

A RESPONSE TO: KARBALA FACT OR FICTION

All readers and unfortunate followers/fans of Shabbir Ahmed must read his emails before actually reading his book which is unfortunately negating what the Prophet brought with him (Quran and Islam), a book which is negating historical facts. It is recommended that before you read the actual response to Shabbir Ahmad's book, go through the e-mail exchange between him and brother Ali Gardezi, it might provide an insight on the beliefs of DR Shabbir.

Following are the replies of Shabbir Ahmed. A man who negates the concept of Salat, the fact that Hz Maryam (AS) was a virgin when Isa (AS) was given birth to, the fact that Karbala, Siffin, Nahrwan, Jamal took place and what not. Replies to Shabbir Ahmed's claims have been given in the other document in this very folder. However, any sane Muslim can uncover Shabbir Ahmed's lies using the Holy Book of Quran itself, whose meanings and commentaries have been misused and twisted by Shabbir Ahmed to cause havoc and fitnah throughout the Muslim Ummah.

www.sdol.org thanks Brother **Ali Gardezi** for his valuable contributions, and an effort to come up with a reply to Shabbir Ahmed's blasphemous and irrational book, worth not even reading!

May Allah guide us all to the right path, to the path of those who gained his (Allah's) blessings, not of those who earned his wrath.

E-Mail Exchange

From: ali gardezi <ali00ae@yahoo.com>

Date: 2006/07/01 Sat PM 05:45:45 EDT

To: drshabbir@bellsouth.net

Subject: Karbala fact or fiction

Dear sir, What should I say to your work based on irrationalism. Indeed you have misguided a lot of innocent and ignorant people by your false propaganda and deceptive sweet talk. At first I thought maybe you are being biased your book might contain some solid arguments but all praise is for ALLAH your book is nothing but blasphemy. There is no doubt that you are an agent of those wahabi mullas and your only mission was to elevate the position of the so called companions of the PROPHET(P.B.U.H)and turn down the position of the household of the prophet but remember you have to die one day and answer the LORD ALMIGHTY indeed you will have to face terrible consequences...MAY GOD NEVER FORGIVE YOU for the distortion you have made which mislead so many ignorant people...MAY ALLAH CURSE THE ENEMIES OF THE PROPHET(P.B.U.H) AND HIS PURIFIED HOUSEHOLD(AMEEN)
And don worry mister shabbir indeed the lovers of the PROPHET(P.B.U.H) AND HIS PURIFIED HOUSEHOLD will soon come with a reply to your blasphemous book Very soon INSHALLAH may you suffer the consequences soon

drshabbir@bellsouth.net wrote:

Dear Sir, I have criticized the historians only and used mostly the Shiite books that you may have. The exalted Prophet and his noble household are dearer to me than my life. If you see objectively, exaggerations become insult to the noble family of Rasool (S). I will wait for a book in response. A life-long student, Shabbir

From: ali gardezi <ali00ae@yahoo.com>

Date: 2006/08/07 Mon PM 05:14:26 EDT

To: drshabbir@bellsouth.net

Subject: Re: Kerbala fact or fiction

Dear mister shabbir,

As I promised you in my mail the followers of the noble Prophet (P.B.U.H) will soon come up with a response to your book. I was very sad to see that no one from the sunnis or the shias came up with with any book in response so i made it a duty for myself and hence have come up with a response to your book. I am mailing you a copy of the book as you claim to be a life long student. I hope after reading it you will open your eyes and accept the realities. I apologize for the harsh language in advance and im sorry to say when it comes to he noble family of the Prophet(P.B.U.H) no one is more dearer to me so it was your actions which made an equal and opposite reaction.

