] Ustad Ja’far Subhani: *Peshwayi az Nazar-e-Islam (Leadership in the view of Islam)*, Pgs. 285-286

[4] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Article quoted in *Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 70*

Part 5
**Efforts to prove the Bay'at was of
free choice after Zahra's
martyrdom**

A Suspicion

Sunni sources mention that *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr took place in a free atmosphere with a free choice. Ibne Abil Hadeed Motazalli (d. 656) has this to say in this aspect:

“This is what a group of narrators say and reputed persons of prominence among them too say. He (Ali) did not do Bay'at with Abu Bakr for six months. He remained in his house. He did not do Bay'at until the death of Fatima. When she died he did Bay'at voluntarily.”**[1]**

Cause of Zahra's wrath against Abu Bakr

Readers by now must have become aware of the claim Sunni sources allege that Ali performed *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr by his own will and wish, after Zahra's martyrdom!!

As if the only hindrance of his willing *Bay'at* was remaining alive of the daughter of the Prophet. And if there was delay in this for some months it was only because of this hindrance and there was no other reason!!

Such claims convey that Ali did not see any wrong in doing *Bay'at* in addition to his having recognized the legitimacy of Abu Bakr's Caliphate. The handicap was the daughter of the Prophet whom he revered and respected.

Therefore as soon as she passed away he hurried over to Abu Bakr and paid allegiance to him!!

It is nothing but a clever ploy to gain legitimacy of the Caliphate of Abu Bakr and to cast doubts on the sacredness of the anger of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) on Abu Bakr and make it as insignificant as female emotion. [2]

Analysis and criticism about allegation that *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr took place with his (Ali's) free choice becomes important:

[1] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 2, Pg. 22*

[2] *Thus Ibne Kathir in his audacity has put a question mark of the infallibility of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) who is protected by the guarantee of the Verse of Purification. (Ibne Kathir: Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya, Vol. 5, Pg. 249 & Pg. 286)*

Because *Sahih Bukhari*[1] and *Muslim*[2] mention that it entailed wrath of Zahra against Abu Bakr.

In fact, the text runs thus:

Likes of Muhammad bin Ismail Bukhari and Muslim bin Hajjaj Nishapuri have used words like: "So Fatima, daughter of Prophet of God, got enraged at Abu Bakr and left him (deserted). She boycotted him till her death." [3]

"and Fatima got angry at Abu Bakr. So she left him and did not talk to him till she died." [4]

They have mentioned these points in their books. Indeed, it had been their efforts to invalidate or discredit

these narrations. So they took to vague claims such as *Bay'at* willingly after the martyrdom Zahra."

They have cast suspicion on anger of God in the person of Zahra - Siddiqah Tahera - on Abu Bakr and her most elevated station.

First the allegation that *Bay'at* was by Ali's desire should undergo a thorough scrutiny then alone would it enable us to rely on narrations regarding anger and discontent of Zahra against Abu Bakr. Criticism is necessary to bring out the treasury of history where its gleam and glitter will dazzle and astonish the fact-finding sights and blind the prejudiced eyes.[5]

On the basis of this to establish the falsehood of claim that *Bay'at* was of free choice goes parallel to defend Zahra's anger against Abu Bakr. Exposing this matter will enable one to draw a line between wrong and right after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) especially regarding the discussion of Imamate and Caliphate.

In how many ways Sunnis Narrate this Incident?

With reference to suspicion surrounding the correctness of *Bay'at* of Imam Ali (a.s.) with Abu Bakr during the early stage of the usurpation of Ali's Caliphate,

[1] *Tradition No. 3913*

[2] *Tradition No. 3304*

[3] *Muhammad Ismail Bukhari: Sahih Bukhari, Tradition No. 2862*

[4] *Ibid. Tradition No. 3913; Muslim bin Hajjaj: Sahih Muslim, Tradition no. 3304*

[5] *As you will see in the text of Ibne Qutaibah Dinawari in Al-Imamah was-Siyasah in the description of the condolence of these two for Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) the same attitude is present.*

defenders of Caliph have preferred to pave the way for another *Bay'at* free from all these troubles which the first *Bay'at* carried. They thought this would be advantageous to wipe out stigmas of shame, which the preceding events brought to them.

To get more familiar with the above refer to following sources:

Ibne Hazm: *Al-Fasl Fil Milal Wan Nihal*, Vol. 4, Pg. 235

Ibne Athir: *Al-Kamil Fit Tarikh*, Vol. 2, Pg. 10

Abil Fida: *Al-Mukhtasar*, Vol. 1, Pg. 165

Ibne Jauzi: *Tadhkiratul Khawaas*, Pgs. 60-61

Ibne Athim Kufi: *Al-Futuh*, Pg. 8

It is interesting that some have come under the influence of these writings of Sunni Sources and they say:

“Some say that Ali never did *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr. This is against historical reality. Such sayings are outcome of bigotry which conceals historical facts.”**[1]**

And more interesting is that other defenders of School of Caliphate allege that Imam Ali (a.s.) did *Bay'atin* the very early days of Abu Bakr's Caliphate, and he did it with all his pleasure and willingness.

Some have inserted thoughts, which are their own created lies between the lines of their writings:

Ibne Abde Rabb: *Al-Iqd al-Fareed*, Vol. 4, Pg. 247

Tabari: *Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook*, Vol. 3, Pg. 207

Ibne Katheer: *Al-Sirah al-Nabawia*, Vol. 4, Pg. 495

Nuwairi: *Nihayat al-Arab*, Vol. 4, Pg. 37

It should be mentioned here that the allegation is in open contrast with all historical documents. Further, it clearly contradicts the view of Sunni scholars, which says that Ali did not do *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr as long as Zahra was alive. **[2]**

[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. 89

[2] *Even though these clarifications close all avenues of falsehood propagators we must*

These narrations can be divided into three categories:

Type One) Issue of Murtad (apostasy)

Type Two) Issue of the letter of Ali

Type Three) Special meeting of Ali with Abu Bakr

It must be mentioned that some have tried to establish legality of Abu Bakr's Caliphate by means of these very narrations, which to them serve as a foundation. They go on and make claims like:

"After passing away of Prophet, Ali did not enter into Bay'at with Abu Bakr for a period. Then afterwards he agreed and did Bay'at with Abu Bakr." **[1]**

"Ali refrained from Bay'at for a short period. But his high moral and generous nature impelled him to agree to Bay'at." **[2]**

"Ali and a group of elder companions of Prophet refrained from Bay'at with Caliph whom they themselves had selected. But after a period they saw that their refusal to do Bay'at would result in undue repercussions in Islamic world. So later they paid allegiance. Secondly, they saw that one who had occupied the seat of Caliph is a man who would make every possible effort to strengthen Islam. This was the final aim and aspiration of Ali from Caliphate. So he did Bay'at." **[3]**

Criticism of Three Standards in Narrations of Sunni Sources Concerning willing Bay'at

First standard: Scrutiny into allegation of becoming *Murtad* of some Arabs

Balazari (d. 279) writes:

“When the issue of apostasy arose Uthman came to Ali and said:

Cousin, as long as you do not give Bay'at no one will go out to fight these enemies. And he insisted on this so much that Ali came to Abu Bakr with Uthman and pledged allegiance.”

not be unmindful of the aims of confession makers.

[1] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Raahi Bi Soo-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Way to Islamic Unity), Pg. 163*

[2] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Mashal-e-Ittehaad (Torch of Unity), Pg. 20*

[3] *Ibid. Paara-e-Payambar (Portion of the Prophet), Vol. 6, Pgs. 14-15*

After Ali's Bay'at to Abu Bakr Muslims became glad. They prepared to fight the Murtads and from every side people went to the battle.”!**[1]**

In view of the above document the issue of this *Bay'at* can be divided into three original pivots, which are as follows:

1 - Apostasy of Arabs and its danger to Islam and Muslims.

2 - The allegation of Uthman that no one was willing to join the campaign to crush the movement as long as Ali refrains from *Bay'at*.

3 - A vast army set out to crush the apostates as a proof of completion of this *Bay'at*.

Allegation of Sunni Sect concerning the Bay'at having had taken place because of Murtads cannot be considered reliable

A) Investigation on reliability of this narration

The real pivot of this *Bay'at* is Arabs becoming *Murtad* in the time of Abu Bakr's Caliphate. Now we must see whether there is any or a little truth in it and to what extent.

Biographies in Sunni historical sources show a vast canvas of 'Denial of Faith after accepting it' (which in Arabic is *Irtitaad* – the noun of the Adjective *Murtad*) during Abu Bakr's Caliphate. This creates a probability of imminent danger that could change into a terrible attack on Medina.

"Tabari from Saif and he from Sahl bin Yusuf narrates that: the various tribes of Thalaba bin Saad and other tribes who had associated with them under a pact like the tribe of Murra and Abas in a place called Abraaq, which was in the territory of Rabaza. Another group from Bani Kinana too had joined this confederation. They became a large multitude, which this location fell short to house them all.

Being short of accommodation, they divided into two groups. One group remained in that same location, Abraaq. The second group moved to another location named Zilqissa. Tolaiha Asadi who had claimed himself to be a Prophet sent help and forces to his brother, Jibal, who was the chief there.

Among these tribes, the tribes of Diyil and Laith and Madhij too were present. Auf, son of Falan bin Sanin, administered the Marra tribe in Abraaq. The leadership of the tribe of Thalaba and Abas was responsibility of Harith bin Falan. Harith was one of the folk of the tribe of Bani Saba.

[1] *Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 1, Pg. 587*

So their number went on increasing and their multitude widened.

These tribes delegated a number of their men to Medina as their representative. The representative of the Murtad groups that returned from Medina reported to their respective tribes the weakness and paucity of men in Medina. What they had witnessed in Medina they reported to their chiefs concerned. The weakness among Muslims, the little number of Muslims

created greed in the minds of the chiefs of the various tribes gathered in Abraq. Their strength and extraordinary manpower encouraged them to attack Muslims and they got ready for it.

After three days, a large number Murtads started the most calculated attack on Medina by night.”**[1]**

These events are related as a preliminary ground for the battle of Abraq. This is the first battle of *Murtad* by the soldiers of Abu Bakr. Historians have stated these events in various versions but the point of apostasy is same. The danger inherent in it is reflected in the narration of Balazari.

In the course of Tabari’s narration of these developments and events, we come across preliminary events that preceded the Abraq battle. We give hereunder extract from Tabari:

“Abu Bakr got the intelligence of the attack designed by Murtads. He appointed Ali, Talha, Zubair and Ibne Masood at the entrance points of Medina.”**[2]**

In view of this allegation the *Bay’at* (of Ali) was concluded in those early days, that is when the *Murtads* delegated their representatives to Medina and Abu Bakr became aware of their plan.

Therefore Abu Bakr was able to provide the people of Medina with necessary elements of defense. According to the claims he (Abu Bakr) made Ali the commander of the army stationed at the entrance point to Medina.

There is a close link between the narration of Balazari about *Bay’at* and credibility of events related to the battle of Abraq. This link enhances credibility of Balazari and makes the events believable.

[1] Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends)*, Vol. 2, Pgs. 29-30; quoting from: *Tarikh Tabari*, Vol. 1, Pgs. 1871-1875

[2] *Ibid.* Vol. 2, Pg. 30

In spite of this, the events are surrounded by surmise and suspicion.

Investigation of correctness and occurrence of the Battle of Abraq and events following it

Allamah Askari in Volume Two of *Abdullah bin Saba and other historical stories* has dwelled much on the analysis of battles and victories during Abu Bakr's Caliphate. In his analysis he has exposed the fabrications and lies of Saif bin Umar.

Regarding the reliability of report about Abraq battle and events ensued therefrom, which we have mentioned, he writes:

“Through serious research it should be said with certainty:

Things narrated with so many details about Abraq battle and story of Zilqissa[1] – all are fabricated and created by Saif. No historian except Saif has narrated them. So it is nothing but a lie and imagination of Saif.

Neither is true apostasy of most of these tribes whom Saif has accused of being *Murtads*. There was no gathering of *Murtad* in Abraq and Zilqissa. There is no basis of sending representatives of *Murtad* to Medina. Likewise, the choice of Abu Bakr has no base. There is no truth in it. Again, he posted soldiers at entry points of Medina. He sent army to fight them. All this is again wrong. Nothing of it is correct. The four battles[2]

[1] *[The details of this forgery are as follows: Tabari proceeds: Abu Bakr's army chased them (the Murtad) until Zilqissa. This was the first victory gained by Abu Bakr.*

(Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 32; quoting from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 1, Pgs. 1880-1885)

Then he continues. The followers of Tolaiha remained in Abraq – Rabaza. The army (of Abu Bakr) chased them upto Zilqissa. Tolaiha sent a message to Gidila and Ghouse. They were two branches of Tai tribe and invited them to help him. Some at once marched towards him in compliance with his message. They enjoined others to join Tolaiha gradually.

(Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 52; quoting from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 1, Pgs. 1871-1873)

When Abu Bakr saw such developments, he was encouraged and moved towards the territory of Zilqissa. There he gathered a large army of Muslims. Since the army was great and vast in manpower, he divided it into eleven battalions, each under a

commander. He gave a banner to each commander and ordered each of them to move to a tribe that had gone Murtad. In biographies Saif bin Umar is described as follows; it is enough to prove that he was a liar.

(Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 52; quoting from: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 1, Pgs. 1880-1885)

[2] *[The first and the second battle was related to the Abraaq wars and it the preface of it and the fourth battle was connected to Zilqissa expedition in the eleventh group.*

which Saif has attributed to Abu Bakr are also without ground.”**[1]**

The following extracts from Rijaal books sufficiently prove that Saif bin Umar was a liar

“1 - Yahya bin Moin (d. 233) says about him:

His sayings are weak and feeble.

2 - Nasai, author of Sahih (d. 303) says:

Many have avoided him. They do not quote from him because of his not being honest or reliable.

3 - Abu Dawood (d. 275) says:

He is worthless. A great liar!

4 - Ibne Abi Hatim (d. 327) says:

They have ignored his narrations.

5 - Ibne al-Sakan (d. 353)

He is weak.

6 - Ibne Hibban (d. 354)

He used to invent traditions and narrate them attributing to some reliable source. He is accused of being an atheist. Saif is accused of creating false traditions.

7 - Darqutni (d. 385) says:

He is weak. His narrations are avoided.

8 - Hakim (d. 405) says:

His traditions are avoided because he is said to be an atheist.

9 - Firozabadi (d. 817) compiler of Qamoos says:

He is weak.

10 - Ibne Hajar (d. 825) says:

He is weak.

11 - Suyuti (d. 911) says:

He is very weak.

12 - Safiuddin (d. 923) says:

He is considered weak.”**[1]**

(Refer: Ibid. Vol. 2, Pgs. 45-46)

[1] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pgs. 46-47*

Result

Most narrations regarding *Bay'at* quoted by Sunni writers are from Saif. Similar is the issue of *Murtad* and battle of Abraq. Hence it loses credit and does not carry any historical credibility.

B) Analysis of proof of this narration

The issue of *Bay'at* is related to the issue of *Murtad* and battle of Abraq. Its correctness too is related to the above.

In Sunni books, like *Tarikh Tabari*, the issue of *Murtad* and story of attack of Medina by *Murtad*s commences from the battle of Abraq and ends at Umme Zamal becoming a *Murtad*.

Continuation of scrutiny about authenticity of Abraq battle and events following it

According to Sunni sources, *Murtads* after their defeat in Abraq battle invited the Tai tribes to co-operate with them and another battle took place in Zilqissa at Buzakha. They confronted eleven divisions of Abu Bakr's army but were again defeated.

These people who were defeated for the second time gathered around a woman who had become *Murtad*. Her name was Umme Zamal. Again they posed danger to Islam. This movement too was crushed by forces of Caliph. [2]

On the basis of this authenticity of *Bay'at*, narrator of which is Balazari, is related to authenticity of the four battles:

- 1 - Battle of Abraq.
- 2 - Campaign at Zilqissa and battle at Buzakha.
- 3 - Apostasy of Tai tribe.
- 4 - Apostasy of Umme Zamal.

The interesting point is that some researchers consider all narrations relating to above events as fabricated. They give credibility only to developments that occurred at Zilqissa - and that too not totally. We quote some texts:

[1] *Ibid. Vol. 1, Pg. 70*

[2] *Refer: Tarikh Tabari, Vol. 1, Pgs. 1871-1872 (Events preceding the battle of apostates); Ibid. Vol. 1, Pgs. 1873-1875 (Battle of Abraq); Ibid. Vol. 1, Pgs. 1880-1885 (Battle of Zilqissa and war of Buzakha); Ibid. Vol. 1, Pgs. 1871-1873 (Apostasy of Tai tribe); Ibid. Vol. 1, Pg. 1902*

"Usamah along with his army returned to Medina from the battle of Syria. It was the time Abu Bakr was preparing for confrontation with Murtad. With a group of Muslims he left Medina and reached Zilqissa, which is twelve miles from Medina on route to Najd. He camped here and his army also remained alert.

Khalid bin Waleed was sent to Murtad tribes. Abu Bakr vested the command Ansaar to Thabit bin Qays and made Khalid commander-in-chief. Abu Bakr ordered Khalid to move towards

Tolaiha and Oyinat bin Hisn who were stationed in the vicinity of Bani Asad tribe at a place called Buzakha.

In the meantime Abu Bakr told Khalid: Good will shortly ensue from this meeting of yours with my army at Khaiber. Of course Abu Bakr's words were based on policy and were a trick. His idea was that the enemy would come to know; and this would create a dread in their hearts. It is concluded thus because Abu Bakr had already sent all his warriors with Khalid towards the enemy. There remained no one with Abu Bakr to be sent to the support of Khalid either to Buzakha or Khaiber.**[1]**

Yaqubi too has mentioned in his history the incident in which Abu Bakr moved towards Zilqissa and appointment of Khalid as Commander. Yaqubi adds that the appointment of Thabit as leader of Ansaar was after Ansaar objected to Abu Bakr why he did not appoint anyone of them as the commander."**[2]**

"When we compare the narrations of Saif regarding Abraha battle and story of Zilqissa with narrations of other historians it obviously shows the imaginative mind of Saif. Because all other historians are unanimous in saying that Abu Bakr left Medina for battle only once. After the return of Usamah from Muta**[3]** he moved towards Zilqissa. There he provided a well-ordered army and vested Khalid with command of this army. He made Thabit chief of Ansaar under supervision of Khalid. Then Abu Bakr ordered them to move towards Buzakha to crush Tolaiha and those from tribes of Asad and Fuzara who had gathered around him."**[4]**

[1] *[On the basis of this same quotation we will analyze the claim of free Bayyat.]*

[2] *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane, Vol. 2, Pgs. 40-41*

[3] *[On the basis of this same quotation we will analyze the claim of free Bayyat.]*

[4] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 43*

"Other historians write regarding this that from groups living on outskirts of Medina only two tribes rose against Islam. One was Asad, the tribe of Tolaiha himself and the other was Fuzara a branch of Ghatfan and Ghatfan itself was a sub tribe of Qays Eylan. Except these two, no other tribe is seen aiding Tolaiha or fighting against Muslims."**[1]**

“In the army of Tolaiha there were a few persons from Asad tribe, which was his own tribe and a few other from Fuzara tribe under the supervision of their chief Uyanna bin Hisn.”[2]

“Some historians again write that soldiers of Tolaiha assembled in Buzakha a populated place of Asad tribe. Khalid bin Waleed came from Zilqissa with two thousand seven hundred men from Fuzara and confronted them. A severe battle took place between them.”[3]

More interesting is the point that the issue of *Bay'at* of free choice is related to the issue of apostasy of Tai tribe while the fact is that:

“Tai is the same tribe, which was not Tolaiha’s supporter, but they took the stand against - Tolaiha. Whenever an army confronted Tolaiha, they too joined them against Tolaiha. They used to say: Abu Bakr must fight you so hard that you will name him Abul Fahal. Besides, he (Khalid) sought help from them in the battle against Tolaiha.”[4]

For the first time issue of *Murtad* was shown as a great danger:

1 - Usamah’s army had returned from Muta so Abu Bakr had no shortage from military aspect.

Therefore there was no need for him to demand Ali’s allegiance in order to call for volunteers.

2 - Tolaiha and his associates were not in considerable number and the issue of apostasy was not so widespread that it needed a huge army to be crushed.

As a matter of fact, the issue of *Murtads* was not a serious danger to threaten a town like Medina that it should have required demanding Ali to give *Bay'at* to Abu Bakr.

[1] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 58*

[2] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 61*

[3] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 58*

[4] *Ibid. Vol. 2, Pg. 61*

Result

The issue of *Bay'at* of free will of Imam Ali (a.s.) for the sake of crushing the revolt of *Murtads* is a thing added to historical documents. The propaganda disseminated on the wings of falsehood was so high that the issue of *Murtads*

gained a ground.

Another look at the case of Apostasy of Arabs

The researchers have acknowledged the *Murtad* Arabs were few in number. In his research into the history of battles against *Murtad*, Allamah Askari has concluded that it was not such a serious matter.

The issue of apostasy was such that researchers have very simply passed by without pursuing it like Allamah Askari.[1] So the lies written by Tabari in this respect remained unchallenged. But when historical records and documents mentioned in Sunni books are scrutinized it proves that:

“The vastness of Arabian Peninsula caused the historians to believe that apostasy was also so widespread. While the limited number of inhabitants who accepted Islam during Prophet’s lifetime remained adherents of Islam.”[2]

“Most historians have exaggerated the matter. They imagined the length and breadth of Arabian Peninsula and fancied that the issue of Murtads[3] was also as widespread. So they wrote: The Arabs became Murtads - a superlative expression reflecting a wrong idea that all the population apostised while in fact it was not so. They exempted three towns: Medina, Mecca and Taif from being Murtad. But research shows a different picture. Many tribes were loyal to Islam and government at Medina. It was quite likely they even helped the central government in crushing Murtads.

Through historical testimonies and sources we shall prove that most of these tribes and people adhered to their faith in Islam and the exaggeration in this issue is uncalled for...

There are many reports that indicate people’s loyalty to Islam and their scorn of apostasy. A few instances are as under:

[1] Refer: Ali Gholami Dahqi: *Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar*, Pg. 34; Pg. 41 (Commanders of Ridda wars); Pg. 39 & Pg. 117 (Instruction of Abu Bakr to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) for defending Medina).

[2] Ali Gholami Dahqi: *Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar*, Pg. 120

[3] Refer: *Waqidi: Kitab ar-Ridda*, Pg. 48; *Ibne Kathir: Al-*

Bidayatun Nihaya, Vol. 6, Pg. 312; Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 242

1 - Most historians are unanimous that there was no apostasy in Mecca, Medina and Thaqif and they even came out to help in crushing the apostates of Asad, Zibyan and Ghatfan.**[1]**

2. Loyalty of tribes living between Mecca, Medina and Taif like Muzina, Ghiffar, Johaina, Balla and...to Islam.**[2]**

After the Prophet's passing away some of these tribes paid Zakat to Abu Bakr. The Caliph sought their help in his coming battle of Ridda.**[3]**

There are indications that some individuals of Amir and Hawazin also remained loyal to Islam. As mentioned in the report of Fujaat that Amir and Hawazin used to support all the Muslims of Sulaym tribe.**[4]**

A group among the tribe of Bani Kalb under leadership of Imrul Qays bin al-Asbagh and similarly a group from Bani al-Qain under leadership of Umar bin al-Hakam who was an agent of the Prophet, remained Muslims until the last.**[5]**

Besides these there are many in Yemen such as Nakha, Jofi, Murad and Madhij who separated themselves from Aswad Ansi and protected themselves from apostasy...

A large number of tribes from Bani Tameem also remained Muslims and they remained firm against the claim of prophethood of Sajah. On the basis of this it can be said that among the Bani Tameem the number of those who remained Muslims was more than those who had doubts about Islam or those who had apostatised.

Maqdasi has absolved many from Nakha'a and Kinda from being Murtads in addition to Bahrain, Mecca and Medina.**[6]**

The fact is that to give such vastness to the issue of apostasy is a mistake. So the right thing is that some claimants of prophethood and their

[1] Quoted from: *Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 242*

[2] Quoted from: *Mahdi Razaqallah Ahmad, Ath-Thabitoon Alal Islam Ayyam Fitnatur Ridda, Pg. 20; quoting from: Kalai Balansi: Haroob ar-Ridda, Pg. 41*

[3] Quoted from: *Ibne Saad: Tabaqat al-Kubra, Vol. 1, Pg. 293;*

Ibne Hisham: As-Sirah an-Nabawiya, Vol. 2, Pg. 309; Dayar Bakri: Tarikh Khamees, Vol. 2, Pgs. 21-22; Waqidi: Kitab ar-Ridda, Pgs. 54-67

[4] Quoted from: *Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 2, Pg. 264; Dayar Bakri: Tarikh Khamees, Vol. 2, Pg. 202*

[5] Quoted from: *Tabari: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 3, Pg. 243*

[6] Quoted from: *Maqdisi: Al-Bado wat-Tarikh, Vol. 6, Pg. 151*

followers and some others who attacked the central government of Medina may be called apostates. Even the claimants of prophethood cannot be called apostates because they had not accepted Islam in the first place that they could turn away from it.

Perhaps the fact that apostates were scattered in a large area caused the historians to believe that they were in such a large number.

In *Tarikh Ridda* while listing apostate tribes the following are absolved from being Murtads: Abas, some from Ashja, Ghiffar, Juhaina, Muzina, Kaab, Thaqif, Tai, Huzail, people of Sarrah, Bajila, Khathama, Hawazin, Nasr, Jusham, Saad bin Bakr, Abdul Qays, Doos, Shajeeb, Hamadan and Anba in Sanaa. **[1]**

...the result is that the issue of apostasy was not so widespread in Arabian Peninsula as historians have made it out to be and most of them remained Muslims and were loyal to Islam." **[2]**

Conclusion

As you saw the magnitude of apostasy described by Waqidi and Tabari is not having any truth as shown in analysis of Allamah Askari. But researchers have not followed the line of Allamah Askari and thus apostasy remains in the same exaggerated condition.

On the basis of this from every angle you look at the issue of apostasy you will conclude that:

The apostasy of Arabs was neither so widespread nor such a serious danger to Islam.

Therefore its suppression has no connection with the *Bay'at* of Imam Ali (a.s.) to Abu Bakr.[3]

[1] Quoted from: Khurshid Ahmad Farooq: *Tarikh ar-Ridda*, Pgs. 5-8

[2] Ali Gholami Dahqi: *Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar*, Pgs. 33-37

[3] *Regretfully the author of Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar has ignored this point and he thinks that the apostasy of the people was a factor of Bayyat by Amirul Momineen (a.s.).*

But he has also mentioned about the dissatisfaction of His Eminence Ali (a.s.) with Abu Bakr in the matter of dealing with the apostates without his direct intervention.

