



Creed of the Shia'a;
Explained

Chapter 1

Introduction

This is Answering-Ansar's rebuttal of this article where 'proofs' that the Shi'a are kaffir were based on what can be identified in their books. It was put together by the Deobandi group Maktabat Minhaaj Al-Sunnah, and found on many anti Shi'a sites such as:

These adherents of Mu'awiya declare right at the beginning:

This group has clearly learnt a great deal from anti Muslim sites and adopted a methodology of adopting 'parts' of traditions out of context, in the same way that answering-Islam evangelists such as Gilchrist quote hadith and Qur'anic verses out of context so as to convince their faithful that Islam is a false religion. We shall Inshallah go through the points cited and show how pathetic the Minhaj al Nasibi have been.

Chapter 2

The Shi'a Rejection of the Sahah Sittah

These adherents of Mu'awiya declare right at the beginning:

There is NO requirement in Islam to believe in Sahih Bukhari, Muslim etc. As the Minhajj have taken offence to the comments let us look at some of these hadith, and then we leave it to those with open minds to conclude whether these are true words / deeds or folk tales, we present seven hadith for our readers perusal:

Narrated Abu Hurayra(RA): The Prophet (s)said, "The (people of) Bani Israel used to take bath naked (all Together) looking at each other. The prophet Moses (RA)used to take bath, alone. They said, 'By Allah! Nothing prevents Moses from taking a bath with us except that he has a scrotal hernia.' So, once Moses went out to take a bath and put his clothes over a stone and then that stone ran away with the clothes. Moses followed the stone saying, "My clothes, O stone! My clothes, O stone! Till the people of Bani Israel saw him and said 'By Allah, Moses has got no defect in his body.Moses took his clothes and began to beat the stone." Abu- Hurayra added, "By Allah! There are still six or seven marks present on the stone from the beating."

"Sahih Bukhari" Volume. (1) Book (5): Bathing, Chapter (21): Taking bath in seclusion & completely naked

Do our readers believe this type of rubbish? The dash of the stone with the clothes of Moses and the sprint of Moses (nude) after it is such a fabricated story that no rational mind is

ready to accept it. This hadith can only best be described as a fable, narrated by Abu Hurayra it cannot be a hadith of The Holy Prophet (s).

Thus this is clearly a fabricated Hadith, that has clearly been based on folk lore.

"Narrated Jabir bin Abdullah: While Allah's Apostle (s) was carrying stones (along) with people of Mecca for (the building of) the Kaaba wearing an Izar (waist-sheet cover), his uncle Al-'Abbas said to him, "O my nephew! (it would be better) if you take off your Izar and put it over your shoulders underneath the stones". So he took off his Izar and put it over his shoulders, but he fell unconscious and since then he had never been seen naked".

"Sahih al Bukhari" Volume. (I). Book (8)"The book of Salat (Prayers)" Chapter (8):"It is disliked to be naked during the prayers"

We are sure that any rational mind would agree that for anyone to remove his trousers in broad day light in public is a deplorable act of indignity.

No matter how exhausted a person maybe he would never commit such an appalling act, let alone the beloved Prophet Mohammed (s). This is an absolute lie fabricated by the Nasib-i-Banu Ummayya to degrade Banu-Hashim.

This is hence another tale!

"Having Sexual Intercourse and repeating it. And engaging with one's own wives and taking a single bath (after doing so)"

Narrated Mohammed bin Al-Munthahir on the authority of his father that he had asked 'A'isha (RA) (about the Hadith of Ibn 'Umar). She said " May Allah be merciful to Abu Abdur Rehman. I used to put scent on Allah's Apostle (s) and he used to go round in the morning he

assumed the Ihram, and the fragrance of the scent was still coming from his body".

"Sahih al Bukhari" Volume. (I). Book (5): "The book of Bathing" Chapter (13)

Narrated Qatadah: Anas Bin Malik (RA) said, "The Prophet (s) used to visit all his wives in a round, during a day and night and they were eleven in number. I asked Anas, "Had the Prophet(s) the strength for it?" Anas replied, we used to say that The Prophet(s) was given the strength of 30 (men)"

"Sahih al Bukhari" Volume. (I). Book (5): "The book of Bathing" Chapter (13)

Narrated from A'isha (ra): We performed Hajj with the Prophet (s) and performed Tawaf-al-Ifadaon the day of Nahr (slaughtering). Safiya got her menses and the Prophet desired from her what a husband desired from his wife, I said to him, "O Allah's Apostle! She is having her menses". He said "Is she going to detain us?" We informed him that she had performed Tawaf-al-Ifadaon the Day of Nahr. He said, "Proceed".

"Sahih al Bukhari" Volume (II), Book 26:Book of Hajj, Chapter: The visit (of the Ka'aba to perform Tawaf-al-Ifada) on the Day of Nahr (10th of Dhu'l Hijja)

Narrated A'isha: "The Prophet and I used to take a bath from a single pot while we were Junub. During the menses, he used to order me to put on an Izar (dress worn below the waist) and used to fondle me. While in Itikaf, he used to bring his head near me and I would wash it while I used to be in my periods (menses)".

"Sahih al Bukhari", Volume. (I). Book (6): "The book of Menses", Chapter (7):"Fondling a Menstruating Wife"

Abu Wali used to send his menstruating maid servant to bring the Qur'an from Abi Razin by carrying it from the hanger (of its case)". Narrated A'isha (RA): "The Prophet (s) used to lean on my lap and recite Qur'an while I was in menses".

*"Sahih al Bukhari" Volume. (I). Book (6)"The book of Menses"
Chapter (5):"To recite Qur'an while lying in the lap of one's
own menstruating wife"*

According to these 'authentic' traditions we can see clearly that the above hadith prove that the Holy Prophet (s), The Master of all the Prophets was::

1. So fond of Sexual Intercourse that he used to sleep with his eleven wives in just one night
2. He couldn't be patient even in the days of Hajj (pilgrimage)
3. He liked fondling his wives, and could not restrain himself from fondling them even during their menses.

May Allah give us protection from such vulgar thoughts! As far as his (s) strength and health is concerned Allah (swt) had blessed his Apostle (s) distinctly. He (s) was exceedingly strong both mentally & physically with vital senses many fold more sensitive & powerful than an ordinary human being. Despite this favour, the Holy Prophet (s) used his strengths modestly. It was his (s) complete self-control on emotions that depicted his (s)-exalted manners & sublime morality.

Allah (swt) praises his (s) manners in the Holy Qur'anin Surah-Al-Kalam (The Pen) Verse 4 "

And verily, you (O Muhammad SAW) are on an exalted standard of character."

The Holy Prophet (s) was a just person. He (s) treated all his wives justly He (s) spent a day with each of them. He (s) visited only one wife in a night. He (s) preferred to sleep early after the Isha prayers and wake up soon after the midnight for Tahajjud prayers he then continued various 'Ibadaat' (worship & veneration) until the Fajr (Morning Prayers), this was his routine.

The Actual Shi'a Position

We the Shi'a refuse to accept such filthy traditions, by doing so does that make us kaffir. As far as we are concerned protecting the integrity of the Prophet (S) is far more important than protecting the integrity of Sahih al Bukhari! Hence yes we do regard these as tales we believe that:

1. It is utterly untrue that the Holy Prophet(s) visited all his wives (i.e. eleven) in just one night.
2. It is also untrue that Holy Prophet (s) had the desire of fondling his (s) wives during menses
3. It is also untrue that The Holy Prophet (s) desired to have sexual intercourse with Hadhrath Safiya on the day of sacrifice.
4. It is also untrue that The Holy Prophet (s) recited The Holy Qur'an in the Laps of any wife during her menses.

The above traditions are derogatory to the piety & holiness of The Holy Prophet (s). When a Non-Muslim commits blasphemy by quoting these narrations our necks bow down with humiliation & embarrassment. And this Minhajj are trying to call us kaffirs because we reject these books! On the Day of Judgment at least the Shi'a will say we protected the perfection of the infallible Prophet, whilst groups such as Minhajj dedicated their lives to degrading the Prophet (s) with the above filthy traditions!

Part 1

Tahreef of the Qur'an

Are the Shi'a Kaffir Because Tahreef Traditions Exist in their Texts?

The Imami Shi'a have not only misinterpreted the Qur'an, but they have made actual alterations in the text itself: The false verse, "And we made 'Ali your in-law" has been added to Surah Al-Inshirah (Al-Kafi p.289) In 25:74, the verse "And make us a leader (Imam) for the God-fearing" is replaced with "And make for us a leader (Imam) from among the God-fearing." Of even greater audacity is the addition of an entirely fabricated Surah to the Qur'an, called, "Surah al-Walayah" Translation of this false Surah is as follows: 1) O believers, believe in the Prophet and the guardian (wali), whom We sent to guide you to the straight path. 2) A Prophet and a Guardian, one from the other, and I am the Knower, the Wise. 3) Verily those who fulfil their covenant to Allah will have gardens of pleasure. 4) And for those who deny our signs when they are read to them, 5) Verily they will have a terrible place in Hell when they are called for on the Day of Judgement, 'Where are the wrong-doers who denied the messengers?' 6) He only created them in truth and Allah will surely make them victorious until a time in the near future. 7) Glorify the praises of your Lord and 'Ali is among the witnesses.

It's sad to see that one deviant individual's comments about Surah al Walayah (al Tabarsi) have been translated by Nasibis as the aqeedah of ALL Shi'as. If that is indeed the case then al Tabari and Suyuti both record traditions that the Prophet (S) recited Satanic verses, should we conclude that this is the aqeedah of Ahl'ul Sunnah?

Is that fair? Minhajj al Nasibi had also cited tahreef traditions from Usul al Kafi. In reply to these traditions we will advance the following arguments.

Hadith can Not Contradict the Qur'an

With regards to the traditions of Usul al Kafi that Minhajj had shamelessly quoted, we should point out that these traditions have been deemed by the Ulema to be weak narrations. In addition to this Allah (swt) takes the responsibility of protection of the Qur'an Himself by declaring:

"Certainly We revealed the Reminder and certainly We shall preserve it." (The Holy Qur'an 15: 9)

When Allah (swt) provides a guarantee that it is protected, any hadith of tahreef automatically has to be rejected. We do not deny that these traditions exist, but the Nasibis should know that there is a difference between tahreef traditions and basing one's aqeedah on those traditions. The ultimate standard to determine the authenticity of any hadith is the Qur'an, if it conflicts with Allah (swt)'s Book it must be disregarded. This is also confirmed by al-Kulayni, compiler of al-Kafi from where the Nasibis cite the tahreef traditions to their followers. In the introduction to al-Kafi he states:

"Brother, may God lead you to the right road. You ought to know that it is impossible for anyone to distinguish the truth from the untruth when Muslim scholars disagree upon statements attributed to the Imams. There is only one way to separate the true from the untrue reports, through the standard which was declared by the Imam: "Test the various reports by the Book of God; whatever agrees with it take it, whatever disagrees with it reject it".

Despite this quite logical fact Minhajj al Nasibi and the fellow Nasibi groups have insisted on declaring Shi'as kaffirs on account of tahreef traditions. They are in effect forcing us to accept that these traditions are a part of aqeedah. By that logic, if Shi'as are kaffir then so are the Ahl'ul Sunnah for like the Shi'a their texts also contain traditions of tahreef. We will provide a few examples:

Sunni Traditions of Tahreef

A missing verse on stoning?

Hadhrath Umar's saying that the current Qur'an is incomplete:

Has one-third of the Qur'an been lost?

In Sahih al Bukhari Volume 8, pages 209-210, we read this sermon delivered by Hadhrath Umar during his last Hajj as Khalifa:

"Certainly Allah sent Muhammad with the truth, and revealed to him the Book. One of the revelations which came to him was the verse of stoning. We read it and understood it".

"The Messenger of God stoned and we stoned after him. I am concerned that if time goes on, someone may say, 'By God, we do not find the verse of stoning in the Book of God;' thus, the Muslims will deviate by neglecting a commandment the Almighty revealed."

"Stoning is in the Book of God. It is the right punishment for a person who commits adultery if the required witnesses are available, or there was pregnancy without marriage or adultery is admitted."

Hadhrath Ayesha also Testified to a 'Missing' Verse on Stoning

"When the verses "Rajm" [Stoning] and ayah "Rezah Kabir" descended, they were written on a piece of paper and kept under my pillow. Following the demise of Prophet Muhammad (S) a goat ate the piece of paper while we were mourning.

- 1. Sunan Ibne Majah, Volume 2, Page 39, Published Karachi*
- 2. Musnad Imam Ahmad, Volume 6, Page 269, Published Beirut.*
- 3. Taweel Mukhtalif Al Hadees, Page 310, Published Beirut*

Has Most of Surah Ahzab Been Lost?

Al-Muttaqi 'Alibin Husam al-Din in his book "Mukhtasar Kanz al-'Ummal" printed on the margin of Imam Ahmad's Musnad, Volume 2, page 2, in his hadith about chapter 33, said that Ibn Mardawayh reported that Hudhayfah said:

'Umar said to me 'How many verses are contained in the chapter of al-Ahzab?' I said, '72 or 73 verses.' He said it was almost as long as the chapter of the Cow, which contains 287 verses, and in it there was the verse of stoning.

Suyuti narrates from Hadhrath Ayesha:

"During the life of the Prophet (s), Surah Ahzab was read with 200 verses, when Uthman collected the verses we only found that amount that is found in the current Qur'an".

Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 5 page 180, al Itqan Volume 2 page 25

Has One-Third of the Qur'an Been Lost?

The revered Sunni scholaral Hafidh Jalaladeen as Suyuti writes:

"Hadrath Umar said at the Saqifa that the Qur'an has 1,027,000 letters

"Tafseer al Itqan" by as Suyuti, page 88

The present Qur'an has 267,033 letters. According to Hadrath Umar's research the Qur'an should have approximately 90 parts. What is the Nasibis fatwa here?

Has Most of the Qur'an Been Lost?

Suyuti also records the following words of Abdullah ibne Umar:

"No one can proclaim that I have found the Qur'an complete because most of the Qur'an has been lost".

"Tafseer Durre Manhur" as-Suyui Volume 1 page 104

Have 'Words' Been Omitted from the Present Qur'an?

In Sahih Muslim Volume 7 (commentary of al-Nawawi) in the Book of al-Zakah, about the virtue of being satisfied with whatever God gives and about urging people to have that virtue, pages 139-140, reported that Abu al-Aswad reported that his father said:

"Abu Musa al-Ash'ari invited the Qur'an readers of Basra. Three hundred readers responded to his invitation. He told them: You are the readers and the choice of the people of Basra. Recite the Qur'an and do not neglect it. Otherwise, a long time may elapse and your hearts will be hardened as the hearts of those who came before you were hardened." "We used to read a chapter from the Qur'an similar to Bara'ah in length and seriousness, but I forgot it. I can remember from that chapter only the following words:

'Should a son of Adam own two valleys full of wealth, he would seek a third valley, and nothing would fill Ibn Adam's abdomen but the soil. "

'We used to read a chapter similar to Musabbihat and I forgot it. I only remember out of it the following: "

'Oh you who believe, why do you say what you do not do? Thus a testimony will be written on your necks and you will be questioned about it on the Day of Judgment."

It is obvious that these words which Abu Musa mentioned are not from the Qur'an, nor are they similar to any of the words of God in the Qur'an. It is amazing that Abu Musa claims that two Surah's from the Qur'an are missing, one of them similar to Bara'ah (the chapter of Bara'ah contains 130 verses).

A Missing Verse on Suckling

Muslim also reported in the Book of al-Rida'ah (Book of Nursing), part 10, page 29, that 'Ayesha said the following:

"There was in what was revealed in the Qur'an that ten times of nursing known with certainty makes the nursing woman a mother of a nursed child. This number of nursing would make the woman 'haram' (forbidden) to the child. Then this verse was replaced by 'five known nursing' to make the woman forbidden to the child. The Prophet died while these words were recorded and read in the Qur'an."

A Further Two Surah's Missing from the Qur'an

Abi bin Ka'absaid that in his copy he has added "Surah Al khula" and "Surah Al hifd". Its verses were "(Actual words are cited in the Arabic text)"

- 1. Mujma-ulZayad, Volume 7, Page 157, Published Egypt*
- 2. Al Itqan FilUlum-ulQur'an, Volume 2 Page 66, Published Lahoe*
- 3. Ruh al Ma'ani Volume 1, Page 25, Egyp*

Have Words Been 'Added' to the Qur'an?

The Imami Shi'a have not only misinterpreted the Qur'an, but they have made actual alterations in the text itself: ...

The Nasibi had then cited traditions to prove the point. What they fail to point out is the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah also have similar traditions.

We read Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 hadith number 86:

Alqama went to Sham and when he entered the mosque, he said, "O Allah! Bless me with a pious companion." So he sat with Abu Ad-Darda. Abu Ad-Darda' asked him, "Where are you from?" 'Alqama replied, "From the people of Kufa." Abu Ad-Darda said, "Isn't there amongst you the keeper of the secret which nobody else knows, i.e., Hudhaifa?" Alqama said, "Yes." Then Abu Ad-Darda further said, "Isn't there amongst you the person whom Allah gave refuge from Satan through the invocation of His Prophet, namely Ammar?" Alqama replied in the affirmative. Abu Ad-Darda said, "Isn't there amongst you the person who carries the Siwak (or the Secret) (i.e. of the Prophet, namely Abdullah bin Masud)?" Alqama said, "Yes." Then Abu Ad Darda asked, "How (Abdullah bin Masud) used to recite the Surah starting with: 'By the night as it envelops; By the day as it appears in brightness?' " (92.1-2). Alqama said "And by male and female." Abu Ad-Darda then said, "These people (of Sham) tried hard to make me accept something other than what I had heard from the Prophet."

We read in Mustadrak:

Abdullah bin Abbas would read the following verse in Surah Nisa "Fa ma asthatham thathu ba manaan ku" with these words 'la ajal masmee". When he was asked about this he said 'Allah (swt) revealed this verse in this way.

Of interest is the fact that Allamah Dhahabi in his commentary of Mustadrak, confirms that the chain of narrators in this tradition is Sahih. (Mustadrak ma Talkhees Volume 2 page 305).

What fatwa should we pass here? After all the chain is Sahih and Ibn Abbas is stating that words are missing from the Qur'an. Will the Deobandi Nasibis issue takfeer against themselves? Or does this 'rule' only apply to the Shi'a?

Did the Sahaba Read Verses Containing 'Ali's Name?

The false verse, "And we made 'Ali yourin-law" has been added to Surah Al-Inshirah (Al-Kafi p.289

We would like to make it clear that this is the Nasibi's own interpretation of the text. Before responding to this lie let us first of all cite some of the texts of the Ahl'ul Sunnah.

Ibn Masud narrates: "We in the presence of Rasulullah (s) would read this verse (5:67) as follows:

"O Apostle! Deliver what has been sent down to you from your Lord; 'that 'Ali is the Maula of the Momineen', if you don't...."

- 1. Tafseer Durre Manhur Volume 2 page 298*
- 2. Tafseer Fathul Qadeer, Volume 2 page 87*
- 3. Tafseer Mazhari Volume 3 page 153*

Ibn Masud also notes that he would read this verse from Surah Ahzab as follows:

"and enough was Allah for the believers in their fight 'via Ali ibn Abi Talib'.

- 1. Tafseer Durre Manhur Volume 5 page 192*
- 2. Tafseer Ruh al Maani, Volume 21 page 157*

One should note that Hadhrath Abdullah bin Masud would read these verses with name the 'Ali. His text contained this, and he himself states that he read a verse in this way in the presence of Rasulullah (s). Perhaps Minhajj al Nasibi could shed light as to why we no longer find the name 'Ali in the current Qur'an? The answer will of course be that the name here was contained in Ibn Masud's Tafseer of the Qur'an.

We likewise say exactly the same when explaining our similar texts, we believe that the some Sahabah had the name 'Ali inside

verses in brackets, as an interpolation so that they would know about whom the verse descended. The words 'Ali (as) were NOT part of any verses, but simply a way of 'remembering' that this verse descended in praise of 'Ali. The Imams of Ahl'ul bayt (as) likewise wanted to remind the people about whom these verses descended.

Do the Shi'a Have a 'Different Qur'an, Called the Qur'an of Fatima?

But perhaps the greatest level of audacity is in the assertion that the Qur'an that we now possess is not the true Qur'an at all, but rather a fabrication:"Abu Baseer reported that he said to Imam Ja'far,

"O Abu Abdullah (Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq) What is Mushaf Fatimah?" He replied "It is a Qur'an containing three times what is found in your copy of the Qur'an; yet by Allah, it does not contain even a single letter from your Qur'an." (Al-Kafi p.385)

One needs to point out that "Mushaf" refers to a collection of "Sahifa" which is singular for "page". The literal meaning of Mushaf is "The manuscript bound between two boards". During that era people would write on leather and other materials. They either rolled the writings — what is known as scroll in English. Or they kept the separable sheets and bound them together, in what could be called as "Mushaf", a book in today's terms. The equivalent to the word book "Kitab" used to (and still is) refer to either a letter (e.g. of correspondence) or to a document that was written down or recorded. The Arabic word for wrote "Kataba" is a derivative of the same word.

Although the Qur'an is commonly called a "Mushaf" today, perhaps referring to its "collection" after it was dispersed. Qur'an is a Mushaf (book), but any Mushaf (book) is not necessarily the Qur'an! Do the Minhajj for example follow the 'Mushaf of al Bukhari'? The Minhajj have used maximum dishonesty when citing this tradition the text refers to Mushaf of Fatima, and the Minhajj have defined Mushaf as Qur'an. Can anyone be more dishonest than this? There is no Qur'an of Fatimah. The Mushaf was a text containing rules and regulations of the Deen that Sayyida Fatima (as) had in her possession

The Deobandi Scholar Maulana Anwar Shah's Fatwa, that there is Tahreef in the Qur'an

We should point out to the Deobandi Sect, the fact that you believe Sahih al Bukhari to be one hundred per cent authentic (which is not our aqeedah (belief) about al-Kafi) means that they have to believe in tahreef on account of the traditions of the Sahaba. The famous Indian Hadith scholar of the Deobandis Syed Anwar Shah Kashmiri in his recognized Ahl'ul Sunnah work "Fayz ul Bari" page 395 Volume 3 under the Chapter "As Shah'adhat writes:

"It is my analysis based on Sahih alBukhari that the Qur'an has tahreef with regards to words and this was an accredited to Hadhrath Uthman's party as an unintentional or intentional mistake".

Need we say any more? On the basis of the opinion of the leading Deobandi scholar can we declare all Deobandi's kaffir?

Our challenge to Minhajj -are there Mistakes in the Qur'an?

Allamah Suyuti in al Itqan Volume 1 page 174 narrates the following claim of Hadhrath Uthman, compiler of the Qur'an:

"There are some mistakes in the present Mushaf (Qur'an) that we have".

Now Minhajj perhaps you could be so kind as to answer us this, when Hadhrath Uthman had testified that mistakes are present in the Qur'an then why did he not correct them?

The claim is not just an isolated one we also read in al Itqan Volume 1 pages 183-184 as follows:

"Hashim binUrwa narrates that he asked Hadhrath Ayesha about mistakes in the Qur'an for example Allah (swt) states 'Al Muqameen' when it should read 'al Muqeemeen', the other says 'al Manaan' when it should state 'al Muneen' and thirdly we read 'al Saboon' when it should read 'al Sabeen'. Hadhrath Ayesha replied 'my nephew this has been the mistake of those that transcribed the text".