Regards, Syed Ali Gardezi

A life long student and follower of AhlulBayt (a.s)

drshabbir@bellsouth.net wrote:

Mr. Retarded Gardezi,

You are so stupid to have wasted your time in writing the same stories. I spent only five minutes reading your nonsense and knew your silly sectarian beliefs and imbecility of Mind. You deserve no more time. KARBALA: FACT OR FICTION, TRANSLATED IN 11 LANGUAGES IS CHANGING THE WORLD :-). All I wrote in my book has been taken from the SHIA books and from the Parsi Tabari. Sunni scholars? Read my book THE CRIMINALS OF ISLAM that exposes those criminals too. By the way, even God won't have a son without a mate (6:101), so how could Mary have one without her mate? There was no JAMAL, SAFFAIN, NEHRWAN, KARBALA, period. GO CRY!!! Yes, let me know when your stupidity gets published. It never will. Ha Ha!

SA

From: ali gardezi <ali00ae@yahoo.com>

Date: 2006/08/08 Tue AM 01:04:39 EDT

To: drshabbir@bellsouth.net

Subject: Re: Re: Kerbala fact or fiction

Alas the tone of your language has exposed your character...you used the same language that wahabies use when they are confronted with invincible proofs...My book contains solid proofs and you your self know that and INSHALLAH your lies will be published soon don't worry about that. And by the way are you a Muslim or what I fail to understand? You say God won't have a son without a mate what rubbish a man

Who doesn't even believe in the concept of the oneness of ALLAH is writing a book on Islamic issues wonderful...Mary never had a mate its in the Quran oh sorry I forgot you have a separate Quran...MAY YOU SUFFER YOUR CONSEQUENCES INSHALLAH

Blasphemies of Shabbir Ahmad

From: <drshabbir@bellsouth.net>
To: ali gardezi <ali00ae@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Re: Kerbala fact or fiction
Sent: Tuesday, August 8, 2006 11:23 AM

WHO CONTRIVED NAMAAZ (THE RITUAL PRAYER)?

There was not one single man who introduced the Namaaz deception into Islam. Obviously, no one man could. Such conspiracies have to be state-sponsored in order to get hold of the masses. Think of the history of Christianity for a moment. The Pauline doctrine was not canonized until Emperor Constantine supported it at the Conference of Nicea in 325 CE. WHAT ACTUALLY IS SALAAT:

2:43 And establish the Divine System, and set up the Just Economic Order in the society. And bow with others who bow to these Commands. [9:119, 89:27-30 'Salaat' = To follow closely like a runners-up (Musalli) follows the winning horse (Saabiq). 'Aqimussallat' = Establish the System that facilitates the following of Divine Commands]

THE IMAMIST CONSPIRACY OF NAMAAZ: Please remind yourself of the famous weird tale of the Prophet (S) ascending to heavens to meet with Allah, the so-called Me'raaj (the word is non-existent in the Qur'an). Is not Allah Omnipresent? The "Imams" of Hadith want us to believe that Allah ordained 50 ritual prayers daily for Muslims on that occasion. As the exalted Prophet was descending, Prophet Moses told him of the impossibility of the situation and sent Muhammad (S) back again and again. Imagine the Prophet (S) bargaining with God! Repeated visits to and fro then bring the number down to 40, 30, 20, 10, and finally 5! Moses a. s. wanted him to make one more trip but Muhammad (S) felt shy to bargain any further. Was this Hadith, in addition to promoting ritualism, fabricated to prove Moses' farsightedness over Muhammad (S)? Only an extremely gullible mind would accept this nonsense.

The later Persian Imams built upon this tale and formulated the current Namaaz. They received strong support from the Persian Zoroastrian mother of Khalifa Haroon Rasheed, Khaizran (d. 789 CE). Haroon's Zoroastrian viziers, the Baramika were only too happy to join hands with the royal mother, Khaizran. So, it was she in concert with others who "canonized" Namaaz according to the desires of the Criminal Imams in 153 AH (773 CE). Her main philosopher was Imam Al-Khalil bin Ahmad Shikoh, the first ever compiler of Arabic to Persian dictionary, Al-'Ain. WHY WAS IMAM HANBAL FLOGGED? Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal is reported to have been flogged by Khalifa Mamun son of Haroon because Hanbal supposedly insisted that

the Qur'an being the Word of God was Ghair Makhlooq (non-creation). No! That wasn't it. It was too trivial a debate. Hanbal got flogged because he saw and opposed the Persian Namaaz (Bandagi or Gah) being incorporated into Islam.