(Refer: Ibid. Pgs. 115-118 & Pg. 120)

Three main outcomes of scrutiny of the issue of Apostasy of Arabs

Conclusion 1 - The scrutiny can be summed up in one sentence: The issue of apostasy of Arabs was a fabricated case. *Bay'at* of Imam Ali (a.s.) had no bearing on it as Sunnis claim.

Conclusion 2 - Even if for the sake of argument we even accept the issue of apostasy of Arabs in the magnitude as is claimed, yet we do not see any *Bay'at* taking place. In narration of Balazari the words (so he gave *Bay'at*) are fabricated and a presumption of narrator himself.

Conclusion 3 - Even if for the sake of argument we accept the narration of Balazari it does not exercise any influence on historical realities as the *Bay'at* itself was a forced one. It was only a show.

In other words, the *Bay'at* which occurred as a show was basically invalid.

On the margins of analysis of issue of apostasy of Arabs

If for the sake of argument we suppose that the matter of *Bay'at* is correct we must pursue the concealed motives and aims of Caliphate about the *Bay'at* and make a fresh analysis of circumstances surrounding its occurrence.[1]

Because in this issue there is likelihood of preparation of background to a psychological war in Medina as Uthman's meetings with Ali shows.

This idea arises because the name of Tai has crept in the case of Tolaiha and battle of Buzakha while according to historical records they were not apostates but among supporters of Abu Bakr.[2]

Therefore there is probability that from the very base, the matter narrated by Tabari on the authority of Saif[3] -was not a lie but the tribe of Tai demonstrated *Irtitaad* to the benefit and advantage of Abu Bakr. It can be said to be a pre-prepared game with mutual understanding. An emergency atmosphere is created in Medina. And they send representatives to put awe in the people which evidently served to benefit the Caliph.

[1] *It is matter for contemplation and there is stronger possibility of it being fabricated.*

[2] *Refer: Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pg. 196; Vol. 2, Pgs. 56-57*

[3] *Refer: Ibid. Vol. 2, Pgs. 51-52*

Therefore it can be said:

Upon the martyrdom of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) all the attention of the system of Caliphate concentrated in subduing the opponents living outside Medina.[1]

In the meantime, that which was a source of anxiety to the Caliph was effort of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to overthrow his regime. That also at a time when he wanted to send all available troops out of Medina and his own departure from Medina to Zilqissa.

Therefore they had to find a way that this time they had to without any ceremony and show off and also without any display of threats and enmity take assurance from Amirul

Momineen (a.s.) that he will assume silence and abstain from an armed uprising.

In these circumstances they initiated a systematic propaganda.

So first of all they spread the terror of attack of apostates on Medina.

Then Uthman pressurized Ali to give *Bay'at* so that the regime can mobilize people for suppressing the apostates and that there was no other way to defend Islam and Muslim.

Because of this propaganda it seemed that if Ali still refused allegiance it would at least tarnish his character in the view of people and put a question mark on his rightfulness.

From this aspect *Bay'at* to the Caliphs was under the pressure of public opinion and widespread propaganda of government machinery against His Eminence (a.s.).

In the analysis of this issue Allamah Askari writes:

“The correct Bay'at is that which must be given at pleasure and with willingness, otherwise it is not Bay'at. It is only a handshake, or at the most a show of Bay'at.

So Bay'at of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) after six months took place under pressure and for preservation of Islam. So in fact, it was a Bay'at without any willingness and just a show and a handshake.”**[2]**

[1] Refer: *Ali Labbaf, A Victim Lost in Saqifah, Vol. 3, Pgs. 140-173; Pgs. 183-190*

[2] *Allamah Sayyid Murtuza Askari: Saqifah, Edited by Mahdi Dashti, Pg. 116*

Last Reminder

More interesting is the point that some narrations regarding the issue of apostasy do not mention anything about the occurrence of *Bay'at* of Ali, they only repeat the matter of silence.

These documents clearly prove that the phrase 'so he did *Bay'at*' in the narration of Balazari is an interpolation by the narrator and there is no truth in it.

Tabari Imami (4th century) narrates from Waqidi (d. 207):

"When Arabs turned Murtad, Uthman came to Ali and said: O, cousin of Prophet! As long as you do not do *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr, no one goes to fight the enemy. You yourself are better aware of things. Your viewpoint is correct. But I fear this present issue could develop into a great trouble and might bring havoc to all of us.

Uthman kept on insisting on Ali and his pleadings bore fruit. Finally he brought Ali to Abu Bakr.

Muslims became happy with this development. From every side the horse riders came out. People became desirous to fight. They got ready for the battle.

His attitude that he will neither undertake a movement not an armed uprising alone acted as a deterrent. Because swords of mischief were pulled out and flames of havoc were leaping high. The lances were directed against Islam and Muslims. So he gave up demand of restoration of his rights.[1]"[2]

Scrutiny into narrations regarding the letter of Ali

Another document used to prove willing *Bay'at* is Imam's letter to his companions. On the basis of it they claim:

"Ali refrained from *Bay'at* for a certain period. The hypocrites started their activities. Then the issue of Murtad arose. These two issues posed an eminent danger to Islam and Muslims. Therefore for sake of Islam Ali did *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr at his free will."!**[3]**

[1] *[By sword]*

[2] *Tabari Imami: Al-Mustarshid, Pgs. 383-384 (Published Mahmoodi)*

[3] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issue No. 4-5, Pg. 181*

A) A look at this letter

1 - The letter in *Al-Imamah was-Siyasah* is as follows:

"I withheld my hand even though I considered no one more deserving than myself for the successorship of Prophet. So I remained patient on destiny till I saw a group departing from Islam calling others to give up the religion of Muhammad and Ibrahim.

So I feared that if I do not help Islam and Muslims the havoc will be far greater than that of giving up succession to the Prophet. So I went to Abu Bakr and did *Bay'at*."!**[1]**

2 - In *Ansaab al-Ashraaf* the letter is referred to without its contents.**[2]**

3 - In *Al-Gharaat* the contents of this letter are:

"I withheld my hand even though I considered no one more deserving than myself for the successorship of Prophet. So I remained patient on destiny till I saw a group departing from Islam calling others to give up the religion of Muhammad and Ibrahim.

So I feared that if I do not help Islam and Muslims the havoc will be far greater than that of giving up succession to the Prophet. So I went to Abu Bakr and did *Bay'at*."!**[3]**

A) A look at this letter

1 - The letter in *Al-Imamah was-Siyasah* is as follows:

“I withheld my hand even though I considered no one more deserving than myself for the successorship of Prophet. So I remained patient on destiny till I saw a group departing from Islam calling others to give up the religion of Muhammad and Ibrahim.

So I feared that if I do not help Islam and Muslims the havoc will be far greater than that of giving up succession to the Prophet. So I went to Abu Bakr and did Bay’at.”! **[1]**

2 - In *Ansaab al-Ashraaf* the letter is referred to without its contents. **[2]**

3 - In *Al-Gharaat* the contents of this letter are:

“I withheld my hand even though I considered no one more deserving than myself for the successorship of Prophet. So I remained patient on destiny till I saw a group departing from Islam calling others to give up the religion of Muhammad and Ibrahim.

So I feared that if I do not help Islam and Muslims the havoc will be far greater than that of giving up succession to the Prophet. So I went to Abu Bakr and did Bay’at.”! **[3]**

A - 1) Remark about *Al-Gharaat*

Although the writer of this book is Ibrahim bin Muhammad Thaqaafi Kufi (d. 283) an Imamiyah scholar but the first copy of *Al-Gharaat* has come down to us only through a Sunni channel so we treat it as a Sunni source. **[4]**

A - 2) Common points in Narrations of Ibne Qutaibah and Thaqaafi

A close attention to the above will bring to light two basic pivots common in both.

Pivot A

People going *Murtad* in the period of occurrence of this *Bay’at* as proved from the words: ‘I saw people returning from Islam’.

[1] *Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 175*

[2] *Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 2, Pg. 383*

[3] *Thaqaafi Kufi: Al-Gharaat (with Preface and Notes by Meer Jalaluddin Muhaddith Armawi), Vol. 1, Pgs. 305-306*

[4] Refer: *Ali Akbar Zakiri: Seemai Kaarguzaaraan Ali Ibne Abi Talib Amirul Momineen (a.s.), Vol. 2, Pg. 124*

Pivot B

Going of Imam Ali (a.s.) to Abu Bakr and doing *Bay'at* with him as mentioned in the words: 'Then I went to Abu Bakr and did *Bay'at*'.

B) A glance at the incident mentioned in this letter

1 - Ibne Qutaibah writes about the reason of writing this letter:

"Hujr bin Adi, Amr bin Hamaq and Abdullah bin Wahab Rasabi visited Ali to inquire Imam's opinion about Abu Bakr and Umar..."**[1]**

2 - Balazari writes:

"Hujr bin Adi Kindi, Amr bin Hamaq Khuzai, Habba bin Juwin Bajili Urani, Abdullah bin Wahab Hamadani and Ou bin Saba came to Ali..."**[2]**

3 - Thaqafi Kufi writes:

"Amr bin Hamaq, Hujr bin Adi, Habba Urani, Harith Awar and Abdullah bin Saba visited Ali..."**[3]**

B - 1) Outcome

As you must have noted in the documents of this letter appear some personalities such as Abdullah Ibne Wahab Rasabi Hamadani Sabayee. Balazari calls him Ibne Saba. Thaqafi calls him Abdullah bin Saba as one of the questioners, which is a point worth contemplation.**[4]**

Abdullah bin Wahab Rasabi Hamadani was among the Khawarij and was the commander of Khawarij in the battle Nahrawan.

Shia and Sunni, both sects, regard Abdullah bin Saba as a perverted and deviated person. According to research of Al-lamah Askari, he (Abdullah) is a creation of Saif bin Umar and was a design to distort historical facts.

[1] *Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 154*

[2] *Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 2, Pg. 383*

[3] *Thaqafi Kufi: Al-Ghaaraat (with Preface and Notes by Meer Jalaluddin Muhaddith Armawi), Vol. 1, Pg. 302*

[4] *Some researchers consider him responsible of making alterations in this letter.*

(Refer: Ali Akbar Zakiri: Hukoomat O Siyasat, Pg. 61, Possibility B); This view also supports that the mentioned letter is not reliable and there is greater possibility of it being forged.

On the other hand Tabari Imami, the elder,[1] (4th century) has mentioned this letter in his book, *Al Mustarshid Fil Imamah***[2]** from Shoba (Amir bin Saraheel Abu Umar Kufi) who is only considered reliable by Sunni sect and the Shias have opposed him.**[3]**

Investigation of credibility of sources mentioned in this letter

As you must have noted the text of this letter is mentioned in two ancient sources: *Al-Imamah was-Siyasah* by Ibne Qutaibah Dinawari and *Al-Gharaat* by Thaqaafi Kufi.

Since only Thaqaafi Kufi was of Shia faith and Ibne Qutaibah was a follower of the School of Caliphate his quotation in this particular case cannot be trusted.

In the coming pages you will see that Ibne Qutaibah is very much inclined to represent Ali firstly, in good terms with Abu Bakr; and secondly to do *Bay'at* with him on his own willingness and desire.

Therefore Ibne Qutaibah in quoting the matter about the willing *Bay'at* of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) to Abu Bakr blames the associates of the Caliph and therefore assumes an external position; so in this pursuit he has dared to confirm fabricated documents in which the signs of fabrication and deviation are very much prominent. **[4]**

Therefore there is likelihood that the letter might have been distorted by Ibne Qutaibah and since he has quoted it regarding willing *Bay'at* it becomes unreliable.

As for *Al-Gharaat* the most genuine and reputed source of this letter it must be said:

1 - This book *Al-Gharaat* has reached to us through Sunni sources only. **[5]**

2 - The writer of *Al-Gharaat* has written it in Isfahan. In those times in Isfahan

[1] *Muhammad bin Jurair bin Rustam*

[2] *Mahmoodi Edition, Pg. 408*

[3] *Refer: Ali Akbar Zakiri: Hukoomat O Siyasat, Pg. 32*

[4] *In the coming pages we will criticize this quotation and also discuss the intellectual inclinations and religious leanings of Ibne Qutaibah.*

[5] *Ali Akbar Zakiri: Seemai Kaarguzaaraan Ali Ibne Abi Talib Amirul Momineen (a.s.), Vol. 2, Pg. 124*

lived staunch anti-Shia people. Most were opposed to Imam Ali (a.s.). **[1]**

Muhaddith Armavi in preface to this *Al-Gharaat* gives the reason why Thaqafi lived in Isfahan. According to him:

“...Thaqafi was originally from Kufa, later he migrated to Isfahan because in Kufa he had written a book on the virtues of the Purified Ahle Bayt (a.s.) and the defects of their enemies which the people of Kufa admired and appreciated very much. But they advised him not to publish it as it was time to be in dissimulation. Thaqafi asked them of a place where Shias were less or it is far from Shias. They told him such a town was Isfahan. So Ibrahim swore that he would not publish the book but in Isfahan.