Allamah Suyuti deems this narration to be Sahih in accordance with the standards of authenticity set by the two Shaykhs (al Bukhari and Muslim). Can we conclude that the presence of this single Sahih hadith is enough to prove that Sunnis believe that there are mistakes in the Qur'an? The hadith is Sahih so Minhajj, you are forced to choose between two options:

Either:

Hadhrath Ayesha was lying Or:

The Qur'an has indeed got mistakes in it.

We leave it to Minhajj to pass their fatwa and then declare it on their website

The Actual Shi'a Position

We Shi'as, believe that the Qur'an is the Divine Revelation (wahy) sent down from Allah, the Exalted, upon his noble Prophet (s), containing an exposition of all things. It is also His everlasting miracle disabling all mankind from keeping pace with it in respect of rhetoric and eloquence, and the realities and sublime knowledge it contains, being guarded against any alteration or changing or mutation (tahreef). The Qur'an we have today is the same exact one revealed to the Prophet. Anyone claiming to the contrary is a violator, misguided, mistaken, or ignorant, for it is surely Allah's Word, and falsehood can never come at it from before it or from behind it.

The Shi'a recite the same Qur'an at their homes and the same Qur'an is taught at their Madrassas (religious schools). Apart from this, Shi'a scholars have written commentaries of the Qur'an in many languages including Arabic, Persian and numerous other languages. Also there is no living soul who would have seen a different version of Qur'an in any Shi'as house or at their religious schools. Shi'as believe that this Qur'an is complete and a miracle of the Holy Prophet (S), which is an undoubtedly fact. But some corrupt, so-called, scholar have accused Shi'as of denying this high status of Qur'an, which is a baseless accusation on Shi'as. To prove our point, we would present some sayings of the holy Imams of Ahl'ul Bayt (as), some commentaries of the Shi'a scholars and finally we would present some sayings of the Scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah.

Sayings of the HolyImams of Ahl'ul bayt(as)

There are many saying of the Imams of Ahl'ul Bayt(as) that clearly vouch for the authenticity of the Qur'an, being the same unaltered text revealed to Prophet Muhammad (S) by Allah (swt). There are numerous traditions from the Imams that prove this point,for the sake of brevity we shall cite a few.

Chapter 3

Commander of the Faithful Imam Ali (as)

"We did not make humans rulers, but we made the Qur'an the ruler over humans. This Qur'an is free from change but does not speak on its own accord, an interpreter is needed for this task.

"Nahjul Balagha part 6 page 7, Publishers Rehmania Egypt

Chapter **4**

Hadhrath Imam Ja'far Sadiq (as)

Ali bin Salam narrates from his father who asked Imam Jafer Sadiq (as) "O descendant of Prophet (S). What are your views on the Qur'an? Imam Jafer (as) replied 'the Qur'an is Allah's book; it contains commands of Allah; sent by Allah. It is not subject to alteration, neither can anyone claim that it has been changed, nor has anyone ever made such a claim.

Amali-al-Shaykh Saduq, Page 545, Published Iran

Chapter 5

Hadhrath Imam Ali Naqi (as)

"The whole Ummah agrees on the authenticity of the Qur'an. No sect in the Ummah denies this fact, and this claim is true".*Ehtijaje-Tabrisi, Page234, Published Iran)*

Many copies of the Qur'an, that were hand written by Imam Ali (as), Imam Hasan (as), Imam Hussein (as) and Imam Zain-ul-Abideen(as) can be located at the Imam Raza(as) library in Mashed, Iran. If one examines these copies, one will see that they are identical to the Qur'an in current usage. The claim of the Nasibis that the Shi'a reject the Qur'an is a baseless lie.

Comments of Shi'a Scholars Refuting These Lies

Shi'a scholars have written numerous commentaries of the Qur'an in which they have stipulated categorically that the Qur'an has not been altered in any shape or form. Shi'a scholars have in fact written several books on this very issue. Here are just a few of their sayings:

Chapter 6

Shaykh Saduq (R.A)

The completeness of Qur'an is so indisputable among Shi'a that the greatest Shi'a scholar of Hadith, Abu Ja'far Muhammad Ibn Ali Ibn al-Husain Ibn Babueyh, known as "Shaykh Saduq" (309/919 - 381/991), wrote:

"Our belief isthat the Qur'an which Allah revealed to His Prophet Muhammad is (the same as) the one between the twocovers (daffatayn). And it is the one which is in the hands of the people, and is not greater in extent than that. The number of Surah'sas generally accepted is onehundred and fourteen ... And he who asserts that we say that it is greater in extent than that, is a liar."

1. *Etikadat Shaykh Saduq 93, PublishedIran)*
2. *Awailel-Mukalat, Page55-56, Published Najaf*
3. *Shi'ite Creed (al-I'tiqadat al-Imamiyyah),by Shaykh Saduq, English version, p77*

Chapter 7

Sayyid Murtaza Alam Ul-Huda

We have a firm belief that the Qur'an is complete in the sameway that we believe in the existence of Kufa, Basra or any other city, or the great events that occurred through history. The reason for this firm belief is (firstly) due to the deep affections Muslims have towards the Qur'an and other reason which keep this book, of Almighty Allah, safe from any alteration. Also the Qur'an is (a sign of) the miracle of Prophet Muhammad's Apostleship. It is the source and foundation via which we locate our religious edicts and regulations. It is for this reason that Muslim scholars throughout history have taken great care in its compilation to the extent that if they were unsure about the minutest of matters, they would to examine it (the Qur'an) rigorously. Our belief about the compilation being the exact copy (as the original) is as strong as our belief that the Qur'an is the Book of Allah (swt). The present Qur'an is exactly the same Qur'an that was compiled during the life of Prophet Muhammad (S).

Tafseer Majma-ul-Bayan, Edition 1 Page 15, Published Iran

Chapter 8

Allamah Muhammad Ridha Mudhaffar

"We believe that the Holy Qur'an is revealed by Allah through the Holy Prophet of Islam dealing with every thing which is necessary for the guidance of mankind. It is an everlasting miracle of the Holy Prophet the like of which cannot be produced by human mind. It excels in its eloquence, clarity, truth and knowledge. This Divine Book has not been tampered with by any one. This Holy Book which we recite today is the same Holy Qur'an which was revealed to the Holy Prophet. Any one who claims it to be otherwise is an evil-doer, a mere sophist, or else he is sadly mistaken. All of those who have this line of thinking have gone astray as Allah in Qur'an said:

"Falsehood can not reach the Qur'an from any direction (41:42)"

The Beliefs of Shi'ite School, by Muhammad Ridha Mudhaffar, English version, p50-51

Chapter 9

Shaykh Abu Ja'far Musawi

The main reason behind the compiling of this book is to teach us about the meanings of the words contained in the Qur'an. As far as the question of there being any addition or deletion in the Qur'an, there is no need to debate on this matter as everyone agrees there has been no change made to it the comments of Sayyid Murtaza Alam ul-Huda have been discussed and proved. I have seen many commentaries in the books of Shi'a and Ahl'ul Sunnah suggesting that the Qur'an is incomplete or that a verse has been transferred from its original place to another but these are secluded cases and cannot be relied upon. It is best to abandon such texts and let them become extinct...we are sure of Qur'an being true. The Ummah has never objected or rejected Qur'an.

Al Batiyan Fil Tafseer-ul-Qur'an, 1st Edition, Page 3, Published Najaf

Chapter 10

Allamah Shaykh Muhammad Hussein Kashif

The Qur'an that we possess is the same text that Allah (swt) sent as a miracle, to bring fear to the people, to let them know about the commandments and the difference between good and bad. It has never been changed nor has any addition or subtraction ever occurred to it, all the scholars agree to this fact. Moreover these scholars agree to the fact that whoever alleges that Qur'an has been changed is wrong. Also all the claims of Qur'an not being complete, whether made by Shi'as or Ahl'ul Sunnah, are very weak. These claims are not beneficial in any regard whether that be to attain knowledge or perform a good deed. These claims should be disregarded.

Usul al-Shi'awa Asool-laha, Page 101-102, Published Najaf

Chapter 11

Allamah Shaykh Ja'far Kashif

There is no doubt about the fact due to the Protection of the Creator of the Deen Allah (swt); the Qur'an is free from any change or harm. Some verses in the Qur'an confirm this point, the scholars, in all languages; have likewise testified to this fact. If there is an opinion that the Qur'an is incomplete, it is an incorrect one, such a view should not be adhered to.

Kashaf-al-Ghatafy Al Fuqa, Page 315, Published Iran

Chapter 12

Allamah Muhammad Hussein Tabatabai

This renowned scholar of the Qur'an writes in his very famous exegesis, Tafseer-ul-Meezan, 12th edition, page 109, Published Iran:

The Qur'an, which Almighty Allah descended on Prophet Muhammad(S), is protected from any change.

In addition to these explicit declarations the Shi'a Ulema have in their commentaries have relied on verses of the Qur'an, saying of Prophet Muhammad (S) and the Imams (as) as evidence that the Qur'an is complete and no change has ever occurred in it.

Scholar's of Ahl' ul Sunnah that have Vouched for the Shi'a Viewpoint

Despite the belated efforts of these Nasibis inspreading lies, there are true humble Sunni Ulema that have looked beyond these lies and have confirmed that the Shi'a believe that the Qur'an is the uncorrupted Word of Allah (swt). We cite some of those opinions:

Chapter 13

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Allamah Shaykh Ghazzali of Egypt

Whilst addressing the allegation that the Shi'a ascribe tahreef to the Qur'an. He said:

In one gathering I heard a man say that Shi'as have a different Qur'an, which is unlike the Qur'an we have. I asked him, "Where is that Qur'an? Islam is being practiced on three continents. Since the demise of the Holy Prophet (S) until today, a passing of fourteen hundred years, the Ummah has known of the existence of only the one Qur'an, we possess knowledge of where the chapters begin and end, end as well as the number of verses that they contain. Where is this other Qur'an? During this long passage of time how is it that any man or jinn have not located this 'other' Qur'an? These lies cause dissension between brothers and cause dissension about the Book. There is only one Qur'an, if it is published in Cairo, it is considered holy in Najaf and Tehran as well, they will hold it in their hands and keep it in their homes. They have nothing but respect for the Creator that sent it, and the person through whom it was revealed. Why then are such rumours and lies spread about people and this message?

Wafaan Al aqida wa Al Shariah, Page 265-266, Publishers Al kutub Al hadisia, Egypt, 1985

Chapter 14

Allamah Rehmatullah Hindi Dehlavi

This Renowned scholar of Ahl'ul Sunnah whilst writing about the Shi'a states:

"According to the scholars of the Shi'a Ithna Ashari (12'ers), the Qur'an has never been changed, and whoever and any individual who claims otherwise, is deemed unacceptable in the eyes of the scholars of the Imamia sect.

"After writing the sayings of Shi'a scholars about the completeness of Qur'an. Allamah Dehlavi further comments:

"This proves that Shi'a Ithna Ashari scholars believe that this is the same Qur'an that was descended by Almighty Allah upon Prophet Muhammad (S) and this is the only text that the people possess, no other exists. In addition it was compiled during the time of Prophet Muhammad (S) not by only Abdullah bin Masood and Ubay bin Ka'b but by numerous Sahaba who were hadith. [The Shi'a believe] they will become famous again with the coming of 12th Imam, Shi'as emphasize on the fact that Almighty Allah said that, "We descended the Qur'an and we shall protect it". In "Tafseer Sirat-ul-Mustaqim", which is an important and valued commentary to the Shi'a, it is written that this verse means that Allah would protect Qur'an from any change". *Izhar-ul-Haq, 2nd edition, Page 89-90, Publishers Mutabah Amira, Istanbul*

Chapter 15

Principal of the Shariah Department of Al Azhar University, Allamah Shaykh Muhammed-al-Madani

To state that the Shi'a Imamia believe that the Qur'an on account of traditions that can be located in their texts, is just the same as reaching the conclusion on the basis of such references in our books - but both Shi'a and Sunni scholars have refuted these claims. None amongst the Imamia Shi'a and Zaidia believe in this lie, in the same way that none of the adherents of Ahl'ul Sunnah do. Whoever accuses the Shi'a of ascribing to tahreef of the Qur'an, should read books such as Allamah Suyuti's "Tafseer Itqan" and objectively look at the traditions that point to tahreef of the Qur'an. Although we do not accept these sorts of traditions, one Egyptian scholar in 1948 wrote a book titled "Al Furqan" in which he copied many of these traditions from the works of Ahl'ul Sunnah. Should we on this basis conclude that the Ahl'ul Sunnah do not believe that the Qur'an is complete? Or should we on account of these traditions which were copied by someone or written in such and such book by such and such a person, adopt the view point that the Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that the Qur'an is incomplete? The same conclusion could likewise be reached about the Shi'a, as like us they also have similar traditions in their books.

Risalah'thul-Islam, 11th Edition, Pages 382-383, 4th Part

Allamah Najam-ul-Ghani Rampuri

"The Twelver Shi'a do not believe that the Qur'an is incomplete - the popular misconception that the Shi'a Ithna Ashari believe that the Sahaba omitted ten parts of Qur'an and that many Shi'a recite Surah-e- Hassnain, Surah Fatima or Surah-e-Ali are pure lies. No Shi'a Ithna Ashari scholar believes in this. The scholars of the Shi'a Ithna Ashari sect have refuted such claims in their books. Shaykh Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Ali Babweia wrote in his book that, 'the Qur'an, that Almighty Allah caused to descend on Prophet Muhammad (S) is the same (Book) that the people now have. There has been no addition or subtraction to it'. In "Tafseer Majma ul Bayan", that is considered to be an authentic commentary by the Shi'a Ithna Ashari, Syed Murtaza attests that 'the Qur'an that was present during the times of Prophet Muhammad (S) is the same one that we have'. Qazi Noor Ullah Shostari writes in his book titled "Masaib-ul-Nawasib" that 'the popular belief, which is associated with Shi'as that they do not believe in the completeness of Qur'an, is a lie. Shi'a researchers do not agree to this fact. And whoever says otherwise, is a liar. Allamah Sadiq Sharah writes in "Kafi-a-Kulayni" that 'this Qur'an shall continue to remain in this same form till the reappearance of Imam Mahdi (as)'. Muhammad bin al Hasan Amali comments that 'whoever analyses the traditions objectively will realize that on account of certain factors, the Qur'an can never be subject to alteration'.

1. Mazahib-ul-Islam, Page 447, Publishers Lakishwar Lucknow;

2. Muzayl-al-Ghawashi Sharah Usool Alshashi, Page 9, Published Karachi

Chapter 16

Teacher of History at Jamiah Milia Islamia Aligarh, India - Allamah Hafidh Muhammad Aslam Jirajapuri

After narrating the sayings of several Shi'a Scholars attesting to the completeness of the Qur'an Jirajpuri concludes:

These are the sayings of those scholars, that are very famous and recognized authorities of the Shi'a sect. There is opportunity to revise these sayings and it cannot be said that these scholars lied, due to the fact that some of these scholars have written books refuting the claims that had been put forward by the scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah; to suggest that they were lying is without basis. Moreover, Abu Ja'far Qumi's book "Al Aitiqad" and Mullah Mohsin's book " Tafseer-e-Safi" are books taught as part of the curricula at Shi'a schools. It is somewhat unlikely to suggest that they would teach their students texts that contradicted their beliefs.

Tareekh-ul-Qur'an, Page 62-67, Published Karach

Chapter 17

Shaykh of Tafseer at Dar-ul-Ulum Deoband and Shaykh of Hadithat Jameah Islamia Dh-abil, Allamah Shamas-ul-Haq Afghani

In his article titled "Shi'a and tahreef of the Qur'an", Afghani states:

After trying their level best, and failing, to prove that the Qur'an had been altered the non-believers formulated a new strategy alleging that a large sect of Muslims believe that the Qur'an has been altered, the Sect in question being the Shi'a. The non-believers wrote with such confidence as to suggest that belief in the incompleteness of the Qur'an was an established belief amongst the Shi'a. This is a completely incorrect assertion. Shi'as like Sunnis believe that the Qur'an is protected from any type of alteration....

This proves that apart from a few untrustworthy individuals, the Shi'a do NOT ascribe to a belief in the alteration or incompleteness of Qur'an. For more references Numan Alusi's book titled "Aljawab-un-naseeh lem-ana fiqh Abdul maseeh" should beread. The Qur'an is protected in its present written form, and is embedded in the minds of people. Moreover, the words and meaning of Qur'an testify that they are miracles.

Taken from Ulum-ul-Qur'an, Page 134-136, Published Lahore

Chapter 18

Allamah Abdul Haq Haqani Dehlavi

Up until the present time no Shi'a scholar, or for that matter any adherent of the Islamic Faith has held a belief that the Qur'an has ever been altered or changed. The Shi'a scholars have reiterated this point in their texts.

Tafseer-e-Haqani, 1st Edition, Page 63, Published Lahore

Chapter 19

Allamah Salim Al Bannah View Point

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah and Founder of the Muslim Brotherhood Allamah Salim Al Banna:

The Qur'an we Ahl'ul Sunnah have is the same Qur'an that is used in Shi'a homes and mosques. Al-Sita AL-Muatri Aliha, Page 60, Published Egypt

On page 263 of the same book, he writes

The Ithna Ashari Shi'a deem anyone who believes in the alteration of Qur'an to be a non-believer, this is a known and agreed fact that has been held the inception of Islam.

Chapter 20

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Shah Abdul Aziz Muhadith Dehlavi

Shah Abdul Aziz Muhadith Dehlavi, while acknowledging that the Shi'a do not believe that the Qur'an had been altered states: It is proven from all the traditions of the Imamia that the Ahl'ul bayt used to recite this same Qur'an and based their decisions in accordance with it. The commentary of Qur'an by Imam Hasan Askari is the commentary of this (same) Qur'an. All his children, relatives and servants studied 'this' Qur'an, and he used to order them to recite this Qur'an when praying. It is due to this fact that Shaykh Ibn-e-Bawia in his book "Al Aqidath" denied that Qur'an had been altered. Tuhfa Ithna Asharia, Page 281, Published Istanbul the Qur'an we have is the same that was compiled during the lifetime of Prophet Muhammad (S), proven by the fact that the people used to recite the Qur'an and Prophet Muhammad (S) would listen to them.

On 16th October 1947 in Akhbar-ul-Zia's page 6, column 1, he wrote:

The fact that Qur'an is complete has been proved by numerous traditions from Muslim scholars. The Shi'a also a scribe to this view, this was proven in a previous edition with a reference to the famous commentary "Tafseer Majma-ul-Bayan".

Apart from the scholars cited, numerous other Sunni scholars have also confirmed that the Shi'a do not believe that the Qur'an is incomplete.

- Ahmed Abraham Being Ustad Shaykh Shaltoot in "Ilm Usul-e-Fiqh", page 21 published Egypt.
- Allamah Sami Arif-ud-Din in "Al muslimun man Hum", Page 98, Published Egypt.
- Allamah Muhammad Ali M.A Lahore in "Jameih-al-Qur'an", Page 111, Published Lahore.
- Maulana Ghulam Dastagir Anjahani in "Imamate-ul-Burhan", page 5, Published Lahore.
- Ghulam Ahmed Prevail in "Mazahib-e-Aalim ki Armani Cetacean", Page 144, Published Lahore.
- Imam Abu Zahra Misri in "Al Imam Al Sadiq", Page 206, Published Egypt.

Chapter 21

Shi'a rejection of the Sahaba

"According to Imami Shi'a doctrine, the vast majority of the Sahaba were liars and apostates" One of the leading scholars of the Shi'a, al-Kashshi, reported that Abu Ja'far said: "The people (including the Sahaba) all became apostates after the Prophet's death except for three." When asked who they were, he replied, "Al-Miqdad ibn Aswad, Abu Dharr, and Salman as mentioned in the verse, 'If he (Muhammad) dies or is killed, will you then turn on your heels.'" (Rijal al-Kashshi pp12-13)".

The Actual Shi'a Position

This is not a topic that should cause discord and hatred between Muslims. Whilst we acknowledge there is a difference between the way Sunni and Shi'a approach the issue of the Sahaba- it is incorrect to conclude that the Shi'a reject the Sahaba. We should point out that our books are replete with chapters praising the Sahaba of Rasulullah (s). We however do not ascribe to the belief that one should blindly follow and respect an individual because he benefited from Rasulullah's blessed company, we deem adherence and respect to be based on what we learn about them from the Qur'an, Sunnah and history. We acknowledge the sacrifices that the Sahaba had made, BUT our yardstick for determining the truth is the Qur'an and Sunnah. Hence both schools believe in the Sahaba the only difference being one school examines each individual in relation to their manners/ attitude, whilst the other does not deem this to be a necessary component. As Shi'a we look at the character of a companion against the Qur'an, Sunnah and history and then decide on his reliability. The (14th) century, the well known Sunni scholar, Maulana Wahidu 'z Zaman of Hyderabad Deccan explains the point:

"Those that sat in the company of Rasulullah (s) are true Sahaba. Those deserving of the title 'Sahaba' are those that bore love and respect of Rasulullah (s) and his Ahl'ul bayt (as). The title 'Sahaba' does not suffice, we shall cite an example:

'A King has some servants, on account of their love for their king they also love one another. Then one of the servants rebels against the King, he kills the Kings family, relations and friends, and becomes their enemy. In light of such facts should we STILL love the servant, on the sole basis that he was the kings servant?' Anwaru 'l-lughah Volume 14 page 20

Earlier on in the same book Zaman states:

"The verses and hadith praising the Sahaba refers to those that sat in the midst of Rasulallah (s) and showed love and respect towards his Ahl'ul bayt and supported them".Anwaru 'l-lughah Volume 14page 10

Sunni scholarAllamah Sayyid Asad Haydher writing on the Shi'a aqeedah on the Sahabastates:

"The Shi'a of the Ahl'ul bayt respect Rasulallah's Sahaba, they do not play down respect for them, but when following the life of Rasulallah (s) they stress that the Shari'a applies equally to Sahabaand non Sahaba -the Sahaba's position and status is in accordance with their deeds and actions".

Taken from alSahabeeyathfi NazharShi'a page 32, printed in Egypt

Appraisal of the Sahaba by the Imams of Ahl'ul bayt(as)

To counter the lies of the Nasibi we present the comments of two of our Imams (peace be upon them) that sets out their views on the Sahaba of Rasulullah (s):

Imam Zaynul Abideen (as) our fourth Imam is known in Muslim and non-Muslim circles for his beautiful supplications, some of which have been compiled into book format in Sahifa al Kamilah. One of his (as) specific du'as was for the pious Sahaba of Rasulullah (s) may Allah be well pleased with them:

"O God, and as for the Companions of Muhammad specifically, those who did well in companionship, who stood the good test in helping him, responded to him when he made them hear his messages' argument, separated from mates and children in manifesting his word, fought against fathers and sons in strengthening his prophecy, and through him gained victory; those who were wrapped in affection for him, hoping for a commerce that comes not to naught in love for him; those who were left by their clans when they clung to his handhold and denied by their kinsfolk when they rested in the shadow of his kinship; forget not, O God, what they abandoned for Thee and in Thee, and make them pleased with Thy good pleasure for the sake of the creatures they drove to Thee while they were with Thy Messenger, summoners to Thee for Thee". Imam Zayn al-'Abidin, Sahifa al-Kamilah, (English translation London, 1988), p.27

Imam Jafer Sadiq (as) had praised the Sahaba of Rasulullah (s) as follows:

"Allah (swt) from amongst the Sahaba had selected a group, and showered them with respect, they were successful and the blessed lips of Rasulullah (s) praised them for virtues. You should [likewise] love them, extol their virtues and separate from the people of

Bidah as sitting with them leads to one's heart being filled with kufr and hatred".Misbah al Shaiah page 67

Did the Vast Bulk of the Sahaba Apostatize After the Death of Rasulullah (s)?