ANOTHER POINT OF INTEREST: Khaizran spent a fortune on her project and distributed one million gold coins and 65 million silver coins among her subjects to propagate the 'canonized' Namaaz. References are given in the next heading. Less than 5% Muslims "perform" Namaaz and they keep announcing their prayers. **No one can say or says, "I have established Salaat." Yet, most Muslims keep arguing about Namaaz.**

Experiment: Call a random gathering of Muslims anywhere for Namaaz under completely unexpected circumstances. You will notice almost all of them joining the lines, most of them without Wudhu (Ablution)! What Exactly Was NAMAAZ (Ritual Salaat): As far as I have been able to analytically search our history and Hadith, following was the probable situation in the lifetime of the exalted Prophet and Sahaba Kiraam.

- Ritual prayer or Namaaz was a small part of Aqamatis-Salaat, i.e. establishing the System that facilitates the following of Divine Commands.
- The ritual prayer was always congregational.
- Women and men both formed this congregation, women on the right side of men.
- The frequency and timing of the congregations were determined by the State as needed. It was never fixed as five times a day ritual.
- Namaaz was performed with the Imam (Central or local government official) reciting some verses from the Qur'an relevant to the situation at hand as the congregation listened to the Imam. Then the Imam would lead two units of prayers standing.
- Masjid was not a temple of worship. It was the Assembly, the School, the Municipality, the Parliament and the Government House. So, after that recitation, the leader would discuss real issues about the community, entertain questions, present bills, announce decisions of the Shura (Counsel) and the Assembly would legislate. People came up with their ideas for betterment of the society. Masjid was also the place where the leader was elected.

(Some references on the above two headings: *** Haroon Wa Baramikatil Faras by Sheikhul Ifta Salman bin Abu Qasim Baghdadi. Vol 1 pg 31-55 *** Meezan-il-Faris by Hujjatullah Abdul Qadir Ali Al-Moosvi pg 249-261 ***Takmilatil Lughatal 'Ain 'Urfa by Al-Ustaz Jalaluddin Al-Ash'ari on Imam Al-Khalil ibn Ahmad Shikoh Tabrezi vol 2 pg 3-5 *** Mujahid-al-Munafiq Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal by Abdul Muhsin bin Mullah Ali Al-Qari, pg 67-135)

HOW QUICKLY WAS THE RITUAL SALAAT CHANGING!

Bukhari Vol.1, Book 10, Number 507: Narrated Ghailan: Anas bin Malik (A Sahabi) said, "I do not find (now-a-days) things as they were (practised) 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?"

Bukhari Vol.1, Book 10, Number 508: 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 being offered as it should be)."

The comments, "Have you not done in the prayer what you have done?", and the "Lost Prayer" indicate that something went wrong with the Ritual Prayer (Namaaz) soon after Sahaba Kiraam.

DOES HADITH EXPLAIN THE METHOD OF NAMAAZ?

The Book of Allah claims to be, and certainly is, complete, detailed and describes all things divinely ordained. Say this to an N2I. The knee-jerk response will be, "No, it does not give you the method of Namaaz." Well, did Allah forget? Contrary to the common claims, all the books of Hadith combined together will fail to give you a complete, consistent method of Namaaz. RITUALISTIC SALAAT BY ITSELF IS NOTHING: 11:87 They said, "O Shoab! (We had thought that your religion was only a matter between you and your Lord). Does your Salaat command that we should forsake the worship that our fathers practised? Or, that we leave off doing what we like to do with our economy? Behold, you want us to think that you are the only clement, and the rightly guided man among us."