So he migrated from Kufa to Isfahan and published the book which was against dissimulation there.” [2]

Hence there is very strong likelihood that the copy makers of Isfahan who were of the Sunni School mixed and interpolated the material of the book with their own prejudice against Ahle Bayt of Prophet.

C - 1) Evidences that show deviation in *Al-Gharaat*

Evidence 1 - In the printed copy of *Al-Gharaat* we read the instructions of ablution in line with Sunni sect. the instructions direct to wash the face instead of passing of palm over them. This is Sunni practice which contradicts Shia method. [3]

Such interpolation is also found in the letter of Imam Ali (a.s.) addressed to Muhammad bin Abu Bakr in Egypt.

The signs of interpolation in Evidence 1

Shaykh Mufeed has copied this letter in *Amali*. He has taken it from *Al-Gharaat*. Some among its contents are like this:

“Then pass your palm over your head and feet.” [4]

[1] *Rasool Ja’faryan: Manabe Tarikh Islam, Pg. 150*

[2] *Quoted from: Muhaddith Qummi: Tatammatul Mun-taha, Pg. 270*

[3] *Thaqafi Kufi: Al-Ghaaraat (with Preface and Notes by Meer Jalaluddin Muhaddith Armawi), Vol. 1, Pg. 245*

[4] *Shaykh Mufeed: Amali, Pg. 267*

The interesting thing is that Ibne Al-Hadeed Motazalli has also not mentioned it in *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*. [1]

Therefore it can be said:

This interpolation was done by those who duplicated *Al-Gharaat*. It served their purpose to insert their belief within the words of Imam Ali (a.s.).

Muhaddith Armawi has mentioned in the footnote in *Al-Gharaat* quoting from Muhaddith Noori:

“It is clearly known that contents of *Al-Gharaat* have been distorted by Sunnis; because they narrate from it.” [2]

Evidence 2 - The printed copy of *Al-Gharaat* contains many virtues and superior qualities of Caliphs. While the irrefutable fact is that all qualities attributed to Caliphs are false on the basis of the attitude of Imam Ali (a.s.) in the six-persons Shura committee formed to appoint a Caliph. Abdur Rahman bin Auf laid a condition that the new Caliph must follow the path of Abu Bakr and Umar. The reply of Ali was so severe and harsh [3] that it leaves no room to doubt that the text concerning Caliphs is nothing but a fabrication.

The fabrication that has taken place concerns two letters of Imam Ali (a.s.). One was addressed to Qays bin Saad bin Ubadah in Egypt and the other to his (Ali’s) own companions.

Signs of forgery in Evidence 2 (including 2 letters)

Evidence 2 - Letter One

The text of this letter[4] is as follows in *Al-Gharaat*:

“After the Prophet Muslims chose from among themselves two virtuous men as their Caliphs and leaders who acted on the book of God and administered the affairs in the best possible way. They did not go beyond

[1] *Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 6, Pg. 71*

[2] *Thaqafi Kufi: Al-Gharaat (with Preface and Notes by Meer Jalaluddin Muhaddith Armawi), Vol. 1, Pg. 245; quoting from: Muhaddith Noori: Mustadrak al-Wasael, Vol. 1, Pg. 44*

[3] Refer: *Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 26; Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 188; Tarikh Yaqoobi, Vol. 2, Pg. 162; Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 5, Pg. 22*

[4] *Sayyid Abul Fazl Barqai in his Preface to the book, Shahira-e-Ittihaad has argued on the basis of these sentences.*

the tradition of Prophet. Then God captured their souls. May God have mercy on them.”[1]

In this concern, Allamah Mirza Habeebullah Hashimi Khoei writes in his commentary of *Nahjul Balagha*:

“They could have been such as a show off to the people. Although it is also possible that these interpolations were made by the opponents of Shias and inserted into the text.”[2]

That which proves the veracity of Allamah Hashimi Khoei is that:

What has come in the statements of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) is actually the people’s view about the two Caliphs. There is another letter of Ali addressed to Huzaifa bin Yaman in the town of Madayn. The letter reads as follows:[3]

“After passing away of Prophet some Muslims raised two men to Caliphate. They were pleased with the behavior and the conduct of those two.”[4]

The difference in the words of Ali is another proof of deviation in the text. The difference in the wording is clear comparing the printed copy of *Al-Gharaat* with the narration of Sayyid Ali Khan Madani.

He (Sayyid Ali Khan Madani) has copied the letter in his book *Al-Darjaat ar-Rafiya* from *Al-Gharaat*. The text concerning Caliphs runs as follows:

“After the Prophet, Muslims brought among themselves two men into succession as their chiefs who acted in the best way till their death.”**[5]**

The difference in the text with that of the printed copy of *Al-Gharaat* shows that *Al-Gharaat* gradually underwent deviations by several hands. There does not exist any copy which may tally with another. However little or trifle, but there is a deviation in each. One differs from another. This is an open proof of it not being original.

[1] *Thaqafi Kufi: Al-Gharaat (with Preface and Notes by Meer Jalaluddin Muhaddith Armawi), Vol. 1, Pg. 210*

[2] *Hashimi Khoei: Minhaaj al-Bara-a, Vol. 6, Pg. 106*

[3] *[His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) by these words has put a question mark on the public and general acceptance of the Caliphs.]*

[4] *Muhammad Baqir Mahmoodi: Nahjus Saada Fee Mustadrak Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 4, Pg. 23*

[5] *Sayyid Ali Khan Madani: Ad-Darajaat ar-Rafia (Elevated Positions), Pg. 336*

Evidence 2 - Letter Two

This letter in *Al-Gharaat***[1]** reads thus:

“Umar took over the charge of affairs. He administered the things in the best way. He had a blessed soul.”**[2]**

Muhaddith Armavi writes in footnote of the text of this letter from Allamah Muhammad Baqir:

“It seems it was such in the eyes of the people. He has mentioned about Abu Bakr in the same manner. Of course dissimulation too is obvious in the speech. It is also quite likely that deviation should have taken place by opponents.”

Allamah Majlisi too writes that the contents of the letter reflect the view of the people about the Second Caliph. It is not that of Imam Ali (a.s.) himself. If cannot be. There is narration regarding the letter, which we refer to.

Tabari Imami, the elder (4th century) is among those who have mentioned the contents of the second letter. In his book *Al-Mustarshid fil Imamah* the contents pertaining to the Second Caliph are:

“And he (Umar) was among the people of good character and a blessed soul.” [3]

Difference in the text with that of *Al-Gharaat* indicates deviation and shows hand-to-hand circulation of the copy.

C - 2) Results of the investigation of above evidences

As such, the copy of *Al-Gharaat* is short of credibility as that of *Imamate and Siyasat* regarding the *Bay'at* at a free will.

D) A look towards inadvertency of Balazari to the contents of the letter of Ali

Once again, if we divert our attention to the reasons common between narrations of this letter (Point A-2) and place it by the side of Balazari's narration we will find that the narration of Balazari is in line with the contents of Imam Ali's (a.s.) letter telling the same thing.

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Article in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 2, Pg. 38*

[2] *Thaqafi Kufi: Al-Gharaat (with Preface and Notes by Meer Jalaluddin Muhaddith Armawi), Vol. 1, Pg. 307*

[3] *Tabari Imami: Al-Mustarshid, Pg. 415 (Mahmoodi Edition)*

In the contents of the letter inserted in the book *Al-Mustarshid*, difference is recorded. This makes complete the application of the letter with the narration of Balazari. The text in the book *Al-Mustarshid* reads thus:

“And I saw people not moving against them (the enemies of God) because of my isolation and non-participation.” [1]

With reference to the above points following questions arise:

1) Balazari himself is one of the narrators of Arabs turning *Murtads* and the *Bay'at* of Imam Ali (a.s.) with Abu Bakr at his free will. He has refrained from mentioning the contents of the letter. He only mentions the primary ground that cause the writing of the letter. Why? [2]

2) What justification could be there for Balazari for ignoring to mention the text of this letter?

3) The copy of the letter which was in possession of Balazari whether it did not indicate occurrence of such a *Bay'at*? All present copies of the letter mention that a *Bay'at* of Ali with

Abu Bakr did take place at his own choice and willingness. This is quite in line with the religious inclinations of Balazari and his taste of writing history.

Reply

The answer of these questions can be found in the narration of Muhammad bin Jurair bin Rustom Tabari (4th century). In his narration, there is no mention of *Bay'at*. So such a letter does not meet any of the aims of Balazari.

The text of the letter according to *Al-Mustarshid* is as follows:

“I withheld my hand though I saw myself more deserving for the place of Muhammad among the people as one who denies his self.

So I endured what God had desired. Then I saw among the people their return from Islam openly. They invited the people to give up God’s religion and change the Ummah of Muhammad.

So I feared that if I do not support Islam and sit idle I will have to see ruin and destruction therein. Its havoc upon me will be greater than losing Caliphate.

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 412 (Mahmoodi Edition)*

[2] *Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 1, Pgs. 282-283*

And I saw people not inclined to fight the enemy of God because of my isolation and lack of participation.

So I went to Abu Bakr and co-operated with him. Had I not done this, Islam would have been destroyed.”**[1]**

Reminder

The words of Imam Ali (a.s.): **Had I not done this, Islam would have been destroyed** convey the meaning of ceasefire and that is all.

Three Prime Results of Scrutiny of Ali's Letter

Result 1

The false story of Arabs going *Murtad*, which Tabari has created and publicized to make it doubtless, is used as a tool to draw benefit from this letter. With the help of this letter, deviations are made according to their desire. Misunderstandings and advantages are drawn to support the claims of Sunnis.

It is important to note that we should not necessarily go to the Arabs *Murtad* when the subject matter happens to be any *Murtad*. Muhaddith Armavi writes in the footnote of *Al-Gharaat* in explanation of 'Return of the people' on the authority of Allamah Majlisi:

"It is likely that he should have meant the hypocrites who had gathered around Abu Bakr and were always seeking an opportunity to create mischief or an element to provide them with an excuse to become *Murtad*." [2]

This idea is supported by Imam Ali's (a.s.) wordings. He refers to the time after the incident of Saqifah and the early Caliphate. A little attention is enough to reach to the said conclusion. Hypocrites are meant here not *Murtads*. It corresponds to the time when Ali had not isolated himself. He was after an armed uprising to take his usurped right.

It was exactly when Ali sensed the danger of people turning their back upon Islam. He felt the danger of Islam's annihilation. It is the same meaning in which Allamah Majlisi has said that the Imam assumed silence. And the words: "I saw ruin and destruction of Islam more terrible than losing authority over your affairs."

[1] *Tabari Imami: Al-Mustarshid, Pg. 412 (Mahmoodi Edition)*

[2] *Thaqafi Kufi: Al-Gharaat (with Preface and Notes by Meer Jalaluddin Muhaddith Armawi), Vol. 1, Pg. 306*

Therefore:

So the *Bay'at* which is the theme of this letter on the ground of Arabs *Murtad* is fabricated.

Sunni historians have a very strong inclination to pose the *Bay'at* of free choice as linked to the issue of *Murtad* which is false and lacking veracity and this has led to interpolation in the letter to their advantage.

The alterations were as follows:

Supposition A) The words: “So I went to Abu Bakr and did *Bay’at* with him” are added in the original letter to so that it will support the false narrations of Ahle Sunnat in this matter.

Supposition B) The words: “I saw that as I had not given *Bay’at* people refrained from campaign, so I went to Abu Bakr” are added to the original letter so that people may begin to think on the lines of a *Bay’at* done willingly and accept the claims of historians like Balazari.

These additions in the contents can give three dimensions to the sense of “I co-operated with him.” This phrase exists in the narration of Tabari Imami in a sense of ‘ceasefire’. It was later changed to *Bay’at*. There are several possibilities in it.

The ups and downs of the letter do not carry any reference to incidents of Arabs becoming *Murtad* or *Bay’at* at free choice which is the subject of Sunni claim. It seems to be of the early days of usurpation of Caliphate from Ali. In those days, Ali went into isolation. Those days were very hard and difficult for Ali.

Result 2

Supposing this letter was at the time of *Murtad* issue, the phrase: “I did *Bay’at*” is conjecture of the narrator[1] or it was added later.

Result 3

If we suppose the correctness of the whole text of this letter and the correctness of the phrase: “So I gave *Bay’at* to him”, the phrase of “So I feared that if I do not help Islam...” which is common[2] in all narrations, will make it ‘a *Bay’at* for show, which is invalid’; still they claim:

“His Eminence (a.s.) did *Bay’at* at his free will.”[3]

[1] It denotes a phrase of marginal notes inserted into the actual text.

[2] Quoted from: *Al-Mustarshid*, this statement is also worth noting: If I had not done so, Islam would have been destroyed.

[3] Muhammad Barfi: Article quoted in *Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali*, Vol. 2, Pg. 49

On the margin of scrutiny of the letter of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)

If we treat this letter in accordance with the narration of Balazari, the analysis previously done becomes applicable here too. As a result:

The *Bay'at* mentioned in this letter is of show without reality. It is nothing more than a handshake, so it is devoid of any effect or reliability. **[1]**

In fact with reference to this letter the event that ensued should be named as “Show of *Bay'at* which is basically invalid”.