"One of the leading scholars of the Shi'a, alKashshi, reported that AbuJa'far said: "The people (including the Sahaba) all became apostates after the Prophet's death except for three." When asked who they were, he replied, "Al-Miqdad ibn Aswad, Abu Dharr, and Salman as mentioned in the verse, 'If he (Muhammad) dies or is killed, will you then turn on your heels.'" (Rijal al-Kashshi pp12-13)".

This is one of the favourite traditions that are cited by the Nasibi against the followers of Ahl'ul bayt (as). We had already cited the comments of Imam Zaynul Abideen (as) and Imam Sadiq (as) where they had set out their admiration and love for the Sahaba of Rasulullah (s). Is it believable that these two Imams were praising just three individuals? Not only do these traditions go against those explicit traditions that we have cited, we should also point out that one of the narrators of this tradition was Hanaan bin Sadeed who adhered to the "Wakfee al Madhab", and Imam Raza(as) declared the following about such persons:

"An adherent of the wakfee al madhab is an individual opposed to the truth, should he remain on this deviant path until his die, his ultimate resting place shall be in Hell". Mukees ad'araraya fi ilm alriwaya page 83

If the Minhajare still going insist that we adhere to this belief then we would suggest that examine the testimony in Sahih al Bukhari your most authentic book:

Narrated 'Abdullah:

The Prophet said, "I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount". 'Abdullah added: The Prophet said, "I am your predecessor at the Lake-Fount, and some of you will be brought in front of me till I will see them and then they will be taken away from me and I will say, 'O Lord, my

companions!' It will besaid, 'you do not know what they did after you had left.'Sahih Bukhari,Hadith: 8.578

Narrated Anas:

The Prophetsaid, "Some of my companions will come to meat my Lake Fount, and after I recognise them, they will then be taken away from me, whereupon I will say, 'My companions!' Then itwill besaid, 'You do not know what they innovated (new things) in the religion after you."1. Sahih Bukhari, Hadith: 8584 2. Sahih Muslim, part 15, pp 53-54

Narrated AbuHazim from Sahl bin Sa'd:

The Prophet said, "I am your predecessor (forerunner) at the Lake-Fount, and whoever will pass by there, he will drink from it and whoever will drink from it, he will never be thirsty. There will come to me some people whom I will recognise, and they will recognise me, but a barrier will be placed between me and them." Abu Hazim added: Nu'manbin Abi 'Aiyash, on hearing me, said. "Did you hear this from Sahl?" I said, "Yes."He said, " I bear witness that I heard Abu Said al-Khudri saying the same, adding that the Prophet said: 'I will say: They are my companions. Then it will be said to me, 'You do not know what they innovated (new things) in the religion after you left'. I will say, 'Far removed, far removed (from mercy), those who changed after me." Abu Huraira narrated that the Prophet said, "On the Day of Resurrection a group of companions will come to me, but will bedriven away from the Lake-Fount, and I will say,'O Lord (those are) my companions!' It will besaid, 'You have no knowledge as to what they innovated after you left; they turned apostate as renegades (reverted from the true Islam)"Sahih al Bukhari Hadith: 8585

Narrated AbuHuraira:

The Prophet said, "While I was sleeping, a group (of my followers were brought close to me), and when I recognized them, a man (an angel) came out from amongst (us) me and them, he said (to them), 'Come along.' I asked, 'Where?' He said, 'To the (Hell) Fire, by Allah' I asked, 'What is wrong with them?' He said, 'They turned apostate as renegades after you left.' Then behold! (Another) group (of my followers) were brought close to me, and when I recognized them, a man (an angel) came out from (me and them) he said (to them); 'Come along.' I asked, 'Where?' He said, 'To the (Hell) Fire, by Allah.' I asked, 'What is wrong with them?' He said, 'They turned apostate as renegades after you left.' So I did not see anyone of them escaping except a few who were like camels without a shepherd". Sahih Bukhari Hadith: 8.587 Faced with such explicit traditions Nasibis try and re-define Sahaba here, namely the words don't refer to the Sahaba per se but in fact refer to the Ummah i.e. the vast bulk of the Ummah will be in the fire. To counter this we suggest our readers check the Arabic it says the words "Sahaba". We are yet to find any Arabic dictionary that states Sahaba means Ummah.

Further proofs come from the wording of the traditions. In addition 8: 587 'They turned APOSTATE as renegades after you left.' When you LEAVE somebody, you do so having already BEEN WITH THEM, i.e. he had been amongst them. The words "after you left" clearly indicate that the group being referred to are those who survived the Prophet (S) i.e. the Sahaba. This is absolutely logical, when a parent dies, they leave behind them their children - they have survived their parents.

Moreover in tradition 8: 585 Rasulullah (s) say's: "There will come to me some people whom I will RECOGNIZE" and in 8: 587 "While I was sleeping, a group (of my followers were brought close to me), and when I RECOGNIZED them". Now in both hadith our infallible Prophet (S) refer to a group "whom I will recognise" - I can only recognise someone if I have SEEN that person - common sense. Rasulullah (s)'s surprise is because

he is seeing those who he sat with (companions) being lead into the fire.

These authentic traditions make it clear that the vast bulk of Sahaba

- (1) Innovated
- (2) Became Kaffir
- (3) Only a few will be saved from the fire!

Ummul Momineen Umm Salma (ra) narrates in alIstiaab Volume3 page 390 and Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 67 that:

"Amongst my Sahaba are some that I do not wish to look at, and after my death they shall not see me".

Commenting on this hadith Deobandi scholar Shaykh ul Hadith Maulana SarffarazKhan Safdar states;

"These are those individuals that recited the Shahada before Rasulullah (s) and after him became murtad (apostates), this includes later generations that became murtad and the people pf Bidah" -for further details one can consult Sharh Nawawi Volume 1 page 129" Taken from Izalath al Rahab page 398

For further references along this line readers can consult:

1. Sunan Nasai Volume4 page 114 (Delhi);
2. Mishkaat alMasabih pages 487-488 (Delhi);
3. Tafseer Kazaan Volume 7 page 451 (Beirut);
4. Tafseer Fathul Qadeer Volume 6 page 490 (Egypt);
5. Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 6 page 400 (Egypt);
6. Tafseer Rul al Maani page 244 (Egypt).

Al-Qummi claims that Abu Ja'far said that the following verse was revealed about them; "Verily the doors of Heaven will not open for those who deny Our signs and are arrogant towards them, nor will they enter paradise until a camel passes through the eye of a needle."(7:40) He also adds that the camel in the verse refers to their camel. Thus, according to Al-Qummi, Talhah (RA) and az-Zubayr (RA), who were both amongst the

ten who received glad tidings of paradise from the Prophet SAWS himself, will never enter paradise! (Rijal al-Kashshi pp12-13)"

Whilst we have not gleaned into the particulars of this narration one should point out to the Minhajj that they have traditions in their beloved Sahih al Bukhari that not only places Talha and Zubayr in the fire, but also the vast bulk of the Sahaba that according their traditions have been guaranteed paradise!"Sahihal Bukhari" Volume. (I). Book (2):"The book of Faith" Chapter (23): "And if two parties of believers fall to fight then make peace between them both" (49:9)

Narrated Al-Ahnaf bin Qais : "While I was going to help this man ('Hadhrath Ali Ibn Abi Talib(AS)), Abu Bakra (RA) met me and asked, Where are you going? I replied," I am going to help that person. He said "go back for I have heard Allah's Apostle (s) saying, "when two Muslims fight (meet) each other with sword, both the murderer and the murdered will go to the Hell-Fire." I said, O' Allah's Apostle (s) it is all right for the murderer but what about the murdered one? Allah's Apostle (s) replied, "surely had the intention to kill his companions."

"Sahih al Bukhari"

Volume. (IX).Book ():

"The book of Afflictions"

Chapter (10):"If two Muslims meet (fight) each other with their swords":

Al Hasan;(Al Ahnaf said) "I went out carrying my arms during the nights of the affliction (i.e. war between 'Ali and A'isha) and Abu Bakra met me and asked, "Where are you going?" I replied, "I intend to help the cousin of Allah's Apostle (i.e. Ali). Abu Bakra said, "Allah's Apostle said "If two Muslims take out their sword to fight each other, then both of them will be from the people of (Hell) Fire". It was said to the Prophet,"it is alright for the killer but what about the killed one?". He replied "The killed one had the intention to kill his opponent".

We would urge our readers to examine these two 'sahih' hadith from the Sahihal Bukhari. These hadith clearly infer that all those involved in the Battles of Jamal, Sifeen and the Tragedy of Karbala are destined for Hell. And among them are Ummul-Momineen Hadhrath Ayesha and the eminent personalities of Hadhrath Imam Ali (AS) & Imam Hussain (AS) and all their martyred companions (AS), and of course Talha & Zubair. What is the fatwa of Minhajj al Nasibi here?

Does Cursing the Sahaba Make the Shi'a Kaffir?

Whilst we will Inshallah refute the collection of fatwas in the final chapter we felt that it would be appropriate for us to reply to three fatwas that had been cited suggesting that the Shi'a are kaffir due to their position on the Sahaba.

"During one of Imam Malik's classes, it was mentioned that the Rafidi Shi'a curse the Sahaba. Imam Malik recited the verse, "Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and those with him are harsh with the disbelievers and gentle among themselves. So that the disbelievers may become enraged with them." (48:29) He then said, "Whoever becomes enraged when the Sahaba are mentioned is the one about whom the verse speaks." (Tafseer al-Qurtubi) 4) Abu Zur'ah arRazi: He said of the Rafidi Shi'a doctrine of cursing the Sahaba, "If you see someone degrade any of the companions of the Prophet SAWS know that he is a disbeliever. Because the Prophet SAWS was real, what he brought was the truth and all of it was conveyed to us by way of the Sahaba. What those disbelievers wish to do is cast doubt on the reliability of our narrators in order to invalidate the Qur'an and Sunnah. Thus the disbelievers are the ones most deserving of defamation." 6) Imam Al-Alusi: He declared the Rafidi Shi'a disbelievers because of their defamation of the Sahaba. His position was based on the rulings of Imam Malik and other scholars. In response to their claim to be followers of the Ahl al-Bayt (the Prophet's SAWS family) Al-Alusi said, "No, they are really followers of the devils and the Ahl al-Bayt are innocent of them." (Rijal al-Kashshi pp12-13)".

It is sad that Nasibi cults such as this group seek to vent maximum emotion amongst actual Sunni's by highlighting Shi'a criticism of the Sahaba with the sole aim that this will lead to them joining them in the chorus of takfeer against the Shi'a. We will Inshallah address Imam Malik's Fatwa separately in the final chapter, suffice it to say the Shi'a views on the Sahaba do NOT in any way mean that one can conclude that the Shi'a are kaffir. These Nasibis cannot prove from the Qur'an or hadith that either Allah (SWT) or Rasul (S) ever declared Sahaba who

cursed one another to have become Kaffir. This is a fact, they quarrelled, fought each other in his blessed presence and he NEVER said that they had become kaffir. In fact Sahaba even criticized him (S) accusing him of being delirious on his death bed and yet curiously we never hear these Deobandi and Salafi Nasibis ever running to the aid of our Rasul and deeming such individuals as Kaffir.

When a person enters into the fold of Islam, he is required to recite the Kalima tayyiba and Shahada, upon doing so he comes under the umbrella of Islam. It is following this recital that he can be told about the core components of Iman/ beliefs that make up this declaration. From the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah we learn that the declaration of Iman, is as follows:

"I believe in Allah, in his Angels, In his Books, in the Day of Judgment, the fact that everything good and bad is from Allah and that Life exists after death".

These are the conditions of Iman, there exists no requirement to have faith in the iman of Abu Bakr, Umar or for that matter any other Sahaba. In the absence of this fact, on what basis do these so-called scholars conclude that disrespect of the Sahaba makes you a kaffir?

If one examines the entire contents of the Holy Qur'an there exists no evidence that entry into the fold of Islam is dependent on testifying to the iman of the Sahaba.

Some individuals will seek to cite verses and suggest that these pertain to Abu Bakr, Umar etc, thus concluding that to reject these individuals' means that one is rejecting the Qur'an. From this view point they will argue that believing in the iman of the Sahaba is a necessity since without them, the link to guidance shall be broken - hence to reject them makes one a kaffir. When debating on the issue of takfeer one needs to recognize that this is such a serious matter that a fatwa can only be issued when there is no doubt whatsoever. There is no arguing that general verses came down with regards to specific individuals, but one needs to appreciate that Abu Lahab and

Zaid bin Harith are the only individuals that are mentioned by name in the Qur'an. Even if we are to accept the claim that verses descended with regards to Abu Bakr and Umar, this can not in any way be deemed to proof beyond a doubt, since commentators of the Qur'an interpreted these verses according to their knowledge, thoughts and personal view points i.e., they interpreted verses according to their own school of thought. Whilst some for example cite the verse that refers to Abu Bakr in the cave, deeming this as a verse of appraisal, others have criticized his Iman on this particular occasion.

4) AbuZur'ahar-Razi:He said of the Rafidi Shi'a doctrine of cursing the Sahaba, "If you see someone degrade any of the companions of the Prophet SAWS know that he is a disbeliever. Because the Prophet SAWS was real, what he brought was the truth and all of it was conveyed to us by way of the Sahaba. What those disbelievers wish to do is cast doubt on the reliability of our narrators in order to invalidate the Qur'an and Sunnah. Thus the disbelievers are the ones most deserving of defamation."

This is a very common Nasibi argument. Since the Deen (Qur'an / Sunnah) reached us via the Sahaba, loving them is part of the Deen. We would state that this matter of personal preference, since it is these Ulema and their neo Nasibi followers that have made the mistake of wrongly deeming this to be a part of Iman, they are now seeking to force the Shi'a to embrace this incorrect notion.

The Ahl'ul Sunnah deem every companion as reliable due to the fact that he professed belief in Rasulullah (s) and had the benefit of seeing him - hence he is a 'Sahaba'. At the time of the Farewell Pilgrimage there were at least 100,000 Sahaba, is it correct to conclude that every one of these individuals was just? If it is not, then why do the majority school uphold the belief that ALL the Sahaba were just? In addition we are also expected to believe that all the Sahaba are like stars, whoever amongst them you follow will lead you to guidance. We will answer this claim by citing this example:

"If Rasulallah (s) appeared in this present era, and a Shepherd, bus conductor, street cleaner, barber, butcher, Doctor, engineer, Professor and trader all saw Rasulallah (s) and embraced Islam having met him and hence with that were deemed Sahaba,would it be fair to conclude that they ALL developed the same knowledge, sagacity, piety, mental attitude? Can we deem them ALL to be on an equal level BECAUSE they saw Rasulallah (s)and were hence his Sahaba?"

On the 'Stars' principle you will have a choice to follow a street cleaner or professor, can we conclude that both will be equal in knowledge? The majority school deem all those who saw Rasulallah (s) to be his Sahaba no matter how far away they were from him, when in fact the sad fact is even those that sat close to him, behaved inappropriately as can be vouched for in history.

The books of history testify that on the day of Hudaibiya, one particular Sahaba raised doubts on the Prophethood of Muhammad (s), at Uhud prominent Sahaba fled for the mountains, one fled so far that he returned to Madina after three days. At Khayber the companions led by prominent Sahaba fled in retreat from the enemy, when Rasulallah (s) asked for writing materials on his deathbed, Sahaba said he was delirious. Rasulallah (s) ordered the army of Usamah to leave Makka, Sahaba refused to go, after the demise of Rasulallah (s) Sahaba were debating over his succession at Saqifa rather than participating in his funeral arrangements. These are clearly historical problems, so whoever's heart wishes to gleam over these facts then they can choose such personalities as their guides, and whoever accepts these facts is entitled to reject these individuals as guides. If the majority school do indeed want to grasp such individuals would the better approach not be to grasp those individuals with an exemplary character, and declare such persons as the necessary components of the Deen?

The reality is that the necessary parts of Deen are the Ahl'ul Bayt (as) and Rasulallah (s) had told the Sahaba at the Farewell Pilgrimage "I am leaving amongst you two

weighty things if you follow them you will never go astray, the Qur'an and my Ahl'ul bayt". Rasulallah (s) also identified Imam 'Ali (as) to be the Gate of knowledge, if the Ummah had decided to close the door themselves, grasp the Qur'an and turn their backs on the Ahl'ul bayt (as) then that is their loss, why are they demanding that we do likewise?

If the Minhajj group are seeking to cookup a frenzy citing the fact that the Shi'a are opposed to the Sahaba and certain wives of the Prophet (s), then allow usto cite some traditions and look in to the facts of history. We will cite the treatment of the beloved daughter of Rasulallah (s) Sayyida Fatima (sa). After Rasulallah's demise she remained alive only for a further six months, during which time her treatment at the hands of Hadhrath 'Abu Bakr became so bad that not only did she stop talking to him, she left an explicit instruction that he not attend her funeral.

We read in Sahih al Bukhari hadith 4:325 that Ayesha stated:

"After the death of Allah 's Apostle Fatima the daughter of Allah's Apostle asked Abu Bakr As-Siddiq to give her share of inheritance from what Allah's Apostle had left of the Fai (i.e. booty gained without fighting) which Allah had given him. Abu Bakr said to her, "Allah's Apostle said, 'Our property will not beinherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqah (to beused for charity)." Fatima, the daughter of Allah's Apostle got angry and stopped speaking to Abu Bakr, and continued assuming that attitude till she died. Fatima remained alive for six months after the death of Allah's Apostle".

She died angry with Abu Bakr and Rasulallah (s) warned of the consequences of upsetting Sayyida Fatima, we read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 hadith 61

"Allah's Apostle said, "Fatima is a part of me, and he who makes her angry, makes me angry."

In relation to Imam 'Ali (as), he [Imam 'Ali (as)] testified to hearing these words of Rasulullah (s):

"By him who split up the seed and created something living, the Apostle (may peace and blessing be upon him) gave me a promise that no one but a believer would love me, and none but a hypocrite would nurse grudge against me." Sahih Muslim, English version, Chapter XXXIV, p46 Tradition #141

It is little wonder that we have the testimony of Abu Said al Khudri: "

We recognized the hypocrites by their hatred of Ali."

1. *Fada'il al-Sahaba*, by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v2, p639, Tradition 1086

2. *al-Isti'ab*, by Ibn Abd al-Barr, v3, p47 - *al-Riyad al-Nadira*, by al-Muhibb al-Tabari, v3, p242

From these traditions it is clear that 'Ali (as) was the subject of hatred, and that those that held enmity towards him were in fact only 'pretending' to be Muslims. Upon the death of Rasulullah (s) this hatred became more open. Whilst it is difficult to visualize the events with the passage of some 1400 years, it is clear that the situation deteriorated to such an extent that swords were raised against Imam 'Ali (as), that being the case how difficult can it be to identify and name the enemies of Imam 'Ali (as)? Rasulullah (s) declared that a Muslim would never hate Imam 'Ali, but Ummul Momineen Ayesha and the Sahaba fought the rightly guided khalifa and in the process were responsible for causing the blood shed of thousands. In light of these facts what fatwa will Minhajj al Nasibi and their Imams invoke on Hadhrath Ayesha based on these facts?

"Hatred of 'Ali is such a thing that no good deeds will benefit, whilst love of 'Ali is such a thing that no bad deeds will harm you". taken from Ahlul Sunnah book, al-Nasa'ihal-Kaafiyah page 67

Hatred did not just end there Mu'awiya's hatred of Imam Ali (as) was such that as Khalifa he made the cursing of Imam'Ali (as) a compulsory practice.

Maulana Sayyid Abu'l Ala Maudoodi records this fact in his "Khilafathwa Mulukiyaat". On page 174 he writes:

"Ibn Kathir in al Bidayah records that one unlawful and out rageous practice started by Mu'awiya was that he and his governors would curse Hadhrath 'Ali during the Friday sermon from the Imam's position. This took such an extreme that this practised even took place in the Mosque of the Prophet, in front of the grave of the Prophet (saws), the cursing of the most beloved relative would take place, in the presence of Hadhrath 'Ali's family who would hear this abuse with their own ears." also:

1. Tabari Volume 4 page 188

2. Ibn Athir Volume 3 page 234

3. al Bidayah Volume 8 page 259 and Volume 9 page 80

So, where were the Minhajj and their Deobandi ancestors at this time? Why did they not take a stand and seek to prevent the cursing of Imam' Ali (as)? Why did they not expose Mu'awiya and write eloquent articles like the one that we are refuting here? If despite his being an alleged Sahaba and jurist Minhajj can find it in their hearts to forgive Mu'awiya for cursing Imam 'Ali (as) the Sahaba and cousin of Rasulullah (s), why can they not forgive the Shi'a likewise? If our sin is that we distance ourselves from one group of Sahaba, it is on account of the fact that we love Rasulullah (s) and his Ahl'ul bayt(as). How can we be forced to have a heart that loves the Ahl'ul bayt (as) and at the same time also professes love for their enemies? It is indeed incredible that these Nasibis like Minhajj have a deep affection for the enemies of Ahl'ul bayt (as) such as Mu'awiya, Marwan and Yazeed. The Shi'a are kaffir because they curse the Sahaba, whilst those that cursed, oppressed and killed them are radhiallah-ta'ala-anho! Take the example of Marwan, ask any Deobandi or Salafi about him, and they

willextol him asa pious Sahaba (ra), but Imam of Ahl'ulSunnah, al Muhaddith Shah 'Abdul Aziz declares:

"Love oftheAhl'ul Bayt is a part of religion it is not a Sunnah, love ofAhl'ul Bayt means hating Marwan, and speaking ill of him.He treated Imam Hussain and the other members of Ahl'ulBayt badly,and was their enemy. We denounce this Shaytaan".Fatwa Azizi, page 225

What is of interest is this article appears on a Deobandi Website, and yet the Minhaj al Nasibi have failed to cite even a single opinion of 'Abu Hanifaon those that curse the Sahaba? Why is that? This is because this would go against their beliefs.

Allamah Tahavi whilst setting out Abu Hanifa aqeedah states:

We love the Companions of the Messenger of Allah but we do not go to excess in our love for anyone individual among them nor do we disown any one of them. We hate anyone who hates themor does not speak well of them.

So here based on the fatwa of Imam Numan one who curses the Sahaba may not be a like able person BUT he cannot be deemed a kaffir.

We should also point out that Imam Abu Hanifa must have stated this (i.e. not a like able person) in a context since he had disrespect of Hadhrath Abu Bakr and Hadhrath Umar in his heart,as we learn of...

Imam Abu Hanifa's Disrespect of the Shaykhayn

In Tarikh Baghdad Volume 13 page 373 we read that:

"Imam Abu Hanifa said that Iblis and The Great Truthful one Abu Bakr were equal in Iman".

Allamah Shibli Numani in his book "Imam Abu Hanifa" page 76 (English translation) states:

"There lived in the Imam's lane a miller who was a fanatical Shi'ah and who had, therefore named his two donkeys Abu Bakr and Umar, respectively. One day one of the donkeys kicked the miller so hard in the head that he died. Hearing of this, the Imam said, 'It must be the donkey who hehad named Umar'. On inquiry the guess was found correct".

Please takenote of this reference, one that kicks out is Umar. In addition to his claim that Abu Bakr's Iman was on par with Iblis, what more can we say? Minhajj al Nasibi can collate as may fatwas of takfeer by their Nasibi Imams as they like, but it will be to no avail - since takfeer due to disrespecting of the Sahaba even 'AbuBakr and Umar cannot be proven, andif it can then they should issue takfeer against their beloved Imam Abu Hanifa.

Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have not Deemed Cursing the Sahaba to Constitute kufr

To counter these absurd claims we present the fatwa of Ibn Taymiyyah, the Shaykhul Islam of the Nasibis, who writes:

"And merely abusing some one other than the Prophets does not necessarily make the abuser Kaffir; because some of those who were in the time of the Prophet (i.e. companions) used to abuse one another and none of them was declared kaffir because of this (practice); and (also) because it is not Wajib to have faith particularly in any of the companions; therefore abusing any of them does not detract from the faith in Allah and His books and His messengers and the Last day."As Sarimu l masul", Ibn Taymiyyah, page 579 Published in 1402/1982 by Alam al-Kutub

Mulla Ali Qari in his work of Sharh Fiqh al Akbar whilst setting out Hanafi aqaid on the Sahaba states:

"to abuse Abu Bakr and Umar is NOT Kufr, as Abush Shakuras Salimi has correctly proved in his book, at Tamhid. And it is because the basis of this claim (claim that reviling the Shaykhayn is kufr) is not proven, nor its meaning is confirmed. It is so because certainly abusing a Muslim is fisq (sin) as is proved by a confirmed hadith, and therefore the Shaykhayn (Abu Bakr and Umar) will be equal to the other (Muslims) in this rule; and also if we suppose that some one murdered the Shaykhayn, and even the two sons in law (Ali and Usman), all of them together, even then according to Ahl'ul Sunnah wa al- Jamah, he will not go out of Islam (i.e. will not become kaffir)"

1. Mulla Ali Qari, Sharah al Fiqh al Akba Matba Uthmaan-iyya, Istanbul, 1303 page 130 Matba Muhtabai, Delhi, 1348, page 86 Matba Atab e Hind, India, No date, page 86) Since this conflicts with the new Nasibi thinking, namely those who curse the Shaykhayn are Kaffir, they have tampered with their texts.

The above quote was taken from three (3) editions, printed in India and Turkey. Now a new edition has been printed by Darul Lutubil Ilmiyah, Beirut in 1404/1984, which claims to be the first edition, and from which four pages (including the above text) have been expunged.

Famous Hanafi scholar, Allamah Alaudeen Hanafi in Durr al Mukhthar in his chapter on Imamate page 72 states as follows:

"And whoever turns in the direction of the Kaaba is not a kaffir. Even the Khwaarij are not kaffir, despite the fact that they deem it halaal to take our lives and property. Similarly those that deem it permissible to curse the Sahaba, and deny the concept of seeing Allah (swt), can not be deemed to be kaffir, since their beliefs are based on interpretation and doubt - the fact that they are not held to be kaffirs is proven by the fact that their testimony is accepted whilst those of Non Muslims is not, this proves that they are Muslim".

Hanafi scholar Maulana Abdu Hai Lucknawi in response to a question regarding the Shi'a position on cursing the Sahaba:

"This is bidah (an innovation) not kufr. They believe 'Ali to be superior to the Shaykhayn some state that it is a duty to curse the opponents of 'Ali such as Mu'awiya and Ayesha - this is bidah not kufr, it is based on interpretation, in conclusion to deem the Shi'a kaffir on account of their cursing of the Sahaba contradicts the opinions of the Ulema". Mujmoo al Fatawa Volume 1 pages 3-4

Deobandi scholar Rasheed Ahmad Gangohi in responded to a question on the following topic in this manner:

Q. "Can we deem one that commits the great sin of speaking ill of the Sahaba to be outside the folds of Ahl'ul Sunnah?"

A. Despite this great sin he is not expelled from the Ahl'ul Sunnah wa al Jamaah".al Fatawa Rasheedia, Volume 2 pages 140-141

If a Sunni that speaks ill the Sahabais not a kaffir and remains a member of the Sunni Sect, why is it that the Shi'a by perpetrating this same act become kaffir?

An Appeal to the Deobandi's

The Shi'a have distanced themselves from those Sahaba that subjected the Ahl'ulbayt (as) to ill treatment. Our position is clear and not negotiable.

Maudoodi states in his "Khilafath wa Mulukiyaat" page 233:

"With regards to those that fought 'Ali, 'Ali was more in the right". At the same time he fails to condemn those that opposed him

He says later on page 338 of the same book:

"The majority scholars commenting on 'Ali's stance, deem that he was the rightful Imam, no scholar has said anything different. The Hanafi Ulema agree with the majority scholars that 'Ali was right and his opponents were rebels".

Praising the concept of freedom of speech Maudoodi writes in the same book

"Abu Hanifa felt that if anyone speaks ill of the rightful Imam, swears or intends to kill him, no action can be taken against him, no one can be indicted nor imprisoned UNTIL he practically implements rebellion". [page 263]

We would urge the Minhajj and their fellow Deoband is to contemplate this reference. Allow us to benefit from the freedom of speech that your Imam Abu Hanifa had advocated. The Shi'a do not use foul language nor do we intend on spilling blood BUT we will speak out to defend the truth, why should we be prohibited from condemning Imam 'Ali (as)'s opponents? We refuse to desist from such an approach; we the Shi'a have separated from such individuals. As far as we are concerned the matter is straight forward. If one party is on the path of truth then the other party is on the path of falsehood. If the Sunni

Ulema despite this fact have deemed those in the wrong as worthy of praise since they exercised Ijtihad, for which they shall be forgiven and awarded, ignoring the scores that were killed and failing to apportion blame - then that is their problem not ours. It is indeed regrettable that these 'Ulema' have issued takfeer against the Shi'a because we refuse to join them in this approach.

A Matter to Ponder Over

Before we conclude this section, allow us to analyse this matter from another angle. There is no doubt that the Shi'a are the sole Sect that have in light of established facts been highly critical of the Sahaba, that includes Hadhrath Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. If we are to accept the argument advanced by these fatwas that the Shi'a are kaffir on account of their views of the Sahaba then it makes logical sense that the Shi'a will enter the Fire on the Day of Judgement for holding such a belief.

In an authentic tradition found in the texts of Sunni and Shi'a, Rasulullah (s) said that his Ummah would become divided in to 73 Sects, only one would enter paradise all the others would go into the Fire. On the basis of these fatwas let us for arguments sake conclude that the Shi'a due to their condemnation of the Sahaba are one of the 72 Sects that shall enter the Fire. That leaves us with a further 71 Sects that shall also join the Shi'a in Hell. The difficulty for the Nasibi is the fact that of the remaining 71 Sects all revere the Sahaba, and are not critical of any one of them. Despite the fact that they respect all the Sahaba they shall still enter the Fire on the Day of Judgement.

This proves that respecting or disrespecting the Sahaba is NOT that factor that shall determine whether the adherents of a Sect shall enter Hell on the Day of Judgement! This is clear and logical. We would invite those with open minds to ponder this point carefully and to think twice before being taken in by these three illogical fatwas cited by Minhajj al Nasibi.

Chapter 22

The Wilayat of Ali Ibne Abi Talib (as)

In the book "Al-Kafi fil-Usool, a collection of ahadith attributed to the Prophet SAWS and some of the Imams of the Shi'a, and held in the same esteem amongst Shi'a as Sahih Bukhari is amongst the Ahl us-Sunnah, we find the following..."Whoever sets up another Imam besides 'Ali and delays 'Ali's caliphate is a polytheist." (vol.10 p.55) (this "hadith" refers to everyone who accepts the validity of the caliphates of Abu Bakr, 'Umar and Uthman. The Shi'a claim that the caliphate was stolen from 'Ali, and only he and his descendants have the right to rule the Muslims):

What we are talking about here is the Wilayat (Mastership) of 'Ali ibne Abi Talib (as) over the Ummah after Rasulullah (s). To expand on this we will need to explain that there is a world of difference between the two schools on Imamate. We will In-shallah expand on this in a separate chapter. Suffice it to say, Sunnis believe that the appointment of an Imam is the duty of the public, Shi'as believe it is a duty (RIGHT) of Allah (swt) via the Prophet. We would ask someone rationally, is it really logical to believe that the Prophet (S) did not even bother to leave a successor after him?, When he predicted that the Ummah would be divided, fall into turmoil, fight and kill each other? If the Sahaba thought the issue of Imamate was more important than the Prophet's Janaza (funeral) don't you think he did? Did they care more about future interests of the Ummah than him? That's why we believe that Rasulullah (s) explicitly left a successor and that:

- (1) It was Imam Ali (as)

(2) With this appointment he (s) inherited the same rights over the people as did Rasulullah (s)

(3)The Wilayat of 'Ali is so important that we will be asked about it on the Day of Judgement

We read the following address to Rasulullah (s) in Surah Baqarah verse 120 (Yusuf Ali translation):

Never will the Jews or the Christians be satisfied with thee unless thou follow their form of religion. Say: "The Guidance of Allah,-that is the (only) Guidance." Wert thou to follow their desires after the knowledge which hath reached thee, then wouldst thou find neither Protector nor helper against Allah.

Then in Surah Rad verse 37(Yusuf Ali translation) Allah (swt) speaks to his beloved Messenger (s) as follows:

Thus have We revealed it to be a judgement of authority in Arabic. Wert thou to follow their (vain) desires after the knowledge which hath reached thee, then wouldn't thou find neither protector nor defender against Allah.

Does it make sense that Hadhrath Muhammad (s) after whom no other Prophet shall come, is being rebuked that should he turn his back on his position, and follow falsehood, and leave Allah (swt)'s deen he will have no helper? Was there really a risk that Rasulullah (s) might turn his back on Allah (swt)? We are sure that no Muslim would ever entertain such a thought, then why would he address Rasulullah (s) in this manner? Although the verse was addressing Rasulullah (s) we the Shi'a believe that this was in fact an address to the Ummah at large.

Accordingly we argue that an individual that 'knowingly' is aware of the wilayat of 'Ali and then despite this seeks to ignore it and follow his own desires is on the path of falsehood.

There is no need for the Minhajj to make this an issue of contention with us since many leading Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah in

their commentaries of this verse al Maidah 'Baligh' (5:67) have stated that following the descent of this verse Rasulallah (s) declared the wilayat of 'Ali (as) to the people - that he was the Imam after him (s). It is common sense that any Leader when leaving a post puts into position an individual to succeed him and administer the affairs of the State. Failure to do so will lead to insecurity in the State, uncertainty, confusion and worse still leaves the nation to the mercy of an enemy nation that might take the opportunity and seize power over a leaderless people. Appointment of a successor is the first thing that any 'sensible' leader will do. That is why we believe that in accordance with the guidance of Allah (swt) revealed this verse to Rasulallah (s), to openly declare his successor to the masses who had joined him at the time of the Farewell Pilgrimage. The declaration of Ali's wilayat was to quell the scheming / nefarious planning of the hypocrites. That is why Allah (swt) declared:

"O Apostle! Deliver what has been sent down to you from your Lord; and if you don't do it, you have not delivered His message (at all); and Allah will protect you from the people ... " (Qur'an 5:67).

The following Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have confirmed that the declaration of Ali's wilayat followed this verse:

- Tafseer Mazhari by Thanaullah Panee Pathee Volume 3 page 143
- Tafseer Kabeer Volume 3 page 472 narrated on the authorities of Ibn Abbas, al-Bara Ibn Azib, and Muhammad Ibn Ali.
- Tafseer Fathul Qadheer Volume 2 page 57 by Shaukhani
- Tafseer Durre Manthur under the commentary of verse 5:67

This was clearly that matter that Rasulallah (s) feared that the people would oppose. With the open declaration of Ali's Wilayat all rules / regulations were completed. Deen was completed with the appointment of a successor / a Guide to ensure that the people followed the right path.

We believe that the evidence is so clear that any rational mind will conclude that this was a declaration of Imamate. Nasibis can disagree but let us cite the comments of one of your very own Deobandis scholars, Shah Ismail Shaheed the Indian reformist who introduced the teachings of Abdul Wahab in India. He writes:

"The Imam is the Prophet's successor, the Imam has the same relations with Allah as the Prophet had with Allah. The Imam is the leader, in the same way the Prophet had the right to lead the people, the Imam also has the same rights over the people. We read in Surah Azhab 'The Prophet is a authority to the believers', and the Prophet will be a witness to this fact on the Day of Judgement. The Prophet has rights over the people, as does the Imam, both in this world and the next, which is why the Prophet said 'Don't I have more rights over the people than they have over themselves, to which the people replied 'Yes'. The Prophet then said 'Of whomsoever I am Maula, Ali is his Maula'. This is why Allah says in the Qur'an that on the Day of Judgement you will be called according to your Imam (3:17), and why when Allah says 'And stop they are to be questioned' (37:24), we will be asked about the Wilayat of Ali on the Day of Judgement"*Munsub-e-Imamate, by Shah Ismail Shaheed, p 71*

Shah Ismail was not writing in isolation when he asserted that we would be asked about the Wilayat (Mastership) of Ali (as) on the Day of Judgement.

Numerous Sunni scholars in their commentaries of the verse:

"And stop they are to be questioned" (Qur'an 37:24)- have narrated from Abu Said alKhudri (ra) that he heard the Prophet say that:

"On the Day of Judgement the people will be asked "whether or not they truly accepted Ali as their Wali (Master), as they were instructed by the Prophet to do, or did they ignore it".

al Sawaiq al Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar Haythami, Ch11 subheading 1, as quoted by Wahidi and al Daylami; Faraid al Samtain, by Hamawaini, section 14; Mudham Durar al Samain, by Jamal alDin al Zarandi

Mohib al Tabari, in his "Riyadh al Nadira", records that the Holy Prophet (saww) declared:

"On the Day of Judgement, when the people will be brought together, no one will be able to pass the Bridge, until they have the ticket declaring Ali's wilayat

"Riyadh al Nadira, by Mohib al Tabari, Par3, p 116

Obedience to Imam 'Ali (as

In the book "Obedience to 'Ali is true humility and disobedience to him is disbelief in Allah."(vol.10 p.54)

The Nasibis donot even know what is on their own books, for the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah record the following words of Rasulullah (s): "Whoever obeys 'Ali, obeys me, whoever obeys me, obeys Allah, whoever disobeys' Ali disobeysme, whoever disobeys me, disobeys Allah"

- 1. Kanz ul Ummal, hadith numbers 32973-32976*
- 2. Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 123*
- 3. Riyadh ul Nadira Volume3 page 110*

Chapter 23

The Shi'a Concept of Imamate

Before launching directly into a reply it would be best to first of all set out to our objective readers the concept of Imamate from the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah and Shi'a.

To begin the leading Imam of the Deobandi's Shah Ismail Shaheed states as follows:

"One should remember that there may be some that inherit one, two or three traits with the Prophets, hence Imamate is of different states, some are superior to others, this is 'Absolute Imamate' when an individual shares all the traits of Prophets - his Imamate is superior to all people, the only difference is that he is not a Prophet. We can say, in support of such a person that had Prophethood continued after our Prophet (s) it would have been this person". Taken from Munsub-e-Imamate page 42

Shibli Numani in al Faruq Volume 2 page 96 whilst discussing the topic of Imamate and Jihad states:

"The position of Imamate is in fact the mirror image of the Prophet, an Imam's nature is like that of Prophets".

Both of these renowned Hanafi scholars had said that Imamate was like Prophethood, and the Imam shared characteristics with Prophets, with the exception that he (The Imam) is NOT a Prophet.

Compare these comments to the Shi'a position as vouched for by Muhammad Baqir al-Majlisi in Haq al Yaqeen Volume 1 page 29:

"The position of Imamate is like that of Prophethood".

Can those with open minds show us the difference between the Shi'a and Sunni view points on Imamate based on these comments?

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, Mir Seyyed Shareef in Sharh Muwaf-
faq page 729 states:

"Before discussing the appointment of the Imam it is imperative that we define Imamate. Our Ulema have deemed Imamate to be 'Kingdom' in the spiritual and physical sense...it means to uphold and protect the Ummah, it is succession to Prophethood, its obedience is compulsory on the Ummah".

Similarly Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Ibn Abideen Shami in Fat-
awa Shami Volume 1 page 384 comments:

"Imamate is that Kingdom that is spiritual and worldly, it acts on behalf of Prophethood".

Who Appoints the Imam?

Whilst there is no difference on the importance of having an Imam, the difference lies on the method of appointment. The Shi'a believe Allah appoints the Imam, Sunni's believe this is the right of the Ummah. For the Sunni argument we need to go no further than quote Mulla Ali Qari's book "Sharh Fiqh Akbar", which sets out the madhab of Imam Abu Hanifa, this is what we read in the Chapter "Masala Nusbul Imamah" (Issue of appointment of the Imam):

"It is the majority opinion that there is a duty to appoint an Imam. But there is a difference, as to whether this is Allah's duty or whether this is incumbent on the public. The belief in the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah and Muttazalites is that the duty to appoint an Imam is a duty of the public. In terms of hadith and logic this is a duty of the public. In accordance with this belief, there is a hadith in-Sahih Muslim, narrated by Abdullah ibne Umar 'He who dies without giving bayah to an Imam dies the death of one belonging to the days of jahiliyya'. This is why the Sahaba viewed the appointment of the Imam as so important that they preferred it to attending the Prophet's funeral, because the Muslims need an Imam so that orders can be made on Jihad, and so that Islamic Laws can be implemented"

Taken from Sharh Fiqh Akbar, by Mulla Ali Qari, p 175 (publishers Muhammad Saeed and son, Qur'an Muhall, Karachi

Here lies the difference between the two Sects

1. Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that the Imam is appointment by the People
2. Shi'a believe that Allah (swt) and his Prophet (s) appoint the Imam

It is common sense that the Imam was just not needed after the death of Rasulullah (s) but is 'always needed' because

failure to recognise the Imam of the Time leads to a Muslim dying the death of jahiliyya. At the same time Numani stated that the Imamate is the mirror image of Prophethood. Recognising the Imam saves a Muslim from dying as a Kaffir, and yet when we look at previous Imams from the Banu Umayyad and Abbasid era, can it really be said that recognising these Imams prevented the death of jahiliyya? Can Imams like Mu'awiya, Yazid and Marwan etc be deemed to be the mirror image of Prophethood? Are these Imams who in Shah Ismail's words shared characteristics with Prophet's that made them 'absolute Imams'?

Let us leave the past, what about today, which Imams recognition will prevent us from dying the death of jahiliyya? The Imam is said to be the mirror image of Prophethood, whilst the Imams are the mirror image of American-Israeli policy. And yet the duty is to have an Imam, but there are so many to choose from, and Mullah Ali Qari states in Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 178:

"We are not allowed to have two Imams at any one given time, otherwise disputes shall break out".

As Shi'a we believe that Allah (swt) knows what is best for His servants in the same way he appointed Prophet's to guide mankind, he also appointed Imams to continue the mantle of guidance. We believe that the fallible human being is not competent enough to appoint an Imam that shall represent the Deen on a complete level. Many factors 'influence' appointment.

If one assesses the politics of the world we see regular change, with regards to the selection of people. People are appointed on to different positions. That can be at different levels, at a Committee level, a Council level, a Governmental level. When we choose that person, we do so having a specific expectation, a faith in that individual. Unfortunately the person elected often does not live up to expectation. You become disillusioned with that individual, he has not fulfilled the promises he made during the elections, pledges you relied on when deciding to vote for him.

Man chooses without knowledge of the unseen, he does not know what the future holds. He elects an individual via his own limited capacity, his own limitations. The person elected likewise has limitations, he has limited knowledge, and he is unaware of what will happen in the future.

When Allah (swt) selects an individual who is perfect on all accounts, his knowledge is perfect, he has blessed knowledge; Allah (swt) has endowed him with his treasures such as the Ghayb to help him. We believe that Allah (swt)'s individual is without fault he is not an Alim (learned) he is Aleem (Exalted). When man selects an individual he comes out defective, when Allah (swt) selects an individual he is ma'sum (infallible).

The leader elected by men has weaknesses, he can make mistakes, Allah (swt)'s chosen leader is faultless. The leader elected by men will seek the counsel / advice of others, they are dependent on others for help. Allah (swt)'s leader has no such worries, he is being guided by Allah (swt) alone and does not need to turn to others for assistance.

When the man-made leader comes to power he is frequently subject to stern criticism by his opponents, Allah (swt)'s selected individual is so pious that even his enemies are unable to pick any fault in him.

When people elect their fellow citizens to power they do so in their limited capacity. It is not necessary that they like that individual have factors which have forced them to vote for him, i.e. external pressure such as duress from, family, friends, and powerful figures in the community.

In Feudal Europe and the present third world it is common for landlords to exert pressure on their tenants / subjects to vote for their choice of individual, failure to do so could lead to severe consequences such as loss of employment, home etc. Individuals vote not out of choice but through fear.

People will also take in to account factors such as relationship to the election candidate, they might have some tribal / familial loyalty which forces them to vote in a particular way. On the other hand, when Allah (swt) chooses a leader he does so without considering such factors, neither does he have a family or tribal loyalty, he will not be swayed in this way because as Surah Ikhlas makes clear He (swt) is:

'Lum ya lid wa lum yu lad' ('Neither is he begotten nor has been be gotten')

When man makes his selection he looks at his own problems / situation and he asks himself '**how will my voting this individual benefit me/my family, my business**'. Mans' selection is based on self interest. Allah(swt) has no such self-interest; his concern is for the welfare of the Ummah and individual who will benefit the entire community and not just a class of individuals.

That is why we believe Allah (swt) knows what is best for his people and out of his compassion for us he has appointed Imams to ensure that we are tread the path of salvation in this world and the next.

With the Sunni / Shi'a viewpoint briefly summarised let us now look at the objections that had been raised by Minhajj al Nasibi on the Shi'a concept of Imamate.

Infallibility of the Imams

The Imami Shi'a consider the Imams to be utterly infallible, incapable of even the slightest error.

And by the Shi'a believing that the Imams are infallible how does that make them Kaffir? It would have been better for Minhajj al Nasibi to set out what their aqeedah is on this point. They will no doubt proclaim that Isma (infallibility) is a right bestowed only on Prophets. What they fail to inform the people is there 100% conviction in the authenticity of Sahih al Bukhari means that they cannot even prove the Isma of Rasulullah (s). Isma means a loof from sin, and in Shi'a aqeedah it is deemed to be a right, that was bestowed on Allah (swt)'s Prophet's and after them on the Imams from Ahl'ul Bayt(as). From a logical point we argue that the Imam is that individual that is occupying the position of Rasulullah (s); he is the guide over the nation and hence in the same way the Prophet (s) was ma'sum so are his Imams who have been entrusted the duty to guide mankind. How can the people have faith in an Imam that is capable of making mistakes, whose character is one that does not reflect the seat that he occupies? How can a man capable of mistakes ensure the smooth running of the Islamic State, free from incorrect edicts, ruling setc? This could naturally lead to disastrous consequences and we believe that this would go against the Justice of Allah (swt). Hence we argue that the Imam as the legitimate leader at the helm of the State has to be ma'sum, since he shall rule solely by the rule of law, he shall be untouched by personal views, bribery, corruption and his goal shall be one, that of serving Allah (swt).

Like the Shi'a viewpoint leading Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah have also vouched for the fact that Isma (infallibility) can be bestowed on non Prophets.

Al Muhaddith Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi states in At-Tafhimatu l-Iahiyah Volume 2 page 21:

"No one doubts that truthfulness, purity, piety and good deeds were present in those individuals before they were appointed as Prophets. Similarly non Prophets can also naturally possess such virtues, this is called Isma (infallibility)".

So the question arises 'who are these people (other than Prophet's) that have attained the rank of infallibility. Shah Waliyullah answers this question as follows:

"Finally the Prophet's Waris (Executors) are of three types, those that possess Hikmah (Sagacity, wisdom), Isma (Infallibility) and Qutbiyat Batiniyah (are Spiritual Pivots) they are his Ahl'ul bayt and special people".