DOES NAMAAZ DO ALL THIS? AQAAMATUSSALAAT SURE DOES:

29:45 (O Prophet) convey to people all that is revealed to you of the Book, and establish the Divine System. For, verily, establishment of the Divine System will shut off lewdness, stinginess and behavior contrary to the Divine Values. This is so, because Allah's Law is the Greatest Law that can give you eminence. And (O People) Allah knows whatever you contrive on your own. [21:10, 21:24, 23:70, 43:43-44, 70:21-27 - 'Fahasha' includes lewdness and miserliness and 'Munkar' is all behavior that goes against Divine Values given in the Qur'an] CENTRAL PRAYER: What is Salaatil Wusta? Central Prayer? Middle Namaaz? Namaaz 'Asr? 2:238 Watch all your commitments and especially the Central Duty (of guarding of the Divine System). And stay alert in Allah's Cause.

THE RITUAL PRAYER (NAMAAZ) AND MORE - Ardeshir Spencer

I am a Zoroastrian. Dr. Shabbir's research is quite right. Your NAMAAZ was stolen from Zoroastrianism by your Parsi Imams from Persia. It would be appropriate if we can discuss the startling similarities between some practices of Islam and Zoroastrianism. These parallels go beyond the co-incidental normal ones. I will endeavour to enumerate a few here:

01. Requirements of prayers: Islam enjoins its followers to pray 5 times a day and is called by the Muezzin to his prayers. These prayers are at i) Dawn ii) Noon iii) Afternoon iv) Sunset v) Night.

Zoroastrianism also enjoins prayers 5 times a day called "Geh". The devotee is summoned by the ringing of a bell in the AtashBehram / Agiary. These prayers are also at the same time as in Islam and their respective names are:

Time: Islamic/ Zoroastrianism

Dawn: Fajar/ Havaan

Noon: Zohar/ Rapithwan

Afternoon: Asr/ Uziren

Evening: Mazreem or Maghrib/ Aiwisuthrem

Night time: Isha or Ishan/ Ushaen.

02. Pre-requisites of Prayer: On entering the mosque and prior to commencing prayers a Muslim has to cover his head and wash his face and limbs. Similarly, a Zoroastrian on entering the Agiary will cover his head, wash his face and limbs and perform the Padyaab Kusti before commencing his prayers.

03. The Prayers: Prayers in Islam are in Arabic only, though translations/transliterations are available. The liturgy has to be conducted in Arabic only. **In Zoroastrianism too, prayers have to be recited in Avesta or in Pazend only.** In fact in Avestan prayers Pazend portions have to be recited in an undertone so as not to break the seamless flow of Avestan Manthravani.

04. Sanctum Sanctorum and its veneration: The holiest spot in a Mosque is the wall facing Mecca and is called the Qiblah. **In the Atashbehram/Agiary the room where the Atash Padshah is enthroned is also called the Keblaah.** A Muslim will perform the Sajdah in front of the Qiblah and so also will the Zoroastrian perform the Sezdah before his Keblaah. Both involve kneeling down and touching the forehead to the ground.

05. A Holy Month: In Islam Ramzan is the holy month in which all Muslims are required to fast in the day and only break their fast after sunset. **In Zoroastrianism the month of Bahman has similiar connotations** wherein all are requested to particularly abstain from flesh. Perhaps in the age of the Sassanian dynasty the month of Bahman was observed as Ramzan is now.

06. Ascent into Heaven: The hagiography of Islam assures us that Prophet Mohammad ascended to heaven from Jerusalem on the mythical beast Burrrak. He crossed the 7 spheres, exchanged greetings with the patriarchs and beheld the glory of God.

The Dinkard tells us that at the entreaties of Asho Zarthustra Bahman Ameshaspand transcendentally elevated his consciousness to the realm of heaven wherein Asho Zarthustra looked at the refulgent majesty of God. A similiar journey was attributed to the virtuous Ardaviraf who visited hell, purgatory and heaven during his spiritual journey.

The above similarities are obvious. A more careful research would reveal more parallels. However even these points are too close to be dismissed as mere coincidences. This means Zoroastrianism has had an enormous impact on Islam which is not acknowledged. **Everyone agrees Islam owes a lot to Judaism and Christianity but I feel that the scholars of Islam borrowed very heavily from Iran and this can be perhaps attributed to that shadowy figure of Dastur Dinyar (Salman Farsi).** This debt is so impressive that it had to be consistently downgraded and later denied. After all if Islam is supposedly directly inspired by God it cannot be seen to be acknowledging any debt to an older faith, specially the faith of a nation which Islam has defeated. This may perhaps explain the devotion of your Persian Imams to my Faith.