Third standard: Scrutiny of Narrations about the secret meeting of Ali with Abu Bakr

Narration No. 1

“It is mentioned in Tarikh Tabari **[2]** that a man told Zuhri: Is it not that Ali did not do Bay'at with Abu Bakr until six months? Zuhri said: Not only Ali, but no one among Bani Hashim did Bay'at until Ali did. Because when Ali saw that people were not inclined to have him as their Caliph he was compelled to compromise with Abu Bakr. Therefore he sent a messenger to Abu Bakr and invited him to come for talks, but alone. Ali did not like Umar to accompany him. He knew the roughness of Umar and the extent of his impoliteness. Umar told Abu Bakr not to go alone but Abu Bakr replied: No, by God, I'll go alone to him. What do you think they will do? Abu Bakr visited Ali all alone. He saw all the members of Bani Hashim were around Ali. Ali got up; received Abu Bakr. First, he (Ali) thanked and praised god. Then said: O, Abu Bakr! Your virtues we do not deny, nor does it stand on way to do Bay'at with you. I do not envy with what God has directed to your side. But in our view in this affair we too have a share. You have laid hand over it. You have withheld it from us. After this, Ali recalled his relation and close link with the Prophet of God. Then Ali dealt in detail on things that relate him with the Prophet. Abu Bakr was so influenced that he wept. Ali became silent. Then Abu Bakr spoke after thanking and praising God: I swear by God, kinship with the Prophet of God is the dearest thing to me. I do not give

preference to my own relations and kinship to that of Prophet of God. I again swear by God that the properties that are between you and me I have not laid possession thereon but for the sake of good and for benefit of all. I have heard from

[1] *Only in this instance we can say that it was show Bayyat because there is no indication of force in it.*

[2] *Tabari Shafei: Tarikh al-Umam wal Mulook, Vol. 2, Pg. 447* the Prophet of God: We do not leave anything for inheritance. What we leave is charity. The progeny of Muhammad too feeds thereon. I take refuge of God. I do not recall anything that the Prophet had done. I too shall do it. Then Imam Ali (a.s.) said: Our rendezvous is afternoon for Bay'at. Abu Bakr after finishing prayers faced the people and narrated the conversation between him and Ali. Then Ali got up. He spoke to the people about the greatness of Abu Bakr and his right. Then he went towards Abu Bakr and did Bay'at with him.

Then people gathered around Ali and appreciated him for what he had done. This narration is quoted by Tabari on the authority of Ayesha."!**[1]**

Narration No. 2

Ibne Qutaibah Dinawari in his book, *Al-Imamah was-Siyasah* has given another version of the special meeting of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) with Abu Bakr.

"Then Abu Bakr went to the Prophet's mosque and faced the people then he excused Ali for not giving Bay'at to him.

After that Ali got up and praised his station and extolled his greatness and precedence. After this he went to Abu Bakr and did the Bay'at. People approached Ali and said: You did a good thing. After the matter of Abu Bakr's Bay'at ended he used to tell the people for three days: I left you free for my Bay'at. Is anyone you displeased with it?

Ali stood up before the people and said: By God! We have not appointed you as our leader and chief. It is the Prophet of God who has preferred you over all of us so that our religion remains safe. Now who could drag you behind for the sake of our world?"!**[2]**

Each points of this event is astonishing and indicates the falsehood of these two narrations

A) Excuse for compromise with Abu Bakr!

The Arabic word used means 'made himself little' or 'vilified himself'. This means Ali accepted to vilify himself to compromise with Abu Bakr.

In the two books of *Bukhari* and *Muslim* the words are: 'he implored to compromise with Abu Bakr and do *Bay'at*.' In a sense it is near to the above meaning. **[3]**

[1] *Haider Ali Qalamdaran: Shahira-e-Ittihaad, Pgs. 20-21*

[2] *Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 33*

[3] *Bukhari: Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 4, Tradition no. 3913;*

Muslim: Sahih Muslim, Tradition

B) Testimony to the superiority of Abu Bakr!

The sentence: 'It does not restrict us to do *Bay'at* with you, Abu Bakr nor is it a denial of your virtues.' is a vain allegation in open contradiction with Sunni view of 'Elected Caliphate'.

It is surprising why Abu Bakr in chaos of Saqifah while disputing with Ansaar did not refer to his virtues or superior qualities.

C) Caliphate was a bounty that God gave to Abu Bakr!

It cannot be believed that Ali (a.s.) said: 'Caliphate was a bounty God directed towards you (Abu Bakr).' **[1]**

D) Accepting that inheritance of Prophet was Sadaqah!

It is meant by the words: 'I have heard from the Prophet of God: We do not leave anything for inheritance. What we leave is charity.'

E) The Prophet preferred Abu Bakr to others!

As mentioned in the statement: '...Who can detain you for the sake of our world?'

Deviated Consequences of Forged Narrations

1 - Interpreting and replacing the divinely ordained Caliphate of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) with precedence and replacing the Imamate that is divinely ordained into that of Imamate by selection.

2 - Deviation in the meaning of rightfulness of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) and change in the meaning of protests of His Eminence, Ali (a.s.) in this regard.

3 - Separation of position of Imamate from the position of Caliphate and separation of the holders of these offices!

4 - They not only believe but even persist on Caliphate being at the choice of people.

5 - A wrong interpretation of Ali's refraining from *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr and distortion in the analysis of his aims in not doing *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr.

6 - Finally Ali's willingness to do *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr without any compulsion.

no. 3304

[1] *If the Imam (a.s.) really had such beliefs how can we justify his refraining from allegiance of Abu Bakr for six months and what about the anger of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) against the Caliphs?*

7 - Giving legitimacy to Abu Bakr's Caliphate and bringing it out of the circle of usurpation.

8 - Excusing Abu Bakr for his perversion from religious course.

9 - Showing as though Islamic regulations were practiced in Abu Bakr's rule.

10 - Showing as though Abu Bakr had committed himself to follow the conduct of the Prophet.

11 - Showing as though Ali had a belief in fitness of Abu Bakr to the office he had usurped. **[1]**

12 - Showing as though Ali participated in the administration of the government.

13 - Showing as though Ali compensated the shortcomings of Abu Bakr.

14 - Showing as though there lasted good relations based on good terms with Ahle Bayt (a.s.) of the Prophet from the side of Abu Bakr.

15 - Showing as though there lasted goodwill, peace, affection and friendship from the side of Ali towards Abu Bakr.

Thus they say:

“Imam Ali (a.s.) had another point in his view. He feared the things would spoil and a chaos might take place if the administration falls in incompetent hands. So he hesitated to do Bay’at for some period. He was very much concerned that no corruption creeps in religion or belief of people. But later Imam Ali (a.s.) saw Abu Bakr handled the matters prudently. He was particular to keep within bounds of religion and also particular to carry out the penalties, decrees and other religious commitments. This satisfied Ali. At this point, he did not allow himself to prolong his hesitation. So he finally did Bay’at.”!**[2]**

“Ali inspite of his position did Bay’at with Abu Bakr without any coercion. First he pointed out his mistakes then drew Abu Bakr’s attention to failings in administration. He gave legitimacy to Abu Bakr’s Caliphate. When all the loopholes were filled, he saw no reason to not enter into Bay’at with Abu Bakr. Later he co-operated with Abu Bakr in running the government.”!**[3]**

[1] Results no. 8-11 are that they begin to think that Abu Bakr had the capability to obtain Caliphate.

[2] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 169

[3] *Ibid. Shahira-e-Ittihaad*, Pg. 292

This shows how elevated the position of Ali was. In fact, Ali occupied the highest rank. His position was greater than Caliphate. He invited Abu Bakr to his house. Abu Bakr repeatedly acknowledged the superiority of Ali and verbally and practically extolled the greatness of Ali. Ali too frankly said:

“We do not deny your bright past nor do we deny your virtues.”

“We are not rivals to you in your Caliphate. We do not envy you. Bay’at was withheld for this reason that Imam Ali (a.s.) because of his position as Imam and a guardian should have been consulted.

But when Abu Bakr swore that he endears the link with the Prophet more than his own relatives and kinship and commits himself to follow the footsteps of Prophet, Ali said to him: Tomorrow for Bay’at our rendezvous is the mosque.”!**[1]**

“There is no crime greater than that there be accord between the Imam and Caliph but discord among the people.”!**[2]**

What does History say?

We need not go after a proof or testimony. The falsehoods are obvious and evident in both the narrations of Tabari and Ibne Qutaibah. We suffice only with the statement of the Second Caliph to Ali and Abbas, the Prophet's uncle.

It is a confession of Umar in the presence of Uthman, Abdur Rahman bin Auf, Zubair and Saad bin Abi Waqqas.[3] The falsehood of above narrations is proved at once.

Document No. 1

This document is recorded and mentioned in *Sahih Muslim* one of the most reputed and reliable sources among Sunni sect. In this document Umar bin Khattab says:

"The Prophet passed away. Abu Bakr said: I am the (wali) successor[4] of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) in your leadership.

You two (Abbas and Ali) came to demand your inheritance. You (Abbas)

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 5, Pgs. 21-22*

[2] *Ibid. Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (2nd Edition), Pg. 255*

[3] *At the beginning of the narration it is mentioned that these people were present.*

[4] *[It is interesting that Abu Bakr uses the word of Wali for his Caliphate but Sunnis take it in the meaning of friend!]*

demanding inheritance of your nephew and you (Ali) inheritance of your wife from her father.

Then Abu Bakr said: The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said: We are not inherited. What we leave is charity.

But you accused him to be a liar, a sinner, a cheater and a betrayer." [1]

Even if Imam Ali (a.s.) had accepted one of these things for Abu Bakr was it proper for him to praise him before the people?

Document No. 2

Indeed even if claims of Bukhari, Tabari and Ibne Qutaibah regarding the issue of *Bay'at* of free choice and the

conversation of Ali with Abu Bakr and his words – all this were also true, why did Ali in the six-person committee openly reject the condition put forward by Ibne Auf that made it compulsory to follow the conduct of two Caliphs? Ali openly refused to follow the footsteps of Abu Bakr and Umar and put to question the legality of their Caliphate. **[2]**

Similarly, there are other historical documents that Imam Ali (a.s.) did not do *Bay'at* with Abu Bakr after Zahra's martyrdom. Because as it is said:

The term *Bay'at* carries a distinct sense in Islam. It makes some matters necessary for one who enters into *Bay'at*.

On the basis of this foresight of Umar bin Khattab and Amr Aas about the reactions of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) that it would be at least a ceasefire between His Eminence (a.s.) and Abu Bakr and Amirul Momineen (a.s.) will only give up his dispute with Abu Bakr. **[3]**

Document No. 3

Abu Bakr says to Umar in consultation:

"I plan to send Ali to the battle against Kinda and Hadhramaut (in Yemen) as I am aware of his courage, bravery and virtues. He is a man of Justice. So a majority of people would be pleased with him.

[1] *Muslim bin Hajjaj Nishapuri: Sahih Muslim, Tradition no. 3302*

[2] *Refer: Ibne Qutaibah: Al-Imamah was-Siyasah, Vol. 1, Pg. 26; Ibne Abil Hadeed: Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Vol. 1, Pg. 188; Yaqoobi: Tarikh, Vol. 2, Pg. 162; Balazari: Ansaab al-Ashraaf, Vol. 5, Pg. 22*

[3] *Most of Ahle Sunnat sources mention that the role of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) in this matter was giving counsel with regard to the battle of Zilqissa (Ref: Ibne Kathir: Al-Bidaya wan Nihaya, Vol. 6, Pg. 315)*

Umar agreed and confirmed the qualities, which Abu Bakr attributed to Ali but said: I am afraid Ali would not agree **[1]** and if he refused no one would show any inclination to go to war except by force. **[2]**

Therefore I suggest that Ali remains in Medina and the Caliph benefits from his consultation while Akrama bin Abi Jahl can go to fight.

Abu Bakr agreed to Umar's proposal."[3] "Ali did not go to fight their battles since neither he considered their Caliphate illegitimate nor the Kinda people apostates but the Caliph and his advisors feared in this matter and delegated Akrama to the battle."[4]

Document No. 4

Abu Bakr summoned Amr Aas and asked his opinion how to utilize the services of Ali in suppressing Tolaiha.

"Amr said: Ali will not obey your order."[5]

In conclusion, it can be said:

These two documents clearly indicate that *Bay'at* which took place was not at a free choice nor it was done willingly and nor it was in relation to *Murtad* Arabs otherwise Ali (a.s.) would have accepted the command of the Caliph's army and obeyed his orders.

Final conclusion about Bay'at by choice as Sunnis claim

A) From all investigations in this regard it can be concluded that except for the attack on Zahra's house no other efforts were made by the Caliph to take allegiance from Ali (a.s.). Still with every leniency we can say:

Ali performed something similar to *Bay'at*.**[6]** This also he did to save Islam within a limited framework.

[1] *[The aim of the regime in sending Uthman to Amirul Momineen (a.s.) must also be in pursuit of this same point.]*

[2] *[Such refusals clearly show absence of Bayyat]*

[3] *Ali Gholami Dahqi: Janghai Irtdidat wa Bohran Janasheeni-e-Payambar, Pg. 116; quoting from: Waqidi: Kitab ar-Ridda, Pgs. 197-198; Ibne Athim: Al-Futuh, Vol. 1, Pg. 57*

[4] *Ibid. Pg. 117*

[5] *Ibid. Pg. 117; quoting from: Yaqoobi: Tarikh Yaqoobi, Vol. 2, Pg. 129*

[6] *Shaykh Tusi (q.s.) remarks: "Can anyone whose door is burned upon him has any other choice than giving Bayyat?" (Shaykh Tusi: Talkhees Ash-Shafi, Vol. 3, Pg. 76)*

Imam Ali (a.s.) about his attitude says:

"People did Bay'at with Abu Bakr while (by Allah) I was more superior to him and deserving of it.**[1]** So I too obeyed**[2]** fearing the people would return to infidelity. Some would cut throat of some by sword. After Abu Bakr Bay'at was given to Umar [and he was made Caliph] while (by God) I was more deserving**[3]** than he to it. But I feared people might become infidels."**([4])([5])**

B) All narrations, which take root from various and several sources, are dubious and not certain. They are rife with signs of falsehood and deviation. In such a way that it can be said:

The aim of spreading these narrations is to veil the shameful deeds and attack on Zahra's house to take *Bay'at* from His Eminence (a.s.) in the initial period of the usurped Caliphate of Abu Bakr.