At-Tafhimatu l-Iahiyah Volume 2 page 14

Shah Waliyullah then proceeds to expand on the concept of Isma of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) yet further:

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

Turn him ('Ali) wherever the Haqq turns." At-Tafhimatu l-Iahiyah Volume 2 page 22

As his (s) executors, the Imams from the Ahl'ul bayt inherited the knowledge and wisdom of Rasulullah (s). After Rasulullah (s) Imam 'Ali (as) was the yardstick of truth. Shah Waliyullah was an open advocate of the Isma of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) that Minhaj al Nasibi have taken issue with the Shi'a on. His student Mullah Muhammad Moeen Sindhi expanded on this yet further in his discussion on the verse of purity (33:33):

"Whoever has the slightest integrity in him cannot doubt that the hadith and verse refers to the 12 Imams and Leader of Women of Paradise Sayyida Fatima Zahra. There exists no doubt of their infallibility, they are free from sin, in the same way that Imam Mahdi (who is from among them) is Ma'sum - for there are hadith where we are told that he shall tread the path of Rasulullah (s), similarly Shaykh Akbar elaborated on this, as we cited in response to a previous question".

Dhurasthul Bheeb pages 208-209 In connection with this it would be most apt to cite the comments of classical Sunni scholar Fakhraddin Razi states as follows in his discussion of this verse:

"O you who believe! Obey Allah and his Apostle and those in authority among you". Qur'an, Surah Nisa, Verse 59

The type of obedience that Allah (swt) has ordered is unconditional obedience, it must relate to that individual who is ma'sum, if he was non ma'sum and could make mistakes, then Allah (swt) would be telling us to follow such a person and adhere to him...Allah (swt) told us to follow the U l il Umr unconditionally, he MUST be Ma'sum, a fact that is testified to by this verse".

Tafseer al Kabir Volume 3 page 243

Similarly Shah Ismail Shaheed Deobandi whilst elaborating on the comments of his teacher Sayyid Ahmad, states as follows:

"And the protection afforded to Prophets and wise men is called Isma (infallibility), do not assume that to identify spiritual elevation, wisdom, prestige and infallibility in non Prophets contradicts the Sunnah and constitutes bidah".

Seerath Mustaqeem page 43

One should also remind our readers that these Deobandi Hanafis are split into numerous groups one group is "Ishaath

Tauheed Wa'l Sunnah". Its leader Shaykh Hasan 'Ali wan Pachran from Mianwalli, Pakistan also testified to the infallibility of the Imams from the Ahl'ul bayt (as). Discussing the chains of Tassawuf and that of the "Shathreeya order" he states:

"Our infallible Imam Zaynul Abideen (ra)"Fayouzaath ai Hayneeya Ma'roof ba Taua Ibraheemiya page 202

We the Shi'a believe that our Imams as the legitimate guides appointed by Allah (swt) have been bestowed with the virtue of infallibility, that ensures they always tread the path of righteousness. Our belief has been vouched for by leading Sunni Ulema, who have made it clear that Isma is NOT the exclusive right of Prophets. If this aqeedah is kufr then perhaps Minhaj al Nasibi would be so kind as to offer their views on Shah Ismail Shaheed, Shah Waliyullah, Fakhraddin Razi, Shaykh Hasan Ali and Shaykh Akarm. It is only when they get their own house in order and issue verdicts on these individuals who share their aqeedah, that they can then look to the views held outside.

Obedience to the Imam

Hence following them, according to Shi'a doctrine is obligatory on all true Muslims until the Day of Judgement.

Yet again the Nasibi have failed to look at what is in their own books on this matter. First and foremost one must understand that adherence is based on recognition. Once the Imam is recognised, unconditional obedience is afforded to him, for as Shi'a we believe the Imams to be the legitimate protectors of the Deen. On this type of recognition the Ahl'ul Sunnah ascribe to the same belief. Suffice it to say, Maulana Abdul Aziz Fehrawi sheds light on this matter as follows:

"The appointment of the Imam is compulsory, its foundation is based on the fact that Rasulallah (s) said whoever dies in a state where he has failed to recognise the Imam of his time....who dies at a time when the Imam is present and fails to recognise him, or dies when no Imam exists (nevertheless), his death shall be the death of jahiliyya (one belonging to the time of ignorance). We have a hadith in Sahih Muslim by Ibn Umar whoever dies without an Imam dies the death of jahiliyya. In the tradition of Muslim we find these precise words "Whoever dies in state, having not had bayya over his neck shall die the death of one belonging to the time of jahiliyya".

al Nabraas Sharh al aqaid page 512).

To die the death of jahiliyya is definitely kufr. Now that we have addressed this matter we now question these Nasibis, which Imam's recognition is necessary, Mu'awiya, Yazeed, and the Ummayya and Abbaside khalifas, whose bayah is the difference between dying as a Muslim or as a kaffir? Would giving bayya to Yazeed prevent you from dying a kaffir? Accordingly we believe that the rightful Imams are the Ithna Ashariyya Imams, the Shi'a have always given them bayah and believed in their unconditional obedience. The Nasibis can feel happy in having ancestors that gave bayah to Mu'awiya and Yazeed, we will learn on the Day of Judgement whether Allah(swt) such

bayah as one that had protected their ancestors from dying the death of jahiliyya.

The Superior Rank of Imamate

Ayatullah Khomeini asserts in his book, "AlHukumah Al-Islamiyyah", "Certainly the Imam has a dignified station, a lofty rank, a creational caliphate, and a sovereignty and mastery over all the atoms of creation. It is definitely a basic belief in our school of thought, that our Imams occupy a station unattainable by either an angel or a major Prophet.

So here he is stating that the station of the Imams is superior to:

1. Angels
2. Prophets

Are the Imams Superior to Prophets?

The Minhajj al Nasibi have sought to intentionally mislead the facts as a means of issuing takfeer on the followers of the Ahl'ul bayt (as). When we are talking about superiority it is with regards to their role in protecting the Din al Islam. Previous Prophets brought a part of the Deen that was completed by Prophet Muhammad (saww). These Imams are the Imams of the completed Deen the Imams of the Final Messenger hence their role in the protection of the deen is far greater than that of previous Prophets, they are the Imams of the complete Deen al Islam, hence their more superior rank. That is why Khomeini had stated "our Imams occupy a station unattainable by either an angel or a major Prophet". The word 'station' is the key word here, the position / role that they hold at that particular time.

Imam Mahdi (as)'s Station Shall be Superior to that of Prophet Isa (as)

The superior station of Imamate is even acknowledged by Sunni Ulema. Hadith confirm that Prophet Isa (as) will pray Salat BEHIND Imam Mahdi(as) - why? Because he is representing the complete Deen whilst Isa (as) only brought a part of it:

Jalaluddin al-Suyuti mentioned that:

"I have heard some of the deniers of (truth) deny what has been conveyed about Jesus that when he descends will pray the Fajr prayer behind al-Mahdi. They say, Jesus has higher status than to pray behind a non-Prophet. This is a bizarre opinion since the issue of prayer of Jesus behind al-Mahdi has been proven strongly via numerous authentic traditions from the Messenger of Allah, who is the most truthful." And then al-Suyuti goes on narrating some of the traditions in this regard.

See Nuzool Isa Ibn Maryam Akhir al-Zaman, by Jalaluddin al-Suyuti, p56

Also al-Hafidh Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani mentioned that:

"The Mahdi is of this Ummah, and that Jesus (PBUH&HF) will come down and pray behind him.

"Taken from Fat'h al-Bari, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani v5, p362

This is also mentioned by another Sunni scholar, Ibn Hajar al-Haythami, who wrote:

"The Ahlul-Bayt are like the stars through whom we are guided in the right direction, and if the stars are taken away (or hidden) we would come face to face with the signs of the Almighty as promised (i.e., the Day of Resurrection). This will happen when the Mahdi will come, as mentioned in the traditions, and the Prophet Jesus will say his prayers behind him, the Dajjal will be slain, and

then the signs of the Almighty will appear one after another.

"taken from al-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar Ch. 11, section 1 p234) - a Book that was written AGAINST the Shi'a.

Ibn Hajar also quoted Abual-Husain al-Ajiri saying:

The traditions of al-Mustafa (PBUH&HF) on the rising of al-Mahdi has been transmitted via numerous authorities and is more than the level of (being sufficient for) Mutawatir, describing that he is of his Ahlul-Bayt, and will fill the earth with justice, and that Jesus (AS) will come at the same time and he will assist Jesus for killing al-Dajjal in the land of Palestine, and that he will lead this nation and Jesus will pray behind him.

Taken from Abu al-Husain al-Ajiri as quoted in al-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqah, by Ibn Hajar, Ch. 11, section 1, p254

In Mishkat al Masabih the Rasulullah (s) narrates in the Chapter on the descent of Jesus Hadith 2, Volume 4 page 82:

"How will you be when the son of Mary will come down amongst you and your Imam will come from amongst you".

In the commentary of Mishkat, the statement of Sunni scholar / English translator Maulana Fazlul Karim is indeed worthy of note since it backs our argument, he writes under footnote 2363a:

"He is said to be Imam Mahdi behind whom Jesus will pray. Jesus will show by example that he is a follower of Muhammad".

So Minhajj, who will be leading this movement? Imam Mahdi (as) not Isa (as) as his rank as Leader in this circumstance is superior. Now that the truth has been made manifest let us present for the benefit of Minhajj and their Nasibi brethren their viewpoint on infallibility.

Sunni Beliefs, that the 'Infallible' Shaykhayn Were Superior to Rasulullah (s)

Although most Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that infallibility is restricted to the Prophets of Allah (swt) - Peace be upon them all, we should point out that they have traditions that not only suggest that Abu Bakrand Umar were infallible but had a rankfar above Rasulullah (s).

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 8 hadith 108

Umar bin Al-Khattabasked permission of Allah's Apostle to see him while some Quraishi women were sitting with him and they were asking him to give them morefinancial support while raising their voices over the voice of the Prophet. When 'Umar asked permission to enter, all of them hurried to screen themselves. The Prophet admitted 'Umar and he entered, while the Prophet was smiling. 'Umar said, "May Allah always keep you smiling, O Allah's Apostle! Let my father and mother be sacrificed for you!" The Prophet said, "I am astonished at these women who were with me. As soon as they heard your voice, theyhastened to screen themselves." 'Umar said, "You have more right, that they should be afraid of you, O Allah's Apostle!" And then he ('Umar) turned towards them and said, "O enemies of your souls! You are afraid of me and not of Allah's Apostle?" The women replied, "Yes, for you are sterner and harsher than Allah's Apostle." Allah's Apostle said, "O Ibn AlKhattab! By Him in Whose Hands my life is, whenever Satan sees you taking a way,he follows away other than yours

Such is the rank of Umar that Shaythan is unable to follow the way he travels along. One who is untouched by Satan isone who hence is aloof from sin i.e. infallible. Hence inlight of this tradition Umar is infallible in all but name.

Compare this to the troubles that Rasulallah (s) is subjected to by Satan, in Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 4 hadith number 504:

"The Prophet offered a prayer, and (after finishing) he said, "Satan came in front of me trying persistently to divert my attention from the prayer, but Allah gave me the strength to over-power him."

We would urge our Sunni brethren to consider these traditions. Hadhrath Umar is not only Ma'sum (untouched by Satan) but superior to Rasulallah (s) because Iblis does not even stop harassing Rasulallah (s) when he is offering Salat.

In Mishkat al-Masabih under the Chapter dealing with the virtues of Umar Volume 4 hadith 14 we read:

"The Prophet returned from one of the Holy Wars. When he came back a black girl came and said 'O Apostle of Allah! I have taken a vow that if Allah takes you back sound I shall beat this Daf in your presence with a song. The Apostle said "if you have taken a vow then beat, and if not, not". Then she began to beat. Abu Bakr entered while she was beating, There after Ali entered while she was beating. Usman entered while she was beating. There after when Umar entered, she threw the Daf under her buttock and sat on it. The Apostle of Allah replied "O Umar the Devil certainly fears you. I was sitting and she was beating, then Ali entered and she was beating. Then Usman entered and she was beating. When you entered O Umar she threw down the Daf."

Do our opponents actually believe this hadith that so belittles the rank of the Ma'sum Prophet (s)? First and foremost it is shameful for a man to listen to a woman singing. The hadith is therefore suggesting that the Prophet (saww) was indulging in a sin! Then it wants us to believe that Hadhrath Umar was the hero of the hour who brought this activity to an end. Hadhrath Umar saved the Prophet (saww) from the clutches of Shaytan - he had been taken in by the activity, as

were Hadhrath AbuBakr and Hadhrath Ali. There is no other interpretation possible the words of the Prophet "Only Shaythan is afraid of you" would prove that Hadhrath Umar's rank is above that of the Prophet (s).

In relation to the superior rank of 'Abu Bakr, Ibn Hajr records the following in Sawiqh al Muhriqa (Urdu translation page 121)

"Ibn Dhunjuya narrates: Gabriel went to Rasulullah (s) and told him that Allah (swt) had told him to seek the counsel of 'Abu Bakr". In another tradition in the same book on page 251 we read this hadith:

"Allah does not like the fact that Abu Bakr can do any wrong".

What position can we hold of a Sahaba whose rank according to these traditions is such that Allah (swt) cannot tolerate that he commit any wrong doing, a man who Rasulullah is told to seek the counsel of. Again one who commits no wrong is infallible and Rasulullah's seeking his advice clearly indicates his position to be superior to Rasulullah (s).

In addition to these traditions that we have cited we should also point out that their own Nasibi Deobandi Ulema have extolled the Sahabas virtues above those of Ulil Uzum Prophets!

Maulana Muhammad Na'eem Lucknawi declares the following:

"Hadhrath Abu Bakr's superiority cannot be matched by Musa or Isa" Kitab ay Shahaadah by Maulana Muhammad Na'eem Lucknawi, Volume 2 page 11 (Kurzan Press Publishers)

Do we need to say anything further on this topic?

Superiority of the Imams over the Angels

The Nasibi's by citing the comments of Khomeini are of course seeking to suggest that the view point that man can be superior to Angels is kufr. Yet again the Nasibis do not even know their own aqeedah is that man can have a rank superior to Angels.

Suffice it to say that Rasulullah (s) had stated:

"In the eyes of Allah, the momin is superior to certain angels".

In his explanation of this hadith classical Hanafi scholar, Mullah 'Ali Qari declares: "

Thayabi has commented that this hadith means that ordinary people can be superior to ordinary Angels and superior people are superior to ordinary and superior angels in the same way that superior angels are superior to ordinary men". Mirqat Hadith Mishkat page 510 hadith number 5

We are sure that not even Minhajj would seek to openly deny that the Imams of the Ahl'ul bayt(as) are superior individuals. Hence in accordance with this hadith their rank is superior to that of Angels.

To expand on this further, we shall cite the comments ascribed by the renowned Sunni Sufi scholar Ali bin Usman Al Jullabi Hujwiri in Kashf al Majhub the oldest Persian script on Sufism (translated by Prof Reynold Nicholson). He writes in the Chapter "Discourse on the Superiority of the Prophets and Saints to the Angels" as follows:

"The whole community of orthodox Muslims and all the Sufi Shaykhs agree that the Prophets and such of the Saints are guarded from sin (mahfuz) and are superior to the angels" Page 239.

"...the angels are equal to the Prophets in knowledge but not in rank. The angels are without lust, covetousness and evil; their nature is devoid of hypocrisy and guile, and they are instinctively obedient to God; whereas lust is an impediment in human nature; and men have a propensity to commit sins and to be impressed by the vanities of this world; and Satan has so much power over their bodies that he circulates with blood in their veins; and closely attached to them is the lower soul (nafs) which incites them to all manner of wickedness. Therefore one whose nature has all these characteristics and in spite of the violence of his lust renounces this world, and though his heart is still tempted by the Devil, turns back from sin and averts his face from sensual depravity in order to occupy himself with devotion and persevere in piety and mortify his lower soul and contend against the Devil, such a one is in reality superior to the angel who is not on the battle field of lust, and is naturally without the desire of food and pleasures and has no care for wife and child and kinfolk, and need not have recourse to means and instruments, and is not absorbed in corrupt ambitions". (page 240)

"...in short, the elect among the true believers are superior to the elect among the angels and the ordinary believers are superior to the ordinary angels. Accordingly those men who are preserved (ma'sum) and protected (mahfuz) from sin are more excellent than Gabriel and Michael, and those who are not thus preserved are better than the Recording Angels (hafaza) and the noble scribes (kiram-I-katibin)" (page 241)

So Hujwiri is stating:

1. There is an ijma amongst Ahl'ul Sunnah that Prophets and some Saints are superior to Angels
2. The superiority is because, whilst Angels have no nafs and cannot sin, the individual who has control over his nafs and commits no sin has succeeded - fighting the shackles of worldly desires
3. The Head of believers is superior to the Head of Angels

4. The individual who is "ma'sum" and "mahfuz" ranks higher than Gabriel (as) and Mikhail (as).

According to Hujwiri one who controls Nafs is superior to Angels, this being the case what about that individual that has not just controlled, but SOLD his nafs for the pleasure of Allah (swt)?

"And among men there is who sells himself (soul) seeking the pleasure of God; and verily, God is affectionate unto His (faithful) servants" (2:207).

So who is this verse praising?

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Abdul Hamid Ghazzali writes the following in his most famous work 'Ihya Ulum id din records that:"

The Quraish youths one day surrounded the house of the Prophet in order to kill him. Hadhrath Ali in order to save his life, thought his life insignificant and went to the bed of the Prophet. God then addressed Gabriel and Michael and said: 'I have established brotherhood among you and gave you equal period of life. Who is there among you who can sacrifice his life for another?' Both of them preferred to save his own life. God then said to them: 'Why could you not show example like Ali? I have established brotherhood between him and Muhammad, and Ali is spending the night by lying upon the bed of Muhammad in order to save the life of the latter. Go to the earth and save him from his enemies. Gabriel began to protect him keeping near his head and Michael near his feet. Gabriel said to Ali 'blessed you are, blessed you are. There is no comparison with you. God is taking boast of you before the angels. God then sent this revelation 'There is a man among men who sacrifices his life in search for the pleasure of Allah' -2:207" *Ihya Ulum id din*, by Abdul Hamid Ghazzali, Vol 3 p 237 - English translation by Maulana Fazal Karim

Other Sunni scholars have also recorded this event in exactly the same way:

- Tafseer al Kabir, by Fakhr ad Din al Razi, v 2 p 189;
- Noor ul Absar,p 86
- Hakim al Mustadrak,v 3 p 4
- Ghayatul Maryam, p 344 — 345
- Tafseer e Qurtubi, v 3 p 347
- Asadul Ghaibafe Marifatil As Sahaba, v 4 p 25
- Tafseer Nishapuri (Allama Nishapuri) , v 1 p 281
- Kifaytul Talib, p 114
- Zhakhia al Uqba, p 88

In this tradition both Gabriel (as) and Mikhail (as) the highest ranking Angels are testifying to the superiority of Imam Ali(as) over them, so has the Shi'a aqeedah not been proven or are our opponents going to accuse these great Angels of committing kufr as well?

Do the Imams have Control Over the Atoms of the Universe?

"The Imam has a dignified station, a lofty rank, a creational caliphate, and a sovereignty and mastery over all the atoms of creation"..

By citing this reference the Minhajj al Nasibi are suggesting that control of atoms constitutes divinity. To suggest that this is divinity is absurd, for we believe that Allah (swt) gives this powerful to his chosen Servants. If only our opponents had bothered to examine the contents of the Holy Qur'an.

The Great Book informs us of the miracles of the Prophets of God.

"And what is that in thy right hand, O Moses? He said: "This is my staff. On it, I lean, and with it, I beat branches for my sheep, and in it I find other uses". God said: "Cast it down, O Moses!" He cast it down, and behold! It became a snake, slithering. God said: "Grasp it and fear not. We shall return it to its former state. And draw thy hand to your side, it will come forth white without harm. That will be another miracle." (ch. 20. vs. 17-22).

This means that the dead cells that composed the rod of Moses were transformed into living cells. Then those living cells miraculously went back to dead cells.

In chapter Al-Shu'ara, we read the following words of the Almighty:

"We revealed to Moses: Strike the sea with thy staff. It parted, and each part was like a huge mountain." (ch. 26, v.64)

Does this not mean that God made the sea obedient to Musa (as) to such a degree that Moses was able to divide the water of

the sea into two solid parts, each of them as huge as a mountain in height and size?

The Qur'an Informs Us Of Hadhrath Isa (as) in Al- 'Imran, weread that the Almighty informed us about Jesus:

"And we will make him a messenger to the children of Israel (with this message): I come to you with a sign from your Lord. Lo! I fashion for you out of clay the likeness of a bird, and breathe into it, and it becomes a bird, by Allah's leave. I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I raise the dead by Allah's leave ... "(ch. 3, v.49)

Here we see that the Almighty enabled Isa (as) to transform a piece of clay into a living bird that could fly like other birds. Is this the work of Moses or Jesus? Would the Qur'an invite us to deify someone other than God?

With regard to the Prophet Muhammad (s), we read God's word in the chapter of The Moon:

"The hour (of judgement) is near, and the moon has been split. But if they see a sign, they turn away and say: This is prolonged magic." (ch. 54, vs. 1-2)

This verse informs us that Allah split the moon in response to His Messenger Muhammad's prayer, and this never happened before the time of Muhammad.

Ibn Hisham reported similar to this: "Rukanah Al-Mutalibi was the strongest man in Mecca. He met the Messenger outside Mecca and the Messenger invited him to Islam. Rukanah said: "If you can prove that you are a true messenger, I will follow you." The Messenger said: "What do you say if I wrestle you down? Will that make you believe that I am a true prophet?" Rukanah said: "Yes." The Prophet wrestled him down twice. Rukanah said: "Muhammad, this is really amazing. Did you really wrestle me?" The Prophet said: "I will show you more amazing things than this if you obey God

and follow myway." Rukanah said: "What is it?" The Prophet said: "I will call this tree which you are looking at, and it will come to me." Rukanah said: "Call it", and the Prophet called it. The tree came until it stood in front of him. The Prophet said to it: "Go back to your place," and it went to its original place.*Ibn Hisham, Al-Seerah al-Nabawiyyah part 1, page391*

These miracles that occurred in response to prayers of the Messenger of God testify, as documented in the Qur'an, that Allah empowers His great servants to perform miracles by His permission. In other words, He responds to the prayers of His Messengers by creating miracles.

What happened through the prophets does not indicate that they had any touch of divinity. On the contrary, it testifies that those prophets were true servants of God. They ascended to the highest degree of servitude to Him, and that their obedience to Him was absolute. Had they been otherwise, they would not have been able to perform any miracles, and no prayer by them would have been answered. They obeyed God completely and He responded to their prayers. The Authority that Allah has given to them is authority via which atoms shall submit to them. Ayatollah Khomeini nor any other leading Shi'a scholars believe that the Imams of Ahl Al Bayt without the will of Allah can do anything or change the course of nature.

The Creator GIVES authority to his Faithful Servants. They do NOT act of their own accord, everything they do is by the Will of Allah (swt). This Authority is given to them by Allah (swt) because of their purity, their obedience, their striving in the path of Allah, their knowledge, their merits, virtues and their complete submission to the will of Allah.

Does Minhajjal Nasibi think that Allah will not respond to their prayers if they pray to Allah to change the natural course?

1. Did Allah not make the moon obedient to Prophet Muhammad's command?

2. Did Allah not make the sea obedient to Moses command?
3. Did Allah not make death obedient to the command of Jesus?

Yes! It was Allah behind all these happenings but the command was from the servants of Allah.