07. Chinvat Bridge (The SIRAAT BRIDGE): According to ancient Persian myth, when a person dies, the soul remains by the body for three days. On the fourth, it travels to Chinvat Bridge (the Bridge of the Separator, also call Al-Sirat), accompanied by gods of protection. The bridge is "finer than a hair and sharper than a sword" and spans a deep chasm teeming with monsters. On the other side of the bridge is the gateway to paradise.

08. Hell: Demons guard the foot of the bridge and argue with the gods over the soul's fate. The actions of the dead person, both good and bad, are weighed, and the soul is either allowed to cross or denied access to the bridge. Spirits whose evil outweighs their good fall into the demon-infested pit to face eternal torment. In this abyss of the damned, each soul is tortured by a GHOUL that represents its sins in life. Once fallen into the gulf, no soul can escape the horrors of hell through its own power.

Zoroaster, a sixth century BC religious leader, had warned his followers of this obstacle to heaven but he promised to lead his flock safely across. The ancient manuscript Gathas (Songs of Zoroaster) explains that the Bridge of the Separator "becomes narrow for the wicked," whereas the holy can easily pass unharmed. (In Gathas, the fair god Rashnu is named as the judge who helps determine who is worthy of salvation and who must be damned.) All infidels (non-believers) fall into hell, which the prophet says has been created especially for the "followers of the lie."

The legends are sketchy but assert that Chinvat Bridge is located somewhere in the far north. It is a place of filth where the damned endure physical tortures and spiritual agony. Souls who are unsuccessful in crossing the Chinvat Bridge suffer these torments until AHRAMAN, the evil god of ZOROASTRIANISM, is destroyed by the good god Orzmahd during the LAST JUDGMENT. As this time, lost spirits are restored to the truth since "the lie" has been eradicated, or they face final ANNIHILATION.

Notice the similarity? So you guys are actually pagan stone and sun worshippers,

correct? But your Koran is pure and free from plagiarism.

DUROOD VS SALAWAT

DUROOD is a Persian word meaning 'cutting off from the root'. This term was maliciously introduced by the AJAMI (Persian) "Imams". You probably know that 95% of our "Imams" hailed from the defeated Persia. **They were PARSIS (Zoroastrians, Magians, Majoos), but Muslims in disguise only. This includes the six Sunni MUHADDITHEEN of "SAHAH SITTAH" (the six 'authentic' books of Hadith) and the three Shi'a MUHADDITHEEN of "SAHAH ARB'AH" (the four 'authentic' books of Hadith). Add "Imam" Tabari (d.310 Hijrah), the first historian and exponent of the Qur'an, plus a multitude.** They were "canonized" by the Abbasid caliphs of Baghdad. Why? The caliphs were under the influence of their Parsi mothers and wives. Moreover, these caliphs and the state-sponsored "Imams" had a synergistic relationship. You will not find any ONE of these "Imams" opposing kingship and despotism. Rather, they opened the gates for HAREMS, slaves, concubines, wine and all kind of luxury, indulgence and lavishness for the elite. Anyone criticizing these "Imams" would lose his neck under the state-sponsored QAZI'S FATWA (religious edict). So, DUROOD was implied to mean 'cutting off TAWHEED from its root'. Just as SALAT was changed to the Parsi NAMAZ, SALAWAT was denatured into the despicable DUROOD.

Now, real SALAWAT is given in the Qur'an. We don't need to quit SALAWAT. INNALLAHA WA MALAAIKATIHI YUSALLOON 'ALANNABI. YA AIYYUHALLAZEENA AAMANOO! SALLOO 'ALAYIHI WA SALLIMOO TASLEEMA.