C) If we pay attention to the conditions under which *Bay'at* of Ali was, it would be clear that it was invalid from religious viewpoint.

D) Analysis of events after passing away of Prophet rescinds the use of the word *Bay'at* even if it were concomitant with its conditions. The sense by terms of such 'silence' or 'not campaigning by sword' do not convey the meaning of *Bay'at*. Therefore it would be better to use them instead of *Bay'at*.

E) In the analysis of events after the martyrdom of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.) - supposedly accepting the historical documents - it could only be called a *Bay'at* of show and hence invalid from the legal point of view.

[1] *[The right of Caliphate was restricted to me.]*

[2] *[It implies second obedience.]*

Second obedience is obeying kings and rulers whose obedience is not divinely ordained and they have occupied the seat of power by force. The Almighty Allah has allowed their obedience for Amirul Momineen (a.s.) because it was necessary for security of religion and preventing people from turning back from Islam. (Ref: Muhammad Biyabani Iskoi, Marefat-e-Imam, Pgs. 22-23)]

[3] *[The right of Caliphate was restricted to me.]*

[4] *Khwarizmi: Manaqib, Section 19, Pg. 313;*

Juwaini: Faraidus Simatain, Vol. 1, Pg. 320, No. 251; Ibne

Asakir: Tarikh Madina Damishq, Vol. 42, Pg. 434;

Dhahabi: Mizan al-Etedaal, Vol. 1, Pg. 442; Asqalani: Lisanul

Mizan, Vol. 2, Pg. 156; Muttaqi Hindi: Kanzul Ummal, Vol. 5,

Pg. 724

[5] *Amirul Momineen (a.s.) was forced to give up armed resistance as he feared the apostasy of Ummah and destruction of Islam.*

Part 6
Influence of Deviation on Shia
Belief of Imamate

Imamate and Caliphate from Sunni Viewpoint

Ahle Sunnat believe that:

Imamate and Caliphate means rulership.

Ibne Khaldun writes about the Sunni view of Imamate and Caliphate:

First Description

“Imamate concerns common and general interests, which in their true sense relate to Ummah. And the Ummah can choose or appoint any person as Imam. And that person becomes responsible to administer the general affairs and common interests of the Ummah concerned.”!**[1]**

Second Description

“Caliphate is seating a person in place of the Prophet to protect religion and worldly affairs.”!**[2]**

According to the first description, general and common interests of Ummah constitute the real meaning of Imamate and Caliphate. The second description embraces these two elements by way of meaning:

A) Administration of religious affairs (guarding faith)

B) Administration of worldly affairs (policies of world)

On the basis of descriptions that Sunni sect presents, it emerges to be administration of apparent rules of Islam in a society. Isfahani Ashari in his *Sharh Tajreed* describes Imamate as follows:

“Succession of the Prophet by a person from the Ummah to establish the rules of religion.”!

As a result: The meaning of Imamate and Caliphate among Sunni sect is only supervising the political and social affairs of Ummah.

[1] *Ibne Khaldun: Muqaddimah, Pg. 196*

[2] *Ibid. Muqaddimah, Pg. 191*

Other testimonies that testify the above are:

Evidence 1) The Sunni sect argues the need of Ummah to have a Caliph and Imam**[1]** as says Taftazani:

“Ummah must have an Imam to keep faith alive and to keep the tradition (of the Prophet) in practice. An Imam must attend to the oppressed and restore the rights of people.”!**[2]**

“The Prophet has commanded to carry out the decrees of God, to protect the frontiers, prepare the armies for holy war and several other things for guarding the system and supporting Islam (particularly the essence). All this cannot be achieved except by an Imam.”!**[3]**

Evidence 2) The Sunni sect has a list of duties and responsibilities incumbent on Imam and Caliph alike. They are as follows according to Baqilani:

“He (an Imam) must be in knowledge so as to qualify him to be a judge of Muslims. He must be with a sight that could enable him to see into affairs of war and manage armies and concomitant things and could be able to protect frontiers and save Islam; save the Ummah. He must be daring enough to take revenge from tyrants and preserve the rights of oppressed.”!**[4]**

According to this description Imamate and Caliphate in Sunni concept tantamount to rulership. Ibne Taimmiyah comments:

“Imamate and Caliphate is same as rulership or sultanate.”!**[5][6]**

Sunnis believe that:

Imamate and Caliphate is through selection!

The Prophet has not appointed anyone as a Caliph or Imam, but left it to the choice of people. Therefore anyone can be Imam or Caliph of Islam if he is chosen by people.**[7]**

[1] *According to Sunnis the need of Imam is due to the need of having a government in order to remove chaos from the society.*

[2] *Taftazani: Sharh Maqasid, Part 5, Pg. 233*

[3] *Ibid. Sharh Maqasid, Part 5, Pg. 236*

[4] *Baqilani: At-Tamheed, Pg. 181*

[5] *Ibne Taimmiyah: Minhaj as-Sunnah, Vol. 1, Pg. 141*

[6] *Thus in the view of Sunnis Imam and Caliph means a ruler.*

[7] *From this aspect in the system of thoughts of Ahle Sunnat the legitimacy of Caliphate is based on selection of the Ummah*

and the one who is selected by the Ummah also becomes the divinely selected one.

It shows that in Sunni thought Imamate and Caliphate depends on choice of people and not divine appointment.

So Ibne Khaldun in his description of Imamate and Caliphate says:

“Imamate (= rulership) is among the general and common matters that is delegated to the Ummah, so anyone that the Ummah chooses will be Caliph and Imam.”**[1]**

In the same way Shahristani mentions the outlook of Abul Hasan Ashari about this Sunni belief:

“It is permissible that there should be Nass (Ayat or hadith) for a person that he is Imam, but if there is no Nass about that person**[2]** the Ummah is free to have its own choice.”**[3]**

Therefore the office of Imamate and Caliphate is a matter of choice not to be appointed by God. It is left to the Ummah.

Conclusion

As you must have noted the meaning of Sunni concept of Imamate and Caliphate stands at the level of administration of social justice by means of judiciary and general security by means of executing Islamic punishment and guarding the country by means of providing an army. Furthermore, it is also expected to give expansion to Islam by means of conquering (foreign) territories or countries. All the above items are more or less of common interests of a Ummah in its worldly and religious affairs. In one word - all this is called a government.

On the other hand this government is a chosen one not an appointed body or institution. In Sunni belief,[4] God has not fixed a particular person to head this institution.[5]

Therefore according to Sunni outlook Imamate and Caliphate is a social position[6] and a popular rank.[7] Under the shadow of this selected or chosen

[1] *Ibne Khaldun: Muqaddimah, Pg. 196*

[2] *[This claim of Sunnis is opposed to the Shia belief in divine Imamate.]*

[3] *Shahristani: Al-Milal wan Nihal, Vol. 1, Pg. 144*

[4] *The real founders of the view of 'Elected Caliphate' are Ahle Sunnat.*

[5] *The meaning of selection of Ummah is insistence on this claim only.*

[6] *That is the post of Imamate is limited to rulership and administration of society.*

[7] *That is the Almighty Allah does not specify the holders of these posts.*

government, the common interests of Ummah are looked after and provided. The needs of people are attended to. To gain power and authority is enough to form Caliphate.[1]

Sunni Believe:

Obtaining Power and Dominance is Sufficient for Formation of Caliphate!

In the trend of Sunni thought, the prime aim by framing Imamate and Caliphate is to lay hand upon common and general interests of the Ummah.

In between this the choice of Ummah is a necessity to achieve the aim referred above. When Caliphate is the choice of people, it rescinds the necessity for a Quranic text. **[2]**

The contagion of this thought has stricken even some among Shia youths. Well, if it is the choice of people **[3]** why the Ummah by all its individuals did not participate in selecting a Caliph?

If Caliphate comes into being by means of choice why the choice of each individual was not sought. In fact, committee of consultation and *Bay'at* is a means to give shape to Caliphate.

Their stressing on choice of people is only to form a government to serve popular needs. It is only to reach power and gain rule over society. It is the only ground for Sunni Sect by chosen Caliphate to achieve the aim, which is control over society and domination over it. And to give it legitimacy **[4]** they consider it sufficient **[5]** as Ibne Taimmiyah has explained:

“The purpose from Imamate is to obtain power and authority.”! **[6][7]**

[1] According to Ahle Sunnat during the period of the Caliphs the explanation of Islamic law was on the Caliphs to some extent but it was not restricted to them only.

[2] It can be said that Sunni sect insists upon Ummah's choice even to the extent of denying existence of Divine text (Nass) in this respect. Since Divine verse exists in case of Ali and which was read by the Prophet on the occasion of Ghadeer they are obliged to deny it or to take refuge in a misrepresentation of it.

[3] Selected Caliphate means that which the Ummah is obliged to establish.

[4] From the point of view of Ahle Sunnat the right of rulership is for one who is capable of domination.

[5] According to Ahle Sunnat the pivot of Imamate is power.

[6] Ibne Taimmiyah: *Minhaj as-Sunnah*, Vol. 1, Pg. 141

[7] Ahle Sunnat believe that the legitimacy of occurrence of Caliphate is obtained by

By Imamate and Caliphate, it is not necessary to go beyond the conditions of gaining control of society. The nature of Caliphate is included in a government.

Ibne Taimmiyah further comments:

“Leaders of Sunni Sect have said:

Whoever gains power and control[1] can gain the Guardianship to which obedience becomes compulsory according to God’s command.”!(2)(3)

From Sunni outlook one who possesses power and authority has a right to rule and run a government. Power is the base in Sunni thought for ground of Imamate and Caliphate. The belief of Sunni Sect is to attain power first to establish Caliphate. A Caliph must be obeyed from a Sunni view because he holds a government. In Sunni thought the whole process is made simple and easy. If one attains power and control over society by any means or method, the aim of Caliphate is achieved, which is security of popular interests.

Then at this stage responsibility of choosing a Caliphate is relieved from individuals of society. Once a Caliph is made known, others have no responsibility in this regard.

Qadi Abdul Jabbar says:

“When those who tie and untie[4] appoint one as Imam, the incumbency of choosing an Imam gets relieved from the people. The sufficiency[5] is achieved.”![6]

having power and domination.

[1] *[From the point of view of Ahle Sunnat the basic condition of Caliphate is that a person should obtain domination over the people so that there is no chaos and general benefits of the Ummah are secured.]*

[2] *Ibne Taimmiyah: Minhaj as-Sunnah, Vol. 1, Pg. 141*

[3] *[From the point of view of Ahle Sunnat obeying the Caliph only becomes incumbent when he has established his domination.]*

[4] *Regarding ‘Those who tie and untie’ we should explain that there is no specific or precise description about this term. To explain this we can say it pertains to persons who are brokers of power. They perform the task of creating caliphs, (king-makers). They have influence in society and steer the course of thought in it. They have agents and sub-agents. They know how to elevate the desired one into public opinion and how to bring down one in public estimation. So they are called ‘who tie and untie’ which means they tie one from that job.*

[5] *[According to Qadi Abdul Jabbar if a Caliph is chosen*

others are absolved from the responsibility of society.]

[6] *Qadi Abdul Jabbar: Al-Mughni fil Abwaab at-Tauheed wal-Adl, Pg. 303*

Sunnis believe that:

Caliphate is achieved through whatever means[1] and methods it might have been

Installment of Imamate and Caliphate and achievement of its aim is based on principle of obtaining power and control over affairs of society. The means and methods here do not matter. That which matters is that one individual in the Ummah must attain power over society. If it is attained, it means a Caliphate is established; and through Caliphate a government is established.[2] Such is in line with the Caliphs that existed in Sunni school.

It does not mean that all people must participate in choosing a Caliph.

If one person or few persons performed the appointment of Caliph it is enough. It relieves responsibility from others. To establish a chosen government does not call for whole population to participate. As goes Caliphate so goes the government.

Juwaini has this to comment:

“Do know that consensus is not a condition in establishing Imamate and Caliphate. Imamate will be established if there had not had been any consensus at all. So it became clear that consensus is not a condition to bring Caliphate into existence. Consensus has no bearing on Caliphate. Consensus has nothing to do with Caliphate. There is neither limit nor specified number.[3] Imamate comes into being only by those who tie and untie.”![4]

Qadi Abdul Jabbar comments:

“If some among those who tie and untie choose one to be Imam, he becomes Imam. If no one among Muslims does Bay’at with him, it does not affect him. He is the acknowledged Imam because the people who tie and untie have chosen him to be Imam.”![5]

[1] *In Sunni Sect Caliphate has no fixed ground, a standard, or a principle. The Caliphate and Imamate is based on verbal terms only.*

[2] *That is a government that the Ummah is obliged to form.*

[3] *[There is no fixed standard for appointing a person as Imam.]*

[4] *Juwaini: Al-Irshad Ila Qawaata al-Adalla fee Usool al-Itiqaad, Pg. 424*

[5] *Qadi Abdul Jabbar: Al-Mughni fil Abwaab at-Tauheed wal-Adl, Pg. 303*

So this shows that in Sunni Sect even force and tyranny can be used as means to obtain Caliphate.