Isa (as) said:"

..by Allah's leave. I heal those born blind, and the lepers, and I raise the dead by Allah's leave ... " (ch. 3,v.49) We believe that the Imams from Ahl'ul bayt (as) can also with Allah's leave make every atom submit to them, in the same way that the dead cells in the rod of Musa (as) were turned into living cells.

No doubt the Minhajj will seek to convince their Nasibi flock that this power is only vested in Prophet's (peace be upon them all) - we suggest that they take a closer examination of the Qur'an. Allah (swt) gives this power to the Servant of Prophet Sulayman (as):

"The One with whom was just a part of the Knowledge of the Book said: 'I shall bring it to you within the twinkling of an eye!' Then when (Solomon) saw (the throne) set in his presence, he said: 'This is by the grace of my Lord! to test me whether I am grateful or ungrateful!'" (Qur'an 27:40).

A Non Prophet was able to transport the atoms inside of the throne of Bilqis before Hadhrath Sulayman within the twinkling of an eye. He had a control over these atoms, this does not mean that this faithful Servant was Allah (swt)! How did he attain that feat? Simple the verse states he had a 'partial' knowledge of the book. If one with partial knowledge can obtain control over the atoms, what power do you think is possessed by Imam Ali (as) who has a complete knowledge of the Book? As the Sahaba and Hafiz of the Qur'an Ibn Masud himself testified:

"The Holy Qur'an has outward and inward meanings, and Ali Ibn Abi Talib has the knowledge of both." *Hilyatul Awliyaa*, by Abu Nu'aym, v1, p65

If Imam Ali possessed a complete knowledge of the Book as is vouched by Ibn Masud and other traditions then he, by the will of his Creator, had the ability to control the atoms of the Universe.

Do the Imams Possess Knowledge of the Unseen?

The Nasibi had cited chapters from Usul Kafi to 'prove' that Shi'a are kaffir.

The Imams are thought to have absolute and infinite knowledge, despite what Allah says in the Qur'an; "Verily the knowledge of the Hour is with Allah (alone). It is He who sends down rain, and it is he that knows what is in the wombs. Nor does anyone know what it is that he will learn tomorrow, nor does anyone know in what land he is to die. Verily with Allah is full knowledge and He is acquainted (with all things)"(31:34) This incredible belief that the Imams know the unseen can be amply attested by the following chapter headings in Al-Kafi fil-Usool. 1) Chapter: The Imams have knowledge of All that was given to the angels and the Prophets. (Al-Kafi p.255) 2) Chapter: The Imams know when they will die, and they only die by their choice. (Al-Kafi p.258) 3) Chapter: The Imams have knowledge of the past and future; and nothing is hidden from them. (Al-Kafi p.260) Clearly, the book Al-Kafi fil Usool contains such extreme statements of kufr (disbelief) and shirk (polytheism) that it alone is sufficient to push anyone who believes in it into the Hellfire for eternity. Yet Ayatullah Khomeini states that the sum total of his religion is contained in it, saying: "Do you think it is enough for our religious life to have its laws summed up in Al-Kafi and then placed upon a shelf?" (Al-Hukumah Al-Islamiyyah p.72)

What is Ghayb?

Yet again the Minhajj have used deception citing an isolated verse on Ghayb without examining the whole issue. The original meaning of "Ghayb" in Arabic is "that which has been concealed", and it is with this meaning which has appeared in the Holy Qur'an (4:34, 12:52, etc.)

It's the knowledge of something hidden. Hidden can be in several ways. Something you can't:

1. See
2. Hear
3. Comprehend

Something beyond your understanding can also constitute Ghayb (hidden) its beyond your comprehension. We shall cite an example:

You present a young child with a line in Arabic, he can't read Arabic for him its Ghayb, hidden its beyond his comprehension.

You present a second child with that same line, he can read it, why? Because he has read Arabic, but if you ask him to interpret the MEANING he cannot, he can read but not understand the words, for this child the meaning is Ghayb.

You present the same line to someone who has studied Tafseer of the Qur'an, he can read it, translate it and even provide a commentary to it.

Same line three different responses. What is Ghayb to one person is not Ghayb to another, how are the keys of Ghayb unlocked via Ilm (Knowledge). We will provide another example, 'is knowledge of tomorrow's weather not Ghayb? Is it not hidden?' This being the case how is it that science has developed to such an extent that weather reports can tell us the

weather, temperatures etc, not just tomorrow but for the entire week? Simple because this Ghayb has been unlocked via knowledge. If the keys of Ghayb can be unlocked by normal fallible scientists, don't you think Allah (swt) would also equip his representatives, messengers, Imams to the keys of Ghayb on a bigger level?

The shameless Nasibis had cited this verse as 'proof that Shi'as are kaffir'.

"Verily the knowledge of the Hour is with Allah (alone). It is He who sends down rain, and it is he that knows what is in the wombs. Nor does anyone know what it is that he will earn tomorrow, nor does anyone know in what land he is to die.

Verily with Allah is full knowledge and He is acquainted (with all things)"(31:34)

Another verse Nasibis quotes against Shi'as is this one (we were somewhat taken aback when Minhajj al Nasibi didn't quote it):

"With Him are the Keys of the Ghayb; non knows them but He." (Qur'an 6:59)

According to the Minhajj the Shi'a attribute this power of Ghayb to their Imams hence they are kaffir. If they are simply going to argue that their prosecution case has been proven by these verses suggesting only Allah (swt) has knowledge of Ghayb and he gives it to none, then kindly explain to me why it is that the Holy Prophet (S) predicted future events? They need to examine Sahih al Bukhari under the chapter Bab al Fitan, it is replete with predictions of future events, afflictions on the Sahaba, the signs of the Day of Judgement the coming of al Mahdi (as), how could the Prophet (S) say these things if we are to rely on the verse that only Allah (swt) has knowledge of Ghayb?

We do not doubt that the knowledge of the unseen belongs to the Creator and in that there is no doubt. It however also needs to be pointed out that Allah (swt) gives this knowledge to his servants.

Rasulullah (s) had declared:

"All the keys of the Universe have been laden onto a horse and have been given to me".Sharh Zurqani Volume 5 page 360, Beiru edition

We also cite another tradition:

"Rabiya bin Kabnarrates that he was helping Rasulallah (s) perform Wudhu, Rasul said 'Rabia, ask of me whatever you wish'. Rabia said 'I ask that I am in Paradise with you'. Rasul (s) said'is that all you want, do you want anything else?' Rabia said' I don't require anything else'. With that Rasulallah (s) said, 'fight your nafs, worship excessively and help me".

In his commentary of this tradition Deobandi scholar Maulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani states:

"Rasulullah's stating 'Ask' for something without restriction,points to the fact, that Allah (s) had given him (s) from his treasures,the power to'spend' and to distribute this right. From this our Imams have deduced one virtue given to Rasulallah (s) was that whatever he wants,or whatever others ask of him can be provided for, by the Will of Allah (swt).Fath'al Muhum, Sharh Muslim Volume 2 page 96

Similar comments on this hadith have also been echoed by Mulla Ali Qari al Hanafiin his Sharh Mishkat Volume 2 page 322 and al Muhaddith Abdul Haqq Dehlavi Ashiat al Lamaath Volume1 page 425.

We the Shi'a believe that Rasulallah (s) and the Imams of Ahl'ul bayt (as) as the Chosen of Allah (swt) have been given

the Keys of Allah (swt). One such key is the power of Ghayb. This does NOT in any way mean that Allah (swt) has retired and left administration of the Universe to them (Allah Forbid), they have been given the knowledge such as Ghayb to the extent that they need to do so as to carry out their duties. No Sunni or Shi'a worships anyone other than Allah (swt), we deem our Imams to be the Faithful Servants of Allah (swt) selected by Allah (swt) to guide the people to the right path.

Of relevance here are the comments of Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi, whilst discussing God gifted powers bestowed on Saints in Tafseer Azizi page 113, Part "An Meem" states:

"Those Saints that Allah (swt) has selected to guide people were given powers by the Creator, so that that the needy could turn to them for help, they turn to them to resolve their problems, whatever they desire is resolved by them, from their lips they recite the chant 'turn to us and we shall answer your prayers'".

Allah (swt) undoubtedly holds the keys of Ghayb as stated in the Qur'an, BUT Allah (swt) in other verses makes it clear that Allah (swt) gives this powers to his elects.

We read in Surah Jinn verses 26-27:

"He (alone) knows the Unseen nor does He make anyone acquainted with His Mysteries, Except an apostle whom He has chosen: and then He makes a band of watchers march before him and behind him

"In his commentary of this verse Sunni scholar Abdullah Yusuf Ali under footnote 5749 makes these crucial comments:

The Unseen has two aspects. The relative Unseen is so with reference to a particular person, because of the intervention of Time, Space, or particular circumstances. For example, I cannot see today a house which I saw last year, because it has since been pulled down. Or I cannot in Lahore see the "Gateway of India" in

Bombay, although any one in Bombay can see it. Or I cannot see the satellites of Jupiter with the naked eye, though I can through a telescope. But the Absolute Unseen, the Absolute Mystery, is something which no creature can know or see, except in so far as Allah reveals it to him. And Allah reveals such things to the extent that is good for men, through His chosen messengers, among whom the greatest is Muhammad. The exact time of the Hour of Judgment has not been so shown, because we must not wait for it, but live as if it is to beat this minute. See last note and next note, and the references there.

So the Absolute Unseen is the sole right of Allah (swt) BUT Allah (swt) delegates this power to his elect. Yusuf Ali had stated that this knowledge is given to Messengers of Allah (swt), we argue that this favour is also extended to the Imams from Ahl'ul bayt(as) as Allah (swt) has made them Guides over the Ummah.

The Holy Qur'an tells about the knowledge and the intercession of the Prophet Muhammad and his rightful successors that:

"Who can intercede with Him except the cases He permits? He knows what is in front of them and what is behind them, and they encompass nothing of His knowledge except what He will." (Qur'an 2:255)

We the Shi'a deem this to refer to the Prophet and the Imams. The verse shows that the core/keys of the Knowledge of Ghayb is with Allah, but He may release "a news of Ghayb" to the one He wills.

To give a simple example, consider a person who looks at a monitor that displays some part of a database located in the hard drive of a computer. The user can retrieve any part of this database and see it on the monitor. But the whole database is always in the computer and not in the user's head. Furthermore, the user is unaware of any real-time modifications that

may happen to this data base and the formulas behind the modifications.

The Actual Shi'a Viewpoint

We believe that Allah (swt) let the Prophet and Imams know whatever they needed to know. It is by the will of Allah (swt) he gives it to them, they don't possess it exclusively! We read:

"He possesses the Ghayb and He does not disclose His Ghayb to anyone except to such a Messenger as He is well-pleased with." (Qur'an 72:26-27)

From the above verse, it is evident that although Allah alone possesses the withheld knowledge (Ghayb), but He may disclose a news from it to Prophet Muhammad (PBUH&HF). On the other hand, Prophet Muhammad transferred whatever he was reached from the news of "Ghayb" to those who qualified, as the following verse testifies:

"And he (Muhammad) is not niggardly the Knowledge of the Unseen." (Qur'an 81:24)

Therefore, if the news of Ghayb reached to the Prophet Muhammad (and consequently the Imams of Ahlul-Bayt), it is only because it was given to him by Allah. It is for this reason that according to Qur'an the messengers are all instructed to tell people that they do not possess the Knowledge of Ghayb of their own, for it is reached to them by Allah only as He wishes.

In Usul a-Kafi, it is narrated that:

Ammar al-Sabati said: I asked Abu Abdillah (Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq) concerning if Imam knows al-Ghayb (Unseen). He replied: "No, but when he wishes to know something, Allah causes him to know that." (Usul al-Kafi, Kitab al-Hujjah, Tradition #666)

Shaikh al-Mufeed (d. 413/1022) one of our great classical scholars said: "

... Saying that they (Prophet and Imams) possess the knowledge of Ghayb should be refuted as being something clearly incorrect, because the attribute of this can only be for someone who possesses the knowledge of (all) things within himself, not the knowledge obtained from another. And this can only be for Allah, to whom belong Might and Majesty. All Imams agree on this except those who deviated from them and are called Mu-fawwidah and extremists (al-Ghulat)."Awa'il al- Maqalaat, p38

We need to stress that neither the prophets nor Imams ever claimed that they have all the knowledge within themselves. Obviously they did not know those of information that was "hidden" to them. However, this does not mean that whatever they knew is "visible" to us as well. The information, which is considered to be "hidden" to us, may be "visible" to them. Thus the visibility of knowledge is relative to the person

Those with a Knowledge of the Book Can Unlock the Secrets of Ghayb

The keys to the Ghayb are provided by Allah (swt) to those who have attained a knowledge of the Book. The Holy Qur'an mentions that at the time of Prophet Solomon (Sulayman), a person in the name of Asaf, who was the Minister of Solomon and had only a very small part of "the Knowledge of the Book", was able to bring the throne of Queen Bilqis from another place of the world within the twinkling of an eye:

"The One with whom was just a part of the Knowledge of the Book said: 'I shall bring it to you within the twinkling of an eye!' Then when (Solomon) saw (the throne) set in his presence, he said: 'This is by the grace of my Lord! to test me whether I am grateful or ungrateful!'" (Qur'an 27:40).

Here a non Prophet was able to transport the throne that was Ghayb (hidden), and bring it before Hadhrath Sulayman(as).

As stated in Verse 27:40 of Qur'an, the one who possessed a small part of "the Knowledge of the Book", was able to unlock Ghayb and bring the throne of King Bilqis from another place of the world within the twinkling of an eye. So those who have the whole "Knowledge of the Book" should be able to do more. In that, there is no doubt, because Allah (swt) says in Surah Naml verse 75:

"And there is nothing concealed (Ghayb) in the heaven and the earth that is not contained in this Book" - look at the Arabic not the watered down translations! All Ghayb is contained in the Book, so he who has knowledge of the inner and outer meanings of the Qur'an can also attain the power of Ghayb.

Ibn Mas'ud said:

"The Holy Qur'an has outward and inward meanings, and Ali Ibn Abi Talib has the knowledge of both."

In addition contemplate these words of Imam Ali (as):

"Ask me about the Book of Allah, because there is no Ayah but that I know whether it was revealed at night or in daytime, on the plain or in the mountain"History of the Khalifa's who took the right way by Jalaladeen Suyuti, English translation by Abdassamad Clarke, p 194

The Deobandi Hanafi scholar Shah Ismail Shaheed extolled by the Wahabis expands on this point to an even greater depth:

"Imamate is the Shadow of the Prophethood. The Imam's leadership is openly declared. Whereas history provides evidence of Saints that remained silent, the Imam announces whatever powers he possesses as Imam Ali did when he declared 'I am the Siddiq al Akbar (The Great Truthful One) and whoever declares this after me is a liar and I am the talking Qur'an".*Munsub-e-Imamate by Shah Ismail Shaheed page 69*

The Imams 'Inherited' the Knowledge of the Unseen from Rasulallah (s)

This incredible belief that the Imams know the unseen can be amply attested by the following chapter headings in Al-Kafi fil-Usool.1) Chapter: The Imams have knowledge of All that was given to the angels and the Prophets. (Al-Kafi p.255)

There is nothing objectionable here since we believe that the Imams of Ahlul bayt(as) are the true representatives of Rasulallah (s) they inherited his knowledge in the same way Prophet's inherited knowledge from one another. We believe that the Ahl'ul bayt inherited knowledge from the Holy Prophet (S) in their capacity as Was is (inheritors) of his blessed knowledge. He who inherits the Holy Prophet (s) mission also inherits the same virtues, such as power over limited Ghayb and it is also common sense that that the person who inherits that mission also executes that mission, which is why the Prophet (s) declared Ali (as) to be his Wasi (executor) and Waris (inheritor).

The Holy Prophet once in the presence of his companions said to Ali (as), "You are my brother and inheritor", when the Companions asked what previous Prophet's had left as inheritance, he replied "The Book of God and the teachings of that Prophet"*taken from Riyadh al Nadira, Vol 3 p 123; IzalatulKhia (Urdu translation), by Al Muhadith Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi, Vol 1 p 444*

As further evidence of the inherited power of Ghayb, we shall cite this incident recorded by the renowned Hanafi scholar Abdul Rahman Jami.:

"During the Battle of Sifeen, the army under the command of Ali were unable to find any water. There was a church nearby and Ali went there to ask the people inside where water could be obtained from. They replied that water could only be found several miles away. The army then asked Ali if they could go and drink from it,

Ali told them not to worry. The army began to travel west, all of a sudden he stopped and pointed to the ground and told the army to start digging there. They began to dig, and they found a big stone, Ali (as) told them to lift the stone, but they were unable to do so. Ali, then pulled the stone out with his hand, and fresh water began to spurt out of the ground. A Christian priest had been watching the episode, he went up to Ali and asked: 'Are you a Prophet?' to which Ali replied 'No', the priest then asked 'Are you an Angel?', Ali replied 'No'. The Priest then said 'You are not a Prophet or Angel, so what are you?'. Ali replied 'I am a wasi of the Seal of all Prophet's, Muhummudal Mustapha'. The Priest then said 'Take out your hand so that I can embrace Islam'. Ali told him what to say (i.e. the Shahada) and the Priest then said the following "I testify there is no God but Allah. I testify that Muhummud is the Prophet of Allah, and I testify that Ali is the wasi of the Prophet Muhummud"*taken from Shawahid un Nubuwwa, by Abdul Rehman Jami, (Urdu edition printers Maktaba Nabavi, Gunjbaksh Rd, Lahore), p 287*

Clearly the existence of the spring was Ghayb but Allah (swt) had unlocked the key in this regard on account of Maula Ali (as)'s position as the Wasi of Rasulullah (S).

Ghayb Attributed by Ahl'ul Sunnah to Hadhrath Umar

What amuses us the most is that whilst issuing takfeer on the Shi'as for holding this belief they list this power Ghayb as one of the miracles of Hadhrath Umar! Ibn Taymiyya Imam of the Wahabi Nasibis records the following: ?

"Umar ibn Al Khattab once sent out an army and assigned a man named Sariah as its leader. Whilst Umar was giving a khutbah he shouted out while still on the Minbar: O Sariah the mountain! Later a scout from the army came to Madina. When Umar asked him the news of the army, he said, O Leader of the believers, we met the enemy and were being defeated. Suddenly there was someone screaming: O Sariah the mountain! So we put our backs to the mountain, then Allah defeated them. This is narrated with a good i.e. Hassan chain of narration)" (Taken from the criterion by Ibn Taymiyya page 145

Suyuti also records this in Tarikh ul Khulafa under the Chapter "The miracles of Umar".

Umar according to this narration has powers of Ghayb, he can fore see a calamity about to befall his army, despite the fact that it is hidden from his eyes - if Sunni's record such an event it is a miracle, if Shi'as attribute such powers to their Imams they are Kaffir! Is this not clear hypocrisy?

Chapter 24

The Shi'a Concept of Taqiyyah

One other Imami Shi'a doctrine that must be related is the doctrine of Taqiyyah, or dissimulation,(i.e. calculated deception). In support of this doctrine of deception, the Shi'a attribute the following to Abu Abdullah (Ja'far as Sadiq): "Nine tenths of religion is Taqiyyah (dissimulation), hence one who does not dissimulate has no religion." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.110) "He who conceals his religion has saved it, and he who makes it public has destroyed it." "A believer who does not dissimulate is like a body without a head." (Tafseer al-Askari) "Mix with them (i.e. non-Shi'a) externally but oppose them internally." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.116)

The Actual' Definition of Taqiyyah

Taqiyyah means 'concealing one's religion or faith due to fear, but in one's heart, the person must believe in the religion s/he is concealing'. In other words it is a form of self-defence that encompasses defending one's life, property, esteem and beliefs. According to Shariah, if a person is caught up between two hardships and one of them is intolerable, then to save one's self from the bigger hardship, one should tolerate the smaller one. Therefore, Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Allamah Fakhruddin Razi wrote

When faced with two hardships, one should go through the smaller one to save one's self from the bigger one.

This is a recognized fact. Tafseer-e-Kabir, Volume 5, Page 746-750, published Istanbul

In the same Tafseer, Volume 2, Page 746, Publishers Dar-ul-Taba Istanbul, Razi writes

For a momin, Taqiyyah is allowed till the day of Judgement. And this is the right act, for the reason that using self-control to defend oneself against a hardship is a necessity.

This comment of Razi can also be found in "Libab-ul-Tawil", Volume 1, Page 283, Publishers Altaqdeem Cairo.

If speaking the truth can cause a man to lose his life, property or esteem, then it is a natural instinct that he seek to protect those things, one can, and in some cases, one has to refrain from stating the truth. Islam claims to be the religion of nature, one that in times of desperate need allows its adherent to even eat the meat of dead animal or pork.

He hath only forbidden you dead meat and blood and the flesh of swine and that on which any other name hath been invoked besides that of Allah but if one is forced by necessity without wilful disobedience nor transgressing due limits then is he guiltless. For Allah is Oft-

Forgiving Most Merciful.Surah Al Baqara, Ayah 173;
translieration of Abdullah Yusuf Ali

Taqiyyah Proven from the Qur'an

It is an irrefutable fact that the use of Taqiyyah can be proved from both Qur'an and the sayings of Prophet Mohammed (S). All the prophets(A.S),the Imams (A.S) and others pious people have advised to perform Taqiyyah. Following are some Ayahs from Qur'an to prove our case:

First Verse

Anyone who after accepting faith in Allah utters unbelief except under compulsion his heart remaining firm in faith but such as open their breast to unbelief on them is Wrath from Allah and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty"Surah An-Nahal, verse 106 transliteration by Abdullah Yusuf Ali

All Muslim scholars agree that this verse descended in relation to the suffering of Ammar bin Yasir (ra). Allamah Jalaladeen Suyuti in his commentary of this verse states:

The non-believers once caught Ammar-bin-Yaser (ra) and they forced him to say praise their false gods and to condemn Prophet Muhammad(s). They forced him to an extent that Ammar bin Yasir (ra) gave in and exceeded to their demands. After that, when he returned to the Prophet Mohammed (s), Ammar (A.S) narrated the whole story to him (s). Prophet Muhammad (S) asked him, how do you feel in your heart? To which Ammar(A.S) replied, I am fully content with Allah's religion in my heart. To this Prophet Mohammed (S) said, if non-believers ask you to say the same again, say it. At which time the following ayah was descended.

Anyone who after accepting faith in Allah utters disbelief (save under compulsion and even then his heart remains firm in faith) on them is Wrath from Allah and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty" Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 4 page 132, Cairo edition)

In some Tafseer books, it is written in the following manner:

When this incident occurred with Ammar bin Yasir, people said to the Holy Prophet (s), "O messenger of Allah (s), Ammar has become a non-believer. Prophet Muhammad (s) replied it is not possible; Ammar is full of Islamic zeal from head to toe. This zeal is mixed in his flesh and blood. A while later Ammar (A.S) came to the Prophet (s) crying, after wiping Ammar's (A.S) tears, Prophet Mohammed (S) said, what happened? If non-believers force you to repeat these words, repeat them.

After writing the above incident, Qazi Bezawi commented:

"This verse is a proof that if one is forced to, one can denounce Islam". *Tafseer-e-Bezawi, Volume 1, Page 453, Publishers, Luknow*

Regarding this verse, Imam of Ahl ul Sunnah Allamah Abu Hussein Firah Al baghwi commented:

All scholars in the Muslim Ummah agree on the fact that at times when one is forced, one can denounce Islam. *Tafseer Mu'alim Al'Tazyeeel, Volume 2 Page 214, Published Bombay*

Allamah Fakhraddin Razi in "Tafseer-e-Kabir", Volume 5, Page 564, Published Istanbul, wrote:

It is an agreed fact that while denouncing the Islamic faith, one's heart must not be content with it Allamah Khazin in "Libab-ul-Taweel", Volume 3, Page 136, Published Egypt, while writing a commentary about this ayah, after giving the traditions regarding Ammar (A.S), wrote

This verse is directed to anyone who has been forced to denounce Islam, but is content with Islam in his heart, even if the reason behind is out of the ordinary.