Here it is:

33:56 Verily, Allah and His angels bless the Messenger and support his Mission (33:43). O You who have chosen to be graced with belief! Bless him and give yourself up to him and his Mission in total submission. (4:65, 7:157).

So, we can say and work on SALALLAHU 'ALAYIHI WA SALLAM – or ALLAHUMMA SALLI 'ALA MUHAMMADINWWA BAARIK WA SALLIM Here is the SALAWAT for MU'MINEEN.

33:43 He it is Who bestows His blessings upon you, and supports you, and His angels, that He may bring you forth from darkness into the Light. And Merciful is He, indeed, to those who attain belief. (2:155-157, 9:10314:1, 14:15, 33:56)

THE RIGHTS OF ALLAH

The "Muslim clergy" tell us that there are two kinds of rights.

01. HUQUQULLAH (the rights of Allah)
02. HUQUQUL 'IBAAD (the rights of humans)

The Qur'an makes no such distinction. **One who serves humanity serves Allah.** See what the Glorious Book says about Allah's Right and feel the delightful marvel.

6:141 ---. Enjoy the fruit thereof as they come to fruition but give Him His Right on the day of harvest. ---- ('Haqqahu' = His Right = Allah's Right =

Divine Right of the poor)

By beating the drum of the invented rights of Allah, the "Ulama" make Muslims insensitive and oblivious to human rights.

Because he/she "was fulfilling Huququllah", the N2I will:

- Arrive late and leave early.
- Leave the office for mid-day prayers to return only the next day.
- Ignore a crying baby, a friend or a family member.
- He/She would mysteriously disappear from time to time.
- Will frequently be unavailable at the time of need.
- Ask for days off unexpectedly.
- Break all contact with society for 10 days in the name of I'tikaaf.
- Keep reciting the books of man-made du'as.
- Will disappear for days, weeks and months for Tabligh.
- Break conversation, and even walk away from important meetings.
- Neglect the most important task at hand.
- Keep running away to pilgrimage.
- Waste time and money on the graves of saints.
- Rationalize his lassitude and apathy, "See, I am fasting."
- For prayers, he would keep people waiting in lines at the workplace.

VIRGIN BIRTH: One of the important injunctions of the Qur'an is that Allah makes Laws as He wills in the World of Command and enforces them in the World of Creation i.e. the Universe (7:54, 85:16). And then, He never changes them. The grand empire of human learning, development, invention, science and technology would have failed to come off ground if Allah's physical Laws in the Universe were to keep changing. **Pregnancy requires the union of the male and the female chromosomes. Allah never changes His Laws. Therefore, the idea of a virgin birth, although popular among the Christians and Muslims, is non-Qur'anic and absolutely erroneous. Jesus is referred to as son of Mary because his mother was more prominent and also because his father, Joseph the carpenter, died at an early age. The Bible also refers to Jesus as son of man and as son of David. In fact three of the four Gospels in their geologies name Joseph as the father of Jesus.** Mary was the first revolutionary and that too, a feminine voice, against the man-made institution of monasticism. Let us note here a few salient points for the sake of clear understanding.

Mary was a descendant of Prophet Aaron. Even generations after a prominent person, it was customary to call the descendants by his or her name. In Luke 1:5 Elizabeth, the wife of Prophet Zachariah, is referred to as, "One of the daughters of Aaron". Similarly, Mary is referred to as sister of Aaron in the Qur'an 19:28.

In 19:22-23 Mary is shown grieving, then talking to her husband. Marrying him in violation of the sanctuary rules, lack of shelter and labor pains all add to her grief which she is expressing.

Now a few more important concepts given in the Qur’an that strongly negate the fallacy of the “virgin birth” of Jesus:

- Allah does all things according to His Laws (3:40,19:9) You will never find Allah’s Laws changing or deviating (6:34, 6:116, 10:64, 17:77, 18:27, 33:38, 33:62, 35:43, 40:85, 48:23)
- **The example of Jesus, as far as God is concerned, is the same as that of Adam. He created him from dust, then said to him, "Be!", and he was (3:59) By Adam is meant all mankind