Taftazani has this to say:

“Imamate can be achieved by several means. The third way is force and domination. So when an Imam dies, another man having conditions of Imamate can become Imam without people doing Bay’at with him nor it is necessary that he should have been nominated by his predecessor. He can become Imam by means of force or taking the initiative to occupy the seat. by this way he can even become a successor to Prophet.”!**[1]**

Abu Yali comments:

“One who gains upper hand over people by means of sword becomes a Caliph and is called Ameer al-Momineen. Then it is not allowed to anyone who believes in God and Day of Judgment to pass the night without acknowledging him as an Imam.”!**[2]**

Sunnis believe that:

Imam and Caliph can be a Tyrant, a Sinner or Profligate!

The preceding pages clearly show that the only condition required in a person to qualify him as a caliph is competency to administer affairs of the country. Competency is not a thing that could not be applied on several persons at a time.

Therefore according to above it does not become necessary that a Caliph must excel others in all qualities such as religious knowledge, common information, moral, conduct, human virtues and superiority of behavior.

It is not demanded for him to be the Caliph that he must be superior to all. He is an administrator, a manager or a director and that’s all.

Without superiority in him, he can secure the common interests, which are required of him.

Qalqashandi says:

“Even if a man who gains power and domination on others is a sinner or ignorant; his Imamate is achieved and established.”! **[3]****[4]**

[1] Taftazani: *Sharh Maqasid, Part 5, Pg. 233*

[2] Abu Yaala: *Al-Ahkaam as-Sultaaniyah, Pg. 23*

[3] Qalqashandi: *Maatharul Anaaqa fee Maalimul Khilafah, Vol. 1, Pg. 58*

[4] [From the point of view of Ahle Sunnat Imam is that who has obtained power and domination in the society even if that person be unjust and ignorant.]

Taftazani says:

“It is not necessary that an Imam must be a Hashimite or an infallible and superior to all. An Imam when installed or chosen cannot be dismissed or removed because of his sinfulness!”

Taftazani proceeds further and adds:

“Caliphate is vested and assigned to him although he be ignorant or sinner.” **[1]**

Nawawi says:

“The Sunni Sect has unanimously agreed that a Caliph cannot be deposed from office due to his sins and profligacy.” **[2]**

Baqilani says:

“An Imam cannot be dismissed because of his sins and oppression on people. **[3]** And uprising and rebellion against him is not allowed. **[4]**” **[5]**

Sunnis believe that:

Imamate and Caliphate is a branch of Religion!

In the system of Sunni thought the formation of government is the duty of Ummah. So all discussions concerning Imamate and Caliphate in a way relate to actions of adults and rules and regulations of their obligations.

In other words according to outlook of Sunni Sect the subject of Imamate is among branches of jurisprudence. It supervises the actions of adults on whom apply religious duties. Imamate and Caliphate has no bearing on belief of religion of Islam.

[1] Taftazani: *Sharh Maqasid, Part 5, Pg. 233*

[2] Nawawi: *Sharh Sahih Muslim, Vol. 12, Pg. 229*

[3] [Ahle Sunnat believe that for security of a Caliph’s regime any law can be cancelled.]

[4] *[From the point of view of Ahle Sunnat the real pivot of Caliphate is power; that anyone who gets political power is the Caliph and his Caliphate must be justified and his power must be defended.]*

[5] *Baqilani: At-Tamheed, Pg. 181*

Eji says:

“Imamate and Caliphate is not a pillar of faith as Shias believe.**[1]** It is not a principle of religion.**[2]**

This subject has nothing to do with religion. It is - in our view - a branch that concerns actions of adults. To install an Imam is incumbent on Ummah.”**[3]**

Taftazani says:

“The regulations of Imamate are in branches of religion. Imamate is not a principle. There is no dispute about the suitability of this subject to constitute the branch of religion.

On the whole this branch relates to the worldly interests and interests of religion. The society cannot be administered without this branch.

The aim of the Prophet was that these affairs be attained by general people and not by each individual.

It is obvious that Imamate is a practical side of commands. It is not matter of belief. It is in our books of jurisprudence.”**[4]**

Sunnis believe that:

Imamate and Caliphate are branches of no importance!

The Sunni Sect does not regard the subject of Imamate and Caliphate among basic pillars of faith nor among principles of belief. They even do not provide a room to this subject among issues of jurisprudence. In short, they regard this subject as superfluous or of no importance.

Abu Hamid Ghazzali says:

“Do know that it is not so important to research about Imamate or conduct a study into it. It is also not among intellectual sciences; it is among issues of jurisprudence.”**[5]**

[1] *[Ahle Sunnat scholastic theologians have included this discussion in Ilme Kalaam only to refute the Shias.]*

[2] *Eji: Al-Mawaafiq, Part 8, Pg. 344*

[3] *Eji: Al-Mawaafiq, Part 8, Pg. 344*

[4] *Taftazani: Sharh Maqasid, Part 5, Pgs. 232-233*

[5] *Ghazzali: Al-Iqtisaad fil Itiqaad, Pg. 234*

Saifuddin Amadi says:

“Know that it is not a religious principle to discuss about Imamate. It is excusable if there be no way to refrain from discussion or no way to get rid of ignorance about it. **[1]**”**[2]**

[1] *[He on the basis of this view says:*

“There is more hope in salvation of one who ignores the discussion of Imamate than one who participates in it.”

(Amidi: Ghayatul Maraam, Pg. 363)]

[2] *In the environment of Sunni thought there is no sense to know the Imam. The tradition is distorted in Sunni books. “One who does not know his Imam dies a pagan’s death. This tradition is distorted like this: one who does not do Bayyat... or/and one who does not obey...the inserted words change the sense quite differently. The aim of the tradition too gets changed.*

Part 7
Sunni-inclined interpretations of
Imamate and Wilayat

According to the belief of seekers of revision in Shia Faith:

Imamate and Wilayat is in the meaning of rulership!

Those who are after revision in Shia beliefs[1] are easily entrapped in deviated beliefs. It could be due to their inclination to discussions related to Islamic government. They are prey of this perverted belief of chosen Caliphate.

The first particularity of the system of 'chosen Caliphate' has enchanted[2] these open-minded ones or seekers of revision in belief. They have fallen prey to consider the subject of Imamate and Wilayat unimportant in relation to rulership.

According to this all traditions, Quranic verses and signs related to the subject of Imamate and Wilayat have become an object of moral deviation and perversion, which is, of course detrimental and very much harmful. It has a direct bearing on government.

Thus it is claimed:

"In the pristine faith of Islam the subject of Imamate concerns only government affairs and administration of political and social affairs and issues of Ummah."![3]

"Imamate means leadership and to run the political affairs of Islamic Ummah."![4]

"The executive of Islamic orders applies to Waliul Amr (possessor of affairs)."![5]

[1] Refer: Rasool Ja'faryan: *Jaryaanha wa Saazmaanhai Mazhabi - Siyasi Iran*, Pgs. 350-377

[2] This enchantment has put a big question mark over their originality and sincerity.

[3] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 52

[4] Ibid. *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 51

[5] Sayyid Asadullah Meer Islami Kharqani: *Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Quدرات-e-Islami (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam)* (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 101

"If an Islamic ruler carries out an Islamic order or commandment he is called Waliul Amr."![1]

"In Quran Waliul Amr is mentioned which gains meaning in the domain of government!"

“In Islamic literature, the word Imam is mentioned repeatedly. It is used in a sense of chief of government. His duties have been discussed repeatedly.”!**[2]**

“The dispute between Shia and Sunni since centuries is on the issue of government.”!**[3]**

According to the belief of seekers of revision in Shia Faith:

Wilayat and Imamate is rulership and an elected post

These advocates of revision in beliefs of Shia are strongly inclined that Ummah must be present in field of Islamic government, which is the second deviation of this group.

Thus it is claimed:

“Wilayat and rulership that is surrendered by people to an administrator if it carries Islamic conditions, it will be a divine government and it will be called an Islamic government as well as a popular one....”!**[4]**

Their superficial understanding about elected Caliphate and elected nature of government is the real cause of their deviation.

As said in preceding pages the theory of selection goes beyond the issue of Imamate and Caliphate and becomes a common field without any divine sanction.**[5]**

[1] *Ibid. Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Qudrat-e-Islami (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam) (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 101*

[2] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Hukumat-e-Deeni O Hukumat-e-Mardumi (Government of religion and Government of people), Pg. 1-2*

[3] *Ibid. Hukumat-e-Deeni O Hukumat-e-Mardumi (Government of religion and Government of people), Pg. 2*

[4] *Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: Hukumat-e-Salihaan (Government of the Righteous), Pg. 75*

[5] *Refer to introduction of Ibne Khaldun and Abul Hasan Ashari.*

Choice is a deceptive word used only to avoid or overshadow its being a divine office. This term is utilized in the issue of Caliphate and Imamate to attract the attention of revision-seekers or the so-called modern open minded youths. Then it can be easily claimed:

“The choice of government after the Prophet does not lie in the hands of Prophet. But it lies in hands of people to choose whomever they like.”[1]

“To choose or to select an Imam is only the right of Ummah.”[2]

“Chief Executive of Muslims is a chosen one.”[3]

“To choose a Waliul Amr is a determined certainty of all Muslims which is unchangeable.”[4]

“The responsibility of installing the government of Quran is an obligation on all Muslims. The ruler of Muslims is chosen from among the masses themselves.”[5]

“The issue of Caliphate, Imamate and appointment of a chief is in the hands of people.”[6]

“It is the people who give Wilayat to whoever they desire in an open environment of freedom. It is the people who give entity and reality to his rule. These are powers of the masses which furnish reality to Wilayat and authority of Imam.”[7]

“A man chosen by people has the right to govern the people.”[8]

[1] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 129

[2] *Ibid.* *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 128

[3] Sayyid Asadullah Meer Islami Kharqani: *Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Quدرات-e-Islami (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam)* (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 38

[4] *Ibid.* *Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Quدرات-e-Islami (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam)* (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 290

[5] Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Article quoted in the book *Deen-O-Hukumat (Religion and Rulership)*, Pg. 574

[6] Husain Ali Montazeri: *Mubaani-e-Fiqhi Hukumat-e-Islami (Translated by Mahmood Salawati) (Sources of Islamic jurisprudence in Islamic Government)*, Vol. 2, Section 4. Proof of the wrong of the caliphate elected by people, Pg. 299

[7] Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: *Hukumat-e-Salihaan (Government of the Righteous)*, Pgs. 68-69

[8] *Ibid.* *Hukumat-e-Salihaan (Government of the Righteous)*, Pg. 200

“Islam has vested rulership and authority to the masses themselves.”[1]

According to the belief of seekers of revision in Shia Faith:

Only ways of installing Imamate and Wilayat (Rulership) are consultation and Bay'at

The view that consultation and *Bay'at* are correct ways has exercised great influence on minds of seekers of revision in Shia beliefs. To think so is a particularity of the system of the thought of 'chosen Caliphate'.

In the preceding discussion, it was indicated that in the system of conjecture of 'chosen Caliphate' in reality consultation and *Bay'at* have a very narrow and tight domain. But the simple-minded people do not detect this and are easily dominated by false allegations and window-dressing, because there are several other ways to install a Caliphate.

In other words, those who have laid the foundation of 'chosen Caliphate' do not treat *Bay'at* and consultation as the only way to establish Caliphate. Furthermore, they do not consider it necessary for each and every individual of Ummah to have a say in choosing the Caliph. The founders of chosen Caliphate have made the job for themselves easy. Since the beginning they were particular to clear the way and avoid setbacks and hindrances.

The close inclination to *Bay'at* and consultation has caused this group of revision-seekers to persist on this principle as the only way to establish Imamate and *Wilayat*. They want to purge the beliefs of founders of theory of chosen Caliphate, although it is an attraction to them. Yet they criticize the system of Sunni thought[2] that why they go after other ways and means and leave aside the way of consultation.

They have the following claim:

“The Sunni Sect has gone against Divine commands and traditions of the Prophet with regard to Caliphate and Caliph. They do not follow the conditions which exist in own books including the reputed Sahih Bukhari and Sahih of Muslim. The qualities of Caliph are stated therein. But in practice they did not exercise these conditions.”[3]

[1] Abdul Ali Bazargan: *Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance)*, Pg. 69

[2] *The system of thoughts of Ahle Sunnat is the real founder of the view of 'Elected Caliphate'.*

[3] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 135

“If they refer to their own books and traditions, they could see what is required in the personality of the Caliph. But the thing is they have overlooked these facts.”**[1]**

“Almost all Islamic sects have gone astray with regard to issue of Caliphate. The Quranic verse of Ulil Amr was forgotten from the first day. It was rightful to have these two verses of Ulil Amr as touchstones after the Prophet’s passing away. Each one of companions was an object of this verse and was suitable to be a Caliph. Such a practice would have lasted until the Days of Judgment. Caliphate would have been a Quranic one.”**[2]**

Rulership of Muslims is selection according to the command of Quran! One whose qualities are specified by Quran...Muslims must choose as their Executive since it is enjoined by Quran.