Second Verse

Let not the believers take for friends or helpers Unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allah: except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them. But Allah cautions you (To remember) Himself; for the final goal is to Allah. Surah Al-Imran, verse 28 transliteration of Abdullah Yusuf Ali

Allama Zamakshhari in "Tafseer Kashaf" Volume 1, Page 197, and Published Calcutta, while writing the commentary of this verse, said:

The believers are given the permission to befriends or fall in love with nonbelievers of whom they are scared.

Qadi Bezawi states in Tafseer-e-Bezawi, volume 1, page 134, Publishers Luknow, in his commentary of the verse states:

Yaqoob Qari read Taqiyyah as Taqiyyah. In this verse, Allah (swt), has stopped the believers from befriending, (be it openly or secretive) non-believers, unless they are under a state of fear. Only under fear, one can befriend them.

Allamah Fakhruddin Razi had commented on this verse:

Undoubtedly, there is no harm in practicing Taqiyyah if a believer is caught up between non-believers and his life or property is under threat from them. In such circumstances he should conceal his enmity from them. Infact, he should talk in such a manner that his words should show passion. His hear should not confirm what he is saying. Taqiyyah does not have an effect on one's heart; it only has an external effect. *Tafseer-e-Kabir, Volume 2, Page 626, Published Istanbul*

So we have the word of Allah, and the confirmation of the Sunni Ulema that these verses endorse the use of Taqiyyah to protect ones life. And yet the Minhaj cult are seeking to define Taqiyyah as calculated deception that contradicts the

Qur'an. Whose word shall we rely those of this Nasibi group or the verdict of Allah (swt)?

Al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi Believed in Taqiyyah

Darling of the Ahl'ul Sunnah and leading opponent of the Shi'a, al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi, despite his anti Shi'a views testified to the legitimacy of Taqiyyah:

Taqiyyah is permissible, proven from the Qur'an one such verse is , "except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them."

Taqiyyah means "to protect one's life, property in the face of one's enemies, it is of two types, one when faced with enmity on grounds of religion e.g. opposition by kafirs and mushriks, the other is linked with the material world e.g. One's wife, property and personal possessions". Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya page 584 [Farsi edition]

People Adopted Taqiyyah During the Reign of the Banu Ummayya

Imam of Ahl ul Sunnah Allamah Dhahabi states:

"When Waleed ibn Abdul Malik bin Marwan came to power he entered the Mosque of the Prophet in Madina and saw an elderly man surrounded by people. Upon enquiry he discovered that the man was Saeed bin Maseeb. Waleed summoned Saeed but he did not go to him, this led to Waleed becoming furious. Umro bin Aas commented that during this time people practiced Taqiyyah and a few individuals in order to save Saeed bin Maseeb approached Waleed and pleaded with him, eventually Waleed abandoned his idea to kill Saeed

"Sira Alam page 227

It is clear from this tradition that during the Nasibi reign of the Banu Ummayya people adopted Taqiyyah to protect themselves. Allamah Dhahabi confirms this fact, and yet the Minhajj al Nasibi either through their ignore or lies have sought to define this lawful practice as 'calculated deception'.

"He who conceals his religion has saved it, and he who makes it public has destroyed it."

Note that the Minhajj had failed to even cite the source of this narration! What we know is that the Imam's comments on 'Taqiyyah' were said in answer to queries at a time when people were being oppressed. One needs to recognise that during the reign of the Banu Ummayya throughout their vast domain, Imam 'Ali (as) was openly cursed on the mosque pulpits. The Imams (as Imam Ali's direct descendants) and their adherents were likewise deemed the enemy of the State. What choice were the people left with? It was in such a situation that the Imams made clear comments endorsing Taqiyyah as legitimate, for to convey one's belief openly would have led to serious consequences. To prove our point we shall cite a tradition from Usul al Kafi:

An individual by the name of Muammar bin Khalid asked Imam Abul Hasan (as) how to respond to oppressive rulers? He replied our descendent Imam Muhammad Baqir stated that 'Taqiyyah is the religion of our forefathers. Whoever does not practice Taqiyyah has no Deen'.

Now, we would ask Minhajjal Nasibi - 'Your own esteemed scholar Dhahabi had cited the episode involving Saeed bin Maseeb, and stated that during that time the people 'practiced Taqiyyah' - clearly these people must have learned this practice from the Deen of their forefathers, they must have adopted this practice based on someone's guidance. Why did these people with true faith respond to Waleed and the other Nasibi Banu Umayya Khalifas by adopting Taqiyyah? Why did they not initiate jihad against them? Were all these individuals Shi'a? This incident demonstrates that Taqiyyah was being practised in Madina. Was this a calculated deception? Clearly not, these individuals were hiding their faith to protect their lives, in the same way that the Imams had advocated Taqiyyah as a way of protecting one's deen.

"Nine tenths of religion is Taqiyyah (dissimulation), hence one who does not dissimulate has no religion." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.110)

This hadith also needs to be explained in terms of the context in which it was said. Islam had come as the all-encompassing Deen that would rule over the people, and thus ensure that they lived safe lives under the Sharia. But the situation at that time was so serious that tyrannical rulers were at the helm of the State, they dictated what the State religion was, and they had changed the entire face of the Deen. Religion had been turned on its head, and had in effect become unrecognisable, and to prove this we have the testimony of the Sahaba of Malik bin Anas in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 1 hadith number 507:

"Anas said, "I do not find (now-a-days) things as they were (practiced) at the time of the Prophet." Somebody

said "The prayer (is as it was.)" Anas said, "Have you not done in the prayer what you have done?"

Narrated Az-Zuhri that he visited Anas bin Malik at Damascus and found him weeping and asked him why he was weeping. He replied, "I do not know anything which I used to know during the lifetime of Allah's Apostle except this prayer which is being lost(not offered as it should be)".

This well known Sahaba was testifying that the practices during the time of Rasulullah (s) had been completely lost, save Salat that was also now being changed. The question that we pose is, 'what were the Sahaba doing at this time?' Were they either endorsing these practices or had they simply gone underground and hidden their beliefs in their hearts. Clearly they must have also been practicing Taqiyyah. When the Imam (as) had declared that 9/10th of the Deen was Taqiyyah, it was because 9/10th of Deen that was being propagated by the State was NOT the Deen of Allah (swt), as had been vouched for by Malik - hence the actual 9/10th was hidden in one's hearts it was Taqiyyah. Anyone who did NOT practise Taqiyyah and had infactembraced the State practices was NOT following the Deen of Allah(swt) i.e., one who does not dissimulate has no religion."

"Mix with them (i.e. non-Shi'a) externally but oppose them internally." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.116)

Perhaps these Nasibis could answer us this, if you live in country where the vast bulk of the people are non Muslim, and where very few adherents of your thinking live near you - worse still you are surrounded by those hostile to you, what is the best option for an individual to pursue? This problem is particularly acute in this day and age, indeed since September the 11th 2001, where Muslims living in the West are being deemed 'the enemy' - and are frowned upon by 'others' as terrorists / extremists / fanatics. The hatred vented against Muslims has lead to many going into hiding fearing verbal and

physical abuse. So Minhaj al Nasibi in such circumstances what is a Muslim to do?

To understand the comment of the Imam Sadiq (as) here let us cite the words of Rasulullah (s). We read in Sahih al Bukhari, v4, p45 publishers Uthmania, Egypt that Abu al-Darda' said he heard the Prophet (s) state: "(Verily) we smile for some people, while our hearts curse (those same people)."

Narrated in Sahih al Bukhari, v4, p44, publishers Uthmania, Egypt that the Prophet (s) said: "O `Ayesha, the worst of people in the sight of Allah (SWT) are those that are avoided by others due to their extreme impudence."

NOTE: The meaning here is that one is permitted to use diplomacy to get along with people. The above tradition was narrated when a person sought permission to see the Holy Prophet (s) and prior to his asking permission the Prophet (s) said that he was not a good man, but still I shall see him. The Prophet talked to the person with utmost respect, upon which A'isha inquired as to why did the Prophet (s) talk to the person with respect despite his character, upon which the above reply was rendered.

Now look at these two hadith and tell us, what is the objection with the words of Imam Jafer Sadiq (as)? What is the difference between the hadith of Rasulullah (s) and the words of Imam Jafer Sadiq (as)?

Abdullah Ibn Umar practised Taqiyyah in the Presence of Mu'awiya

We read in Sahih al Bukhari (English translation) Volume 4 hadith number 434 that:

Ibn 'Umar said, "I went to Hafsa while water was dribbling from her twined braids. I said, 'The condition of the people is as you see, and no authority has been given to me.' Hafsa said, (to me), 'Go to them, and as they (i.e. the people) are waiting for you, and I am afraid your absence from them will produce division amongst them.' " So Hafsa did not leave Ibn 'Umar till we went to them. When the people differed, Mu'awiya addressed the people saying, "If anybody wants to say anything in this matter of the Caliphate, he should show up and not conceal himself, for we are more rightful to be a Caliph than he and his father." On that, Habib bin Masalama said (to Ibn 'Umar), "Why don't you reply to him (i.e. Mu'awiya)?" 'Abdullah bin 'Umar said, "I untied my garment that was going round my back and legs while I was sitting and was about to say, 'He who fought against you and against your father for the sake of Islam, is more rightful to be a Caliph,' but I was afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed, and my statement might be interpreted not as I intended. (So I kept quiet) remembering what Allah has prepared in the Gardens of Paradise (for those who are patient and prefer the Hereafter to this worldly life)." Habib said, "You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."

So we see here:

1. Mu'awiya proclaimed his superiority to the Khilafah.
2. Ibn Umar disagreed and wished to highlight the truth openly before the people.
3. Ibn Umar chose not to challenge the claim as he was "afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed"
4. Habib commented to Ibn Umar "You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."

"Ibn Umar's silence to prevent bloodshed and Habib's confirmation that he had adopted this stance to protect himself is clear proof that Ibn Umar was practicing Taqiyyah. Would Minhaj also deem this to be 'calculated deception' on the part of this Sahaba or was he practicing Taqiyyah in order to save his life and the lives of others? What is there fatwa here?

Hanafi Fatwa,at the Time of Danger, One Can Swear at Rasulallah (s) -(naudobillah)

One should point out that the Deobandis very own aqeedah is that when one is being threatened, he can swear at Rasulallah (s) (naudobillah), we cite a text that is still read as part of the curriculum in Deobandi Madrassas "Usul Al Shashi", Chapter "Al Dheema" page 114:

"When under duress one can swear at Rasulallah (s), in order to protect a Muslims life / possessions. One can recite the Kalima of kufr, provided his hearthas not accepted this, one who accepts this without Taqiyyah is a kaffir".

We should also point out that Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Abu Shakoor in al Tamheed Chapter 1 pages 18 & 19states:

"Kufr is the worst act, but when one is threatened he can adopt Taqiyyah and recite the Kalima of kufr. It is permissible in such circumstances, a person who recites the Kalima of kufr should NOT be deemed a kaffir,and the Shari'a has deemed Taqiyyah to be a favourable act".

Why Were the Majority Silent When 'Ali was Cursed?

Allamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri in his work "Fayz ul Bari" page 359 highlights the following fact:

"The Sunnah is that the Salat of Eid should take place before the khutbah, but Marwan altered the placing of the khutbah, on the grounds that this was a time when 'Ali was cursed, and the people would get up and leave".

From history we learn that the sole individual that objected to this alteration was Abu Said al Khudri, and he spoke out against this change openly. This was a time when many of the Sahaba were still alive. No doubt they would have been fully aware that the Sunnah had been changed, so why did they remain silent on the matter? Tell us Minhajj 'When the rightly guided khalifa 'Ali (as) was being cursed from the Mosque pulpits (including the Mosque of the Prophet (s) in Madina) on the Day of Eid, and the State had made him the target of vilification, why did the majority remain silent?' There can only be two reasons:

Either:

The majority (that comprised of the Sahaba and Tabaeen) considered the cursing of 'Ali (as) to be a virtuous act, if this is the case then we challenge Minhajj to pass their verdict on the majority at that time.

Or:

These individuals remained silent in the face of the tyrannical Banu Ummayya Nasibi rulers, and knew that speaking out would result in them losing their lives. They were therefore left with no other choice but to adopt Taqiyyah and remain silent. Clearly this option is the better one to accept, particularly for Minhajj, if their intention is to protect the status of Sahaba and other Muslims of that time.

Sunni scholar Umar bin Bahr Jahiz accepted this option writing in "al Bayan wa'lTabayeen" page 29:

"And these are the people who lowered their eyes due to fear of the next world, there was a fear of the time [they lived in] amongst them were those who had become dispersed and divided. Some were on their own living in fear, some were in waiting, offering prayers. They were a sorrowful people, they were lost in Taqiyyah".

The Imams from the Ahl'ul bayt (as) were deemed a threat by the Leaders of the time. They were conscious of the need to propagate the true teachings of Islam, hence it was important that they protected their lives as well as those of their followers, they therefore took the decision to adopt Taqiyyah as a necessary response to the difficult times they lived in.

The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah Believe in the Legitimacy of Taqiyyah

It is interesting to see that the Nasibi brand Taqiyyah deception, whilst their own aqeedah is lying i.e. deception when necessary is not only allowed, but a must. Therefore, Imam Nawawi wrote:

All the scholars agree on the fact that if a cruel man comes to kill a person who is hiding, or comes to wrongfully take someone else's possessions, and asks for information about that (possession), then it is a must on everyone who has any knowledge about it, to hide it and lie about it. This is not just a lie, in fact it is a must for the reason that it is a means of protecting the weak from the cruel. Sharh Muslim Nawawi, Volume 2, Page 106-266, Published Luknow

Due to these reasons, some scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah have openly agreed to the logic behind Taqiyyah.

In al-Nasa'ih al-Kaafiyah page 109, (Bombay edition), Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, Muhammad bin Aqeel Shaafi writes:

I say our scholars (Scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah) agree on the fact that when needed, telling a lie is allowed, and this is Taqiyyah. But if we name this Taqiyyah, a lot of the scholars raise an objection, since Shi'as use this term. So the difference between Shi'a and Sunni is only the word difference.

Shaykh Ahmed Fehmi Mesri in "Hashia Al mihal-wa-An nahal", Volume 1, Page 195, Published Cairo, wrote

Taqiyyah is allowed at times of fear, and Tabbara said that our companions say that in times of need, Taqiyyah is allowed; rather, in some cases to create an environment of unity, it can also be used. And all the narrations which are present speak for it."

The Khwaarij are the Only Sect that Reject Taqiyyah

Minhajj whilst defining Taqiyyah as 'calculated deception' and rejecting its as an act of hypocrisy, should know that they have in fact exposed their 'actual' beliefs. The fact of the matter is in Islam all Sects agree that Taqiyyah is a legitimate practice except the Khwaarij.

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, Ibn Asakir discusses the beliefs of the Khwaarij in Tadheeb Volume 4 page 147, whilst commenting on the life of Hasan bin Farokh. He states:

"The fourth characteristic of the Khwaarij is that they consider it permissible to kill their enemies women and children...the sixth characteristic of the Khwaarij is they deem advocating (verbally) and practising Taqiyyah to be unlawful".

Mir Shareef in Sharh Muwaffaq page 757 whilst setting out the beliefs of the Khwaarij states:

The Khwaarij consider the endorsement and practice of Taqiyyah to be a haraam act, and deem it permissible to kill their opponents.

Similarly Abdul Kareem Shahrastani in his famous text al Mi-hal wa al Nahal Volume 1 page 122, whilst setting out the views of the Khwaarij, states:

"The sixth characteristic of the Khwaarij is that they consider the act of Taqiyyah (by word and deed) to be unlawful".

We would like to make it clear that both Shi'a and Ahl'ul Sunnah believe in the legitimacy of Taqiyyah and the only group that deny it and deem it to be 'calculated deception' are the Khwaarij and Nasibi like Minhajj al-Sunnah, who also deem

shedding the blood of their opponents to be an act for which they shall be rewarded.

For comprehensive study into the topic of Taqiyyah please read our article:

Chapter 25

The Fitnah of Takfeer

Having misrepresented the true creed of the Shi'a, Minhaj al Nasib seek to conclude their fitnah by presenting the fatwas of Sunni Ulema on the Shi'a.

What Do Scholars of AhluSunnah in the Past and Present say about Shi'a (Rafidah)?:1)Imam Ash-Shafi'i:On one occasion Imam Shafi'i said concerning the Shi'a, "I have not seen among the heretics a people more famous for falsehood than the Raafidi Shi'a." and on another occasion he said; "Narrate knowledge from everyone you meet except for the raafidi Shi'a, because they invent a hadith and adopt them as part of their religion." (Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyah) (Some Shi'a at the time of the Alid Imam Zayd ibn 'Ali demanded that he make a declaration of innocence (tabarra) from whoever disagreed with 'Ali's right to be Imam. When Zayd refused, they rejected him, and became known as the "raafida" or rejectors. Those who followed Imam Zayd became known as Zaydis, and have very little difference from mainstream Islam. The Raafidi evolved into the various Imami Shi'a sects, the largest of which is the Ithna 'Ashari.)

2) Imam Abu Hanifah:It is reported that often Imam Abu Hanifah used to repeat the following statement about the raafidi Shi'a; "Whoever doubts whether they are disbelievers has himself committed disbelief."

3)Imam Malik:Once when asked about the Rafidi Shi'a, Imam Malik said; "Do not speak to them or narrate from them, for surely they are liars." During one of Imam Malik's classes, it

was mentioned that the Rafidi Shi'a curse the Sahaba. Imam Malik recited the verse, "Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and those with him are harsh with the disbelievers and gentle among themselves. So that the disbelievers may become enraged with them." (48:29) He then said, "Whoever becomes enraged when the Sahaba are mentioned is the one about whom the verse speaks." (Tafseer al-Qurtubi) disbelievers wish to do is cast doubt on the reliability of our narrators in order to invalidate the Qur'an and Sunnah. Thus the disbelievers are the ones most deserving of defamation."

4) Abu Zur'ahar-Razi: He said of the Rafidi Shi'a doctrine of cursing the Sahaba, "If you see someone degrade any of the companions of the Prophet SAWS know that he is a disbeliever. Because the Prophet SAWS was real, what he brought was the truth and all of it was conveyed to us by way of the Sahaba. What those disbelievers wish to do is cast doubt on the reliability of our narrators in order to invalidate the Qur'an and Sunnah. Thus the disbelievers are the ones most deserving of defamation."

5) Ibn Hazmal-Andalusi: During the period of Muslim rule in Spain, Imam Abu Muhammad ibn Hazm would often debate with the Catholic priests about their religious texts. He brought before them evidence of textual distortions in the Bible and the loss of the original manuscripts. When they replied by pointing out the Shi'a claims that the Qur'an has been distorted and altered, Ibn Hazm informed them that Shi'a claims were not valid evidence because the Shi'a were not themselves Muslims.

6) Imam Al-Alusi: He declared the Rafidi Shi'a disbelievers because of their defamation of the Sahaba. His position was based on the rulings of Imam Malik and other scholars. In response to their claim to be followers of the Ahl al-Bayt (the Prophet's SAWS family) Al-Alusi said, "No, they are really followers of the devils and the Ahl al-Bayt are innocent of them."

7) Muhammad Rasheed Rida: This scholar was among those who worked sincerely for rapprochement between the Shi'a

and the sunni, and they in turn pretended moderation for his benefit. However, in the midst of his efforts, they caught him by surprise by presenting him with a number of their books which slander Islam. He then replied in a paper called As-Sunnah wa Ash Shi'a in which he exposed their false doctrines and idolatrous practices.

8) Dr. Hilali: After living close to the Shi'a for some years, the famous Moroccan scholar, Dr. Hilali wrote a paper on them in which he declared them to be disbelievers.

9) Abul-A'la Maududi: This great Pakistani scholar wrote an introduction to the book, "Ar Riddah bain al-Ams wa al-Yaum" In it was written, regarding the Imami Ja'fari Shi'a, "despite their moderate views (relative to other Shi'a sects), they are swimming in disbelief like white blood cells in blood or like fish in water."¹⁰) among the other contemporary scholars who have expressed similar views are: Sheikh Abdul 'Aziz ibn Baz, Sheikh Nassiraddin Al-Albani, Allama Ash-Shanqiti, Sheikh An-Nashashibi, Imam Ahmad Ameen, and Dr. Rashaad Salim.

The Testimony of One Sect Against Another Cannot be Deemed to be 'Proof'

Those against us are of one school of thought, so it is common sense that they would throw dirt on those who do not ascribe to their beliefs. In addition we should point out that those that have made such verdicts have often done so in accordance with their own Nasibi views (whether open or hidden) and misguided propaganda against the Shi'a.

It is ironic that these alleged scholars despite their own differing views are united/ one voice against the Shi'a! We reject these fatwas, for it is only fair for a Judge to look at both sides of a case before reaching a decision. That would be the 'just' method, but then what correlation do these Nasibis have with justice?

The Minhaj by collating these fatwas feel as if they have proven their argument beyond a shadow of a doubt, when the truth is the opinion of one sect against another can never be deemed as proof.

Deobandi scholar Maulana Zafar Ahmad Uthmani writing on Jauzjani commented in Kawaid fi Ulum il Hadith page 400:"

I say that Jauzjani was a Nasibi who hated 'Ali, those opposed to Uthman are the Shi'a, we should be friends with both, since the opinion of one school of thought against another can never be deemed to be valid".

We will proceed to look at these fatwas, and should point that we have already refuted the fatwas of takfeer in the previous Chapter based on enmity towards the Sahaba.

Chapter 26

The Fatwa of Imam Malik

During one of Imam Malik's classes, it was mentioned that the Rafidi Shi'a curse the Sahaba. Imam Malik recited the verse, "Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and those with him are harsh with the disbelievers and gentle among themselves. So that the disbelievers may become enraged with them." (48:29) He then said, "Whoever becomes enraged when the Sahaba are mentioned is the one about whom the verse speaks." (Tafseer al-Qurtubi)

Although we have already addressed fatwas based on hatred of the Sahabain a previous let us now analyse the views of Imam Malik.

Classical Maliki scholar Qadi Iyad in "Tartheeb ul Madharik wa Takreeb al Masalik" Volume 2 pages 45-46 states in his discussion on Malik's beliefs:

"Once an Alawi asked Malik 'Who was superior after Rasulallah (s)?"

Malik replied Abu Bakr. He then asked "Then who" he replied "Umar". The Alawi then asked "Then who". He said "The victim Uthman". Malik's student Mashab asked Malik who was superior after Rasulallah? He replied Abu Bakr. Then someone asked him, 'Then who'. Malik replied Umar. 'Then' Malik replied 'Uthman'. When asked 'Then' Malik said 'people's view then differed', these are the beloved of Rasulallah (s), Abu Bakr was made the Imam of Salat by Rasulallah (s), Umar was appointed by Abu

Bakr and Umar made a 6 man Shura and people chose Uthman, after that the people stalled. In another narration Malik had stated whoever was desirous of the Caliphate ('Ali) cannot be superior to one who did not want it (Abu Bakr).