So since the era of Muawiyah upto now all leaders of Islam were chosen against Quranic standards.”**[3]**

It is misunderstanding the meaning of chosen Caliphate that impelled revision-seekers to purge the beliefs of Sunni outlook on this issue. And they limited their criticism to Sunnis only to this subject.

While what they criticize is coherent with the thought of chosen Caliphate. Contrary to their imagination, the Sunni Sect is not lacking anything in the issue of Imamate and Caliphate. They do their job without *Bay’at* and consultation.

On the whole, it can be said:

Wrong conclusions about conjecture of chosen Caliphate have resulted in a belief that there is no way other than *Bay’at* and consultation to appoint a Caliph. Therefore they say:

“The real issue of Caliphate according to traditions and Quran is based on consultation and choice.”**[4]**

[1] *Ibid. Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 136

[2] *Sayyid Asadullah Meer Islami Kharqani: Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Qudrat-e-Islami (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam) (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 42*

[3] *Ibid. Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Qudrat-e-Islami (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam) (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 101*

[4] *Haider Ali Qalamdaran: Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 121*

“The matter of rulership in Islam is through consultation and selection.” **[1]**

While the system of Imamate and Caliphate (rulership) is so designed that no criticism applies thereon because the thought in Sunni conjecture is based on choice.

The revision-seekers regard *Bay’at* and consultation as the only way to fix Imamate and *Wilayat*. They emphasize on it too much.

This group in the end justifies all other ways of forming Caliphate (rulership) and they further say:

“Domination over masses by means of force or succession or *Bay’at* by only a few people is not ground of governorship. If it does not secure the satisfaction of all, it would be short of validity. If it is supported by agreement of all it is a valid choice.” **[2]**

According to the belief of seekers of revision in Shia Faith:

Consultation and *Bay’at* is source of legitimacy of Imamate and *Wilayat*

Misunderstanding of this group regarding view of chosen Caliphate is the cause for considering *Bay’at* and consultation to be the only ways to form Caliphate and Islamic government. But they have gone even farther. They think that *Bay’at* and consultation is the means to give legitimacy to the chosen Caliphate.

Thus it is said:

“Discussion is how to establish the system of *Wilayat* and Imamate. It would not attain popularity through means of *Bay’at* and consultation.” **[3]**

“A head of government must be chosen through consultation and public opinion. The Holy Quran refers to this as a

legitimate way. It further lays stress on the necessity of its practice in absence of the Prophet.” [4]

[1] *Ibid. Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 111*

[2] *Husain Ali Montazeri: Mubaani-e-Fiqhi Hukumat-e-Islami (Translated by Mahmood Salawati) (Sources of Islamic jurisprudence in Islamic Government), Vol. 2, Pgs. 190-191*

[3] *Abdul Ali Bazargan: Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance), Pg. 18*

[4] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Hukumat-e-Deeni O Hukumat-e-Mardumi (Government of religion and Government of people), Pg. 5*

“The principle of consultation in Islam is an absolute principle. If the government happens to lack this principle, it will not be legitimate.” [1]

“If people choose a man of their choice by consultation with Imam or a guardian to administer affairs of Islamic government it will please God.” [2]

“Bay’at is a right of leader on the masses. This gives legitimacy to government. A governor or a ruler has no command on the people and people too have no obligation to obey him.” [3]

“As long as people have not done Bay’at with him they are not obliged to obey him. But as soon as they do Bay’at with him his rule becomes legitimate and obedience becomes a religious duty on them.” [4]

“Rightfulness of Islamic government comes to light when the people have entered into Bay’at with it.” [5]

All this is borrowed from belief of Sunni Sect about the issue of Imamate of selection. As a matter of fact, the chosen Caliphate on the basis of *Bay’at* and consultation has quite a different dimension with Sunnis. But revision-seekers are unaware of it.

To explain further:

Founders of ‘chosen Caliphate’ believe in its substitute or transferring it to another. This is against Quranic verse and Divine appointment as is the belief of Shia Imamiyah Sect. Sunni belief is briefed in this:

God has allotted a right to people to choose an Imam for themselves to administer their affairs and govern the society.

To prove their belief that God has sanctioned them to choose an Imam they follow several ways. One of the important ways is *Bay'at* and consultation. According to them it has an important place in Islam.

In other words, founders of chosen Caliphate believe its legitimacy lies in substitution of authority. Therefore they lay much stress on consultation and *Bay'at* because they think it a correct one.

[1] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Guzarish Daily*, Issue no. 99, Pg. 15

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

[3] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Nahjul Balagha Magazine*, Issue No. 4-5 Pg. 172

[4] *Ibid.* *Nahjul Balagha Magazine*, Issue No. 4-5 Pg. 171

[5] Abdul Ali Bazargan: *Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance)*, Pg. 98

Therefore these two elements, consultation and *Bay'at* are to them one of several ways to appoint Caliphate. They bring it forward as the origin of legitimacy. This is the only proof with them towards correctness of theory of transferring the authority.

In other words they regard consultation and *Bay'at* as the only important sign, which gives them the right of choosing a Caliph for the Ummah. They think this is the route through which they can obtain legitimacy for Caliphate. Caliphate to them is not a divine appointment. After all this dispute and argument, they do not bind themselves to any particular method because they think they have established legitimacy to it. They argue:

“The nature and characteristic of system of chosen Imamate and Caliphate lose importance of its means when the government is established.

Revision-seekers think consultation and *Bay'at* to be the only means to frame Imamate and *Wilayat*.

The above perverted outlook is a reason why revision-seekers exert their efforts to find ways and means to carry out *Bay'at* and consultation towards establishment of government. To set aside the difficulties and setbacks that hinder

execution of this design they should borrow the services of those who tie and untie as is the system in Sunni Sect.

It is neither practicable nor possible for each individual of the Ummah to participate in choosing an Imam. The revision-seekers cannot conceal every age and every occasion in history.

The situation of some endeavors is as follows:

The first stage

“It is natural that all individuals can participate directly in the first stage and choose a ruler for their society, which is most necessary and important. Or to seek their opinion individually too is not possible.

What is possible and practicable is that a few among the Ummah choose a person. Masses too agree with the choice. Then the masses do Bay’at with him. So a government is formed.”**[1]**

“Between consultation and Bay’at, there is a difference in meaning. Imam and administrator of Islamic society must be a reputed person in addition to his being popular and most popular among majority of

[1] *Abdul Ali Bazargan: Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance), Pg. 135*

people. Bay’at does not mean that all people know the candidate. Consultation has a direct bearing on those who distinguish the people.”**[1]**

“In the system of consultation the experts, the scholars and persons in charge, who themselves are representatives and confederates of people; choose a man having ability and competency for the job. They select him for Guardianship (Wilayat Amr) of society. Then the masses (in case of acceptance) do Bay’at with him. This is the same system of majority. This system through two stages provides popularity and legitimacy to the Islamic government.”**[2]**

The second stage

“Some have stressed that those who tie and untie should fix a head of the government of Muslims. This right does not apply to all Muslims. Here this much could be debated. First, if the body of those who tie and untie is chosen by Muslims masses

then all people share in political matters. The only difference is that the ruler is appointed in two stages instead of one.

Secondly, the appointment of the ruler by those who tie and untie is an ephemeral job not a permanent one. As there is no way for presence of masses to choose a ruler the persons who tie and untie should give importance to this job. This is applied only when it is not possible to collect popular opinion.”!**[3]**

Perverted Repercussions of this Conjecture on the subject of Alawi Government

First wrong result

The sense of *Bay'at* is changed into a vote of confidence and legitimacy to one with whom *Bay'at* is done.

Thus it is said:

“Bay'at is in the sense of opinion of trust, selection and formalization of someone as a leader to whom Bay'at has been given.” [4]

[1] *Ibid. Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance), Pg. 141*

[2] *Ibid. Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance), Pg. 19*

[3] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Hukumat-e-Deeni O Hukumat-e-Mardumi (Government of religion and Government of people), Pgs. 6-7*

[4] *Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: Hukumat-e-Salihaan (Government of the Righteous), Pg. 67*

It can be said:

Such a sense originated from a wrong outlook that *Bay'at* is the source of legitimacy and legality of Imamate and *Wilayat*.

As a result:

The text of Quran and *Bay'at* become parallel to each other. They become two pillars of equal worth and importance. Both have a part in exercising the right of Imam Ali (a.s.).

So they say:

“One chosen by people has a right to govern them.” [1]

Second wrong result

When *Bay'at* is changed to a vote of confidence and a choosing right, and becomes equal to Verse of Quran in forming a right to frame the Alawi government, the sense of the verse of Ghadeer too is changed from Divine support to that of priority of Ali towards forming a government.

As a result:

In addition to this Imamate is set outside the boundary of Divine appointment. It becomes a sort of a chosen post. Imam Ali (a.s.) too becomes the most befitting person whom God chooses to this job. They also say:

“Although after passing away of Prophet, Muslims had the right to frame a consulting committee to appoint a Caliph but it was better to act on the will of the Prophet also about the consulting committee. Was Shura formed according to God’s command more befitting and suitable than the Prophet? The will is a finishing touch to the consulting body and the completing element to it.”[2]

“When the Prophet has cleared a matter or recommended a thing the job of consulting body becomes simple and easy. The Prophet had wanted to lay the religion on a foundation that it could exist and last to the last day of the world. So the Prophet introduced to Muslims a man most perfect, most brave, most knowledgeable and consummate one in every tribute and in each aspect. He was Ali. The Prophet presented him to the Ummah as a model to be his successor. The Prophet even reminded to Ummah a few of Ali’s virtues and qualities.

[1] Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: *Hukumat-e-Salihaan* (Government of the Righteous), Pg. 200

[2] Abdul Ali Bazargan: *Shura-O-Bayat* (Consultation and Allegiance), Pgs. 82-83

Finally, at Ghadeer he finished the job. He raised Ali on his hands and declared him as the Imam and Caliph and his successor after him.”[1]

Third wrong result

When *Bay’at* changes to the meaning of a vote of confidence and goes parallel to the Holy text of Quran and helps in creating a right to govern in Alawi manner, the sense of legitimacy also gets changed. It becomes the eligibility of a ruler which rests with the people to decide.[2]

So it is said:

“A leader or ruler in Islam should have legitimacy as well as acceptance. His legitimacy is judged on the standards of a serious school.”[3]

“Caliphate is a common right of all. It should be vested on the basis of consultation to a competent person.”[4]

“God’s and Islam’s command is to choose a more suitable man for Imamate, Wilayat and government. People must choose as a leader one who is more suitable than all and has moral values.”[5]

Reminder

Explaining the position of *Bay'at* in the system of divinely appointed Imamate

“Bay’at neither has a religious aspect nor worth in the matter of Wilayat, obedience and holy war. It cannot be a source of legitimacy. According to this theory, the value of Bay’at goes as far as to oblige a Bay’at doer to obey the ruler whose Guardianship is laid upon Muslims. The obedience too goes as far as Divine commands go, and no further.

According to this theory Bay’at does not constitute any superiority or Guardianship of others. According to my belief, this is the highest angle of jurisprudence in this respect.

The Prophet enjoined the people at four stations to do Bay’at with him. First at Aqaba One, then Aqaba Two, third at the Bay’at of Rizwan and fourth on Ghadeer Day.

[1] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 123

[2] *In this system of thoughts the main power lies in the Shura, Nass only makes the matter easy.*

[3] Abdul Ali Bazargan: *Shura-O-Bayat (Consultation and Allegiance)*, Pg. 98

[4] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam)*, Vol. 1, Pg. 162

[5] Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: *Hukumat-e-Salihaan (Government of the Righteous)*, Pg. 77

The first Bay’at was an invitation. The second and the last one for his governorship and successorship and the third for holy war. According to this, three kinds of Bayyats took place in the time of the Prophet. In these Bayyats, there is no jurisprudential decree to make it incumbent. But reason makes it incumbent to pay allegiance because it is demanded by the Prophet.

Obedience to Prophet is incumbent in peace and war. It is a religious duty.

The issue of Bay’at in Imamate and Wilayat has no jurisprudence value. It does not give legitimacy. It is only a connection

and link between Ummah and its leader. It strengthens ties between the two.” **[1]**

[1] *Ustad Muhammad Mahdi Asifi: Waashze Maandgaaraan (Translated by Hasan Shanechi), Pgs. 85-86; Ibid. Mudkhil Ilaa Daraasata Nassul Ghadeer, Pgs. 72-73*

Part 8
END Caution of Wilayat and
warning of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.)
about the beginning of deviation
in belief of Imamate

We close this chapter by referring to two points in the speech of Hazrat Zahra (s.a.):

When a group of supporters of falsehood, in order to conceal the truth and justify their usurpation, instigated a generation to head towards the fire of hell, Siddiqa Tahira (Zahra) said regarding this perversion:

“What a surprise! Have you forgotten the Day of Ghadeer Khumm?”**[2]**

In the same way, Her Eminence (s.a.) in reply to justifications of the betrayers of trust said:

“Did my father leave an excuse for anyone on Ghadeer Day?”**[3]**

[2] *Muhammad Baqir Ansari: Chaharda Qarn Ba Ghadeer (Fourteen Centuries with Ghadeer) Pg. 36; quoting from: Majlisi: Biharul Anwar, Vol. 36, Pg. 353*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 37; quoting from Sadooq: Khisaal, Pg. 173*

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)