Renowned Sunni scholar Abu Zahra commenting on the above narrations states:

"From the above narrations we can see that Malik was a supporter of Mu'awiya and the Banu Ummayya cause...If we look at the reason behind Imam Malik's statements, in relation to his comments about the Sword of Islam, brother and son in law of Rasulallah (s) - 'Ali, from whom the descendants of Rasulallah (s) came, we can see that this view was borne out of Banu Ummayya thought, even if he did not like their deeds he did not give 'Ali the due respect that he deserved". Malik Hayath au Asra page 85

Abu Zahra further states on page 59:

"Some experts have pointed out that Imam Malik did not take many hadith from 'Ali and Ibn Abbas due to his pro Banu Ummayya leanings, in concluding this discussion, Malik belonged to that group that had no association to politics, nor encouraged revolution, they never objected to the Khalifas of the time, they took a salary from the State. Malik's thought / views brought him closer to the Banu Ummayya, this pro Banu Ummayya viewpoint was such that it never brought him against the Banu Ummayya, his view point against 'Ali was like those held by Banu Ummayya, he ascribed to Banu Ummayya views on 'Ali".

So we learn that Imam Malik supported the Banu Ummayya and shared their thoughts. He clearly avoided mentioning 'Ali as the rightful khalifa in line with Banu Ummayya thinking. It is therefore common sense that one critical of 'Ali will likewise be opposed to his Shi'a. His fatwa therefore has no legitimacy.

The Fatwa of Ibn Hazm

5) Ibn Hazm al-Andalusi: During the period of Muslim rule in Spain, Imam Abu Muhammad ibn Hazm would often debate with the Catholic priests about their religious texts. He brought before them evidence of textual distortions in the Bible and the loss of the original manuscripts. When they replied by pointing out the Shi'a claims that the Qur'an has been distorted and altered, Ibn Hazm informed them that Shi'a claims were not valid evidence because the Shi'a were not themselves Muslims.

The key to answering this fatwa lies in Minhajj al-Nasibi's very own admission that Ibn Hazm was the Imam "During the period of Muslim rule in Spain". The Muslim rule during that time was that of the Banu Umayyad, who had a bitter enmity towards Imam 'Ali (as). In connection with this we cite the words of Allamah Shibli Numani al-Hanafi:

"Traditions were first formed in book form in the days of Umayyads, who, for about 90 years, throughout their vast dominions stretching from the Indus in India to Asia Minor and Spain, insulted the descendants of Fatima and got Ali openly censured in Friday sermons at the mosques. They had hundreds of sayings coined to eulogise Amir Mu'awiya. taken from Siratun Nabi, Volume 1 page 60

Ibn Hazm was the Imam in Spain during this era. Whilst there is no doubt that Khalifa Umar bin Abdul Aziz had put an end to the ritual cursing of Imam Ali (as) we ask 'what was the likelihood of this injunction changing three generations (scholars and ordinary folk) who had been brought up on a staple diet of bearing enmity to 'Ali (as)'? Would these anti 'Ali sentiments have just vanished? Clearly not, particularly when the State sponsored Imams continued to advocate the legitimacy of the rule of Mu'awiya (and his actions) then it was natural that they condemned his opponents. Like his Banu Umayyad Nasibi Khalifas Ibn Hazm took the same anti 'Ali line and to prove this

we quote Dhahabi who stated in Tadhkirath ul Huffaz Volume3 page 1152:

"Ibn Hazm Umawi was hated by some people, as he was a supporter of the Banu Ummayya Khalifas past and present, he considered their Imamate to be rightful, which is why he was deemed to be a Nasibi".

Ibn Hazm authored al Fasl fi Mihal al Nihal in which he stated that the Imamate of Imam 'Ali can neither be proven by text or ijma, just by logic. This further exposes his Nasibi beliefs, a supporter of the Nasibi Banu Ummayya his bigoted Nasibi views make this fatwa void.

Verdicts of the Salafi Nasibis

7) *Muhammad Rasheed Rida:* This scholar was among those who worked sincerely for rapprochement between the Shi'a and the sunni, and they in turn pretended moderation for his benefit. However, in the midst of his efforts, they caught him by surprise by presenting him with a number of their books which slander Islam. He then replied in a paper called *As-Sunnah wa Ash Shi'a* in which he exposed their false doctrines and idolatrous practices.

8) *Dr. Hilali:* After living close to the Shi'a for some years, the famous Moroccan scholar, Dr. Hilali wrote a paper on them in which he declared them to be disbelievers.

10) among the other contemporary scholars who have expressed similar views are: Sheikh Abdul 'Aziz ibn Baz, Sheikh Nassiraddin Al-Albani, Allama Ash-Shanqiti, Sheikh An-Nashashibi, Imam Ahmad Ameen, and Dr. Rashaad Salim.

The common link between this group of Nasibis is the fact that they are adherents of the Salafi cult who unlike 'true' Sunnis reject Tawassul, performing ziarat to Rasulullah's grave etc. The key link to these Nasibis is the fact that they deem their Imam to be Ibn Taymiyya, they deem him to be "Shaykh ul Islam" and their Nasibi thought is in line with his views. Now let us analyse what the Ahl'ul Sunnah have said about their Nasibi Imam:

Ahl'ul Sunnah Viewson Ibn Taymiyya

Deobandi scholar Anwar Shah Kashmiri in Anwar al Bari Volume 6 pages 220 -221 states:

"Tahavi's acceptance of the hadith 'Radd ai Shams' as true and Ibn Taymiyyah's reaction against Tahavi, indicates that he had Khwaarij views".

(Our note: Radd ai Shams is the hadith in which Imam Ali (as) returned the sunset via the pointing of his finger).

Shah Abdul Aziz in Fatawa Azizi Volume 2 page 79

"The pen of IbnTaymiyya in Minhajj at some points is so atrocious, in particular his views on Ahl'ul bayt where he has sought to play down their merits, prohibits visiting the tomb of Rasulullah (s), is opposed to Saints and condemns the Sufis. According to the views of Ahl'ul Sunnah his pen is cursed, his writings cannot be deemed to be those of the Ahl'ul Sunnah".

Takfeer Issued Against Ibn Taymiyya

We should also point out to these Salafi Nasibis that 40 Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah deemed their beloved Imam Ibn Taymiyya to be a kaffir, names included leading Sunni Ulema (of the 4 schools) of the time such as:

1. Muhammad bin Ibrahim Shaafi
2. Muhammad bin Abu Bakr Maliki
3. Muhammad bin Abu Bakr Jareer Ansari Hanafi
4. Abdullah bin Umar Muqaddis Hanbali

These 40 Ulema declared Ibn Taymiyya to be a kaffir, and it was declared in Syria that if anyone shared the view of Ibn Taymiyya, then it was valid to shed their blood and appropriate their land". (The fatwa and this text can be found in Al Nabraas Sharh al Aqaid page 114 footnote 4 [printed in Meerath, India], Sharh Aqaid Jalali page 80 [printed in Afghanistan]. AdDhur ra al Kamina, by Ibn Hajr Asqalani, Volume 1 page 147 [Dakkan].

In addition to this we learnt that Shaykh Zaynudeen bin Rajab Hanbali in light of Ibn Taymiyya incorrect views, deemed him to be a kaffir. (taken from Anwar al Bari Volume 11 page 190).

We further read in Anwar al Bari Volume 11 page 119 that:

"18 Egyptians deemed Ibn Taymiyya to be a kaffir, including Qadi Taqiudeen Muhammad bin Abu Bakr Akhi Maliki. This was based on the fact that his view, prohibiting pilgrimage to Madina in order to visit Rasulallah (s) proved his disrespect of Rasulallah (s), the penalty for such kufr was death".

Shaykh Alaudeen Bukhari al Hanafi:

"After analysing Ibn Taymiyya Fatwas he said' Whoever deems Ibn Taymiyya to be "Shaykhul Islam" is a

kaffir".Takdhirathul Huffaz page 316 [Damascus]; Anwar alBari Volume 11 page 192 [Multan]

Theses Nasibi followers of Ibn Taymiyya [who according to Ahl'ul Sunnah disrespected Rasulullah (s)] have been deemed to be kaffirs as they adhere to his thinking and call him "Shaykh ul Islam". They therefore have no right to throw dirt at us, their fatwas have no validity, since the Ahl'ul Sunnah consider them to be kaffirs.

The Fatwas of the Three Fiqh Imams

1) *Imam Ash-Shafi'i: On one occasion Imam Shafi'i said concerning the Shi'a, "I have not seen among the heretics a people more famous for falsehood than the Rafidi Shi'a." and on another occasion he said; "Narrate knowledge from everyone you meet except for the Rafidi Shi'a, because they invent ahadith and adopt them as part of their religion." (Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyah) *(Some Shi'a at the time of the Alid Imam Zayd ibn 'Ali demanded that he make a declaration of innocence (tabarra) from whoever disagreed with 'Ali's right to be Imam. When Zayd refused, they rejected him, and became known as the "raafida" or rejecters. Those who followed Imam Zayd became known as Zaydis, and have very little difference from mainstream Islam. The Rafidi evolved into the various Imami Shi'a sects, the largest of which is the Ithna 'Ashari.)*

2) *Imam Abu Hanifah: It is reported that often Imam Abu Hanifah used to repeat the following statement about the Rafidi Shi'a; "Whoever doubts whether they are disbelievers has himself committed disbelief."*

3) *Imam Malik: Once when asked about the Rafidi Shi'a, Imam Malik said; "Do not speak to them or narrate from them, for surely they are liars."*

First and foremost one needs to point out that Nasibi Ibn Taymiyya in Minhaj al Sunnah has recorded these three fatwas in Minhaj al Sunnah. Readers should know that this Nasibi fails to cite 'from where' he has taken these fatwas, we ONLY have his word that these are the fatwas of these three Imams, and the testimony of this Nasibi is of no value. We would ask the Minhaj and their fellow Deobandi parties to consider the fact that if we are to indeed to accept these fatwas, then we should also accept the fatwas that they have issued against one another. If we were to adopt this approach, accepting all of these testimonies as proof of kufr, then no one would remain a Muslim the adherents of the four madhabs have issued fatwas of takfeer against one another. We will cite some examples:

Shaykh Abdul Qadir Jilani's Deemed Abu Hanifa and his Follower Stobe in the Fire

Whilst discussing the Sects that are in the Fire, Shaafi scholar Shaykh Abdul Qadir Gilani wrote in Ghaneeyuth al Talibeen pages 62 - 63 (printed in Egypt):

"There exist 12 sects of the marijee the Jahimiyya, Saleheeya, Shamneeya, Yunuseeya, Yuhnaaniya, Bukharia, Gilania, Shahbibeeya, Hanafeeya, Mahzeeya, Muriseeya, Kharameya. These are all Marijee as they believe that once an individual has recited the Shahada, no matter how many sins you then commit, you will attain paradise, since iman is connected with heart not with one's deeds, practices are a part of the Sharia - iman remains stagnant. People cannot supersede others on iman, the iman of Prophets, Angels and ordinary people are equal, iman neither goes up nor down, it does not lessen by words that are recited, even an individual fails to practice he remains a momin. Imam Numan bin Thabit stated that 'iman comprises of recognising Allah, his Rasul (s) and Angels'".

This was indeed the aqeedah of Imam Abu Hanifa he stated:

"Recitation with the tongue is iman and then accepting this with one's heart. Iman does not go up nor down, whether this relates to People of the skies or People on the earth, the iman of ALL Muslims is equal".

Commenting on this belief Mullah 'Ali Qari states in Sharh Fiqh Akbar pages 101 - 105:

"People of the skies here means Angels and the people of Heaven, people on the earth refers to Prophets, Saints and all Muslims - whether good or bad, all equal in iman, it neither goes up nor down".

In accordance with this aqeedah, that man is equal for all, Gilani deemed the Hanafi Sect to be the ninth Sect of the twelve that shall be in the fire. If these Deobandi Nasibis are going to issue takfeer against the Shi'a we would urge them to examine this fatwa and then talk with us. It is indeed amusing that the Minhajj al Nasibi have sought to highlight that their four Imams deemed the Shi'a as kaffir, when in fact...

Hanafi, Shaafi, Hanbali and Maliki have Called Each Other Kaffirs

Seventh century Hanafi Scholar Sharafudeen Isa Abi Bakr who authored the Sharh of Imam Hasan Shubaniz "Al Jami al Kabeer" - wrote against the writings of Baghdadi, he was originally Shaafi and then converted to the Hanafi school of thought.

When asked by a relation this question: "When your entire family are Shaafi, why are you a Hanafi? Are you not happy at the fact that amongst you is one that has become a Muslim?".al Fawaid al Bahya page62

If we are to accept this viewpoint then all Hanafi's are kaffir.

Qadhi Muhammad bin Musa Hanafi writing on the Shaafi school of thought said:

"If I was in power I would order the Shaafi's to give Jaziya".taken from Meezan al Itidal Volume 4 page 52

Jaziya is a tax that is imposed on non-Muslims,so this Judge felt that Imam Shaafi and his followers were kaffir to the point that he issued a fatwa deeming it haraam for a Hanafi woman to marry a Shaafi man,although it was okay for a Hanafi man to marry a Shaafi woman.[taken from Bhazazeeya al Hindy Volume 4 page 112, printed in Quetta Pakistan].

So this Hanafi scholar felt that the marriage rules with a Shaafi were on par with those of Ahl'ul Kitab.

In 714 Hijri differences between the Hanbali's and Shaafi's became such that Ibn Kathir states in al Bidayah Volume 14 pages 75-76:

"This year fitnah between the Shaafi's and Hanbalis increased, the matter went before the Khalifa who negotiated a settlement".

Ibn Kathir also records in al Bidaya Volume 11 page 162:

"The Hanbalis in Muhro set fire to a Shaafi Mosque, that lead to many people dying in Nishapur. The Hanafis and Shaafi's had a dispute that resulted in Madrassas and markets being torched, many Shaafi's lost their lives, they avenged this a few days later".

We read in Meerath al Janaan Volume 3 page 307 that:

"The view of Ibn Taymiyya led to people opposing the Hanbalis, there was a declaration that if someone followed Ibn Taymiyya, it would be lawful to take that person's life and property, as they were kaffirs that should be treated as kaffirs".

Ibn Khalikanin Wafay' at thu Ayan Volume 1 page 415 states:

"Imam Shaykh Ali ibne Ali Sayfudeen Ahmadi (died in 631 Hijri) was a Hanbali who converted to the Shaafischool of thought. The Hanbali Ulema opposed him declaring him to be a kaffir, Zindeeq and said that it was lawful to kill him".

Allamah Shaykh Abu Bakr al Mukree al Waiz (d. 476 Hijri) was a Shaafi scholar who declared throughout the province of Baghdad:

"Whoever is a Hanbali is a kaffir" Taken from Shazraath al Dhahab Volume 3 page 353

Imam Subkee in "Tabaqat au Shaafiya Volume 4 page 234 states:

"Shaykh Abu Isaac bin Ibrahim bin Ali bin Yusuf Firoz-abid (d. 479 Hijri) was a famous Shaafi scholar opposed to the Hanbalis. He was oppressed this led to a Shaafi / Hanbali dispute that resulted in many dying

"Subkee, in "Tabaqat au Shaafiya" Volume6 page 390 writing on the life of Muhammad bin Abu Mansur al Faqeeya al Burwee (d. 576 Hijri) states:

"The Hanbalis at night sent a woman with food, poison had been placed inside the potatoes, Abu Mansur ate it, and he and those that ate with him lost their lives".

The greatest fitnah in Baghdad was between Shaafi's and Hanbalis, as a result of which many people died. The Deputy of Baghdad tried to intervene, and the Shaafi representatives cried 'On what basis should we negotiate, and with who? A Resolution is when there is a difference between two parties over power. These people (Hanbalis) deem us a kaffirs and we deem anyone that does not subscribe to our view to be a kaffir, hence peace between us is impossible'. (taken from Tabaqat al Janabal la bin Rajab Volume1 page 20 - 21 & Wafay' at thu Ayan Volume 1 page 308).

Allamah Ibne Abdideen (d 1254 Hijri) writing on the Khwaarij in 'Radd al Mukhthar, Maaruf Fatawa Shaami' Volume 3 page 427, states:

"In modern times Ibn Wahab came from Najd and took control of the holy cities. They said that they were Hanbali but in reality they deemed only those that followed their way to be Muslim, whoever opposed them were mushriks, accordingly they deemed it permissible to kill the Ahl'ul Sunnah and their Ulema".

Hanafi Versus Hanafi Takfeer Fatwas

Here we should point out that one view cited was that of Deobandi scholar Maudoodi:

9) Abul-A'la Maududi: This great Pakistani scholar wrote an introduction to the book, "Ar Riddah bain al-Ams waal-Yaum" In it was written, regarding the Imami Ja'fari Shi'a, "despite their moderate views (relative to other Shi'a sects), they are swimming in disbelief like white blood cells in blood or like fish in water."

Maudoodi was a Deobandi scholar and hence an adherent of the Hanafi school of thought and yet in the Indian Subcontinent Barelvis and Deobandis DESPITE being Hanafi deem each other to be kaffir.

Ex Leader of the Nasibi Sipah-e-Sahaba Zia ur Rahman Faruqi in his defence of the banning of Ahmad Raza Barelvi Khan Tafseer of the Qur'an in Saudi Arabia stated:

"We know that some have sought to revoke this ban, and have attempted to cover up the fault of its writer...The meaning and translation done by Ahmad Raza Khan of the Barelvi Sect and Mufti Naeemudin should not only be banned in the Arab world, but in future the followers of Raza Khan should be prohibited from performing the rites of Hajj". Taken from Kanz al Iman phur phabandhee kyo? Page 3 printed Ash'aathul Maarif, Faislabad

Likewise Barelvi Hanafis deem Deobandis to be kaffir. Their Imam Ahmad Raza stated:

"Worse than murtad's are munafiqs, this is worse than sitting in the company of one thousand kaffirs, in particular the Wahabi and Deobandi deem themselves to be Ahl'ul Sunnah and claim that they are Hanafi, Chisti, Naqshbandi, they perform Salat, Fast, read books, and

yet they throw abuse at Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s), they are the most dangerous of all".Taken from Ahkaam ai Shariat Volume 1page 77, Agra Press

Writing on Deobandi's in Fatwa Rizvi, Bareilvi states:

"Neither is their prayer valid, nor is it permissible to pray behind them".Volume 1 page 191 and Ahkaam ai Shariat page 92

In response to a question posed to Bareilvi we read inMul-foozath Part 1 page 95[Hasani Bareilvi Press]:

"Is a Wahabi Mosque aMosque or not? Answer: No it is a house, a Mosque of kaffirs, whoever denies the kuffar of Khaleel Ahmad, Rasheed Ahmad Gangohi and Ashraf Ali is himself a kaffir".

Also in Ahkaam ai Shariat Volume 1 page 95 Bareilvi issues thisfatwa:

"Wahabis, Deobandis...lamadhabis, Qadiyani's, Chukralwis, Naychris, anything slaughtered by them is impure it is haraam [meat], even if they were to recite the Kalima 100,000 times and were to portray themselves as pious and praise worthy, they are all kaffir".

Zia Rehman Faruqi Deobandi Nasibi wrote a letter to King Fahad:

"You should know that Fiqh Raza Khan is the same person that condemned your father Sultan Ibne Aziz's Government when it was established and deemed it to be a kuffar (Government)".Kanz al Iman phur phabandhee kyo? Pages 3-4

If they are so divided that they do not regard each other as Muslim what credence / authority can be given to their fatwas against the Shi'a?

'Reliable' Al Albani's Condemnation of Fiqh Hanafi Leaves the Deobandi's with Serious Problems

Minhajj had in the final section sought to highlight the fatwas of the Ulema that they deemed as 'reliable' names that ordinary folk would sit up and take heed of. The difficulty for the Deobandi Hanafis is the fact that one of the 'reliable' opinions cited was that of Sheikh Nassiraddin Al Albani. This same 'reliable' Al-Albani had in his commentary on al-Mundhiri's Mukhtasar Sahih Muslim, 3rd ed. (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami, 1977, p. 548) deemed Fiqh Hanafi to be on par with the Gospels. We should point out that such is the dishonesty of the Salafi Nasibis, this phrase has been mysteriously expunged from later editions.

This leaves Minhajj and its Deobandi host website "IslamZine.com" with some serious questions to answer:

1. Do you accept the 'reliable' Al Albani's claim that Fiqh Hanafi is on par with the Gospel?
2. If Al Albani can be relied on when issuing takfeer against the Shi'a then does the same reliability not apply when he is attacking Fiqh Hanafi?
3. This being the quite logical conclusion, will Minhajj and the host Deobandi site "Islam Zine.com" be brave enough to issue a statement on their site, in light of 'reliable' Al Albani's Fatwa - declaring that they no longer adhere to Fiqh Hanafi since it is on par with the Gospel?
4. If they are going to reject Al Albani's assertion and STILL remain Hanafi, does this not therefore mean they no longer deem him reliable?
5. If they no longer deem Al Albani reliable could they explain why they have cited his opinion on this article?
6. If Al Albani can ONLY be relied upon when attacking the Shi'a then is this not blatant hypocrisy?

Chapter 27

Conclusion

As we have sought to, prove these Ulema have a habit of calling each other kaffir, no one has escaped their takfeer fatwas, what sort of Islam is this? The cheapest thing that one can purchase is a fatwa, the Ulema have throughout history without a second's thought issued takfeer against others. If we are to accept the testimony of all of these scholars then that would mean that NO ONE is a Muslim! It is indeed sad that when we look at these fatwas, we see that the Ulema have converted less people to Islam, and declared more Muslims to be kaffir.

These fatwas have divided the Ummah and ripped the core out of Muslim unity. The key to unity is to stand shoulder to shoulder against the kaffir, not as Minhajj al Nasibi have done, to collate baseless fatwas declaring other Muslims askaffir and then kill them! If we are to accept these fatwas then NO ONE will remain a Muslim. Remember Minhajja person can only give a fatwa if he is himself a Muslim in the first place, and yet all Muslims, your Nasibi Sect included have been declared kaffir by other scholars. What has been particularly amusing is this cult have collated fatwas of those they deem to be Sunni scholars- when they are not deemed to be Sunnis by actual Sunnis, but have been labelled as Wahabis, Khwaarij and Nasibis. How can they cite such fatwas when they are themselves not Sunni? It is tantamo unto a Catholic citing verdicts of Protestants against adherents of the Pentecostal Church!

These fatwas mean nothing, remember ANYONE can defame another sect by taking references out of context and

presenting them to the masses as aqeedah. But such methods are in line with the followers of Mu'awiya and Yazeed who always sought to undermine the religion of truth by such tactics. Alas their lies have been exposed, we suggest they examine their own aqeedah before mud slinging and distorting the beliefs of others.

Chapter 28

Copyright

All rights, including copyright, in the content of these Answering-Ansar.org web pages are owned or controlled for these purposes by the Answering-Ansar.org team.

You can distribute the download version of "Adobe® PDF" documents of the Answering Ansar.org articles, as long as the documents remain in their original state and none of the contents are modified in any format.

The Answering-Ansar.org reserves the right over the contents of the articles if they are used in the original format. You can freely distribute the Islamic references and quotes that we use in our articles in any format. When using our articles in your websites or if in distribution in print format, please include the source as Answering-Ansar.org.

Our web site contains links to third party sites. These links are used for the convenience of our users; however, they are not under the control of Answering-Ansar.org. We are not responsible for their contents, nor should they be considered endorsements of the individual linked sites.

However, it is possible that the site could contain typographical errors. If such a condition is brought to our attention, a reasonable effort will be made to fix or remove it.

If you wish to reproduce, print and distribute our articles in book format, then you will need a written permission of

Answering-Ansar.org. If you wish to do so, then please contact us for further details.

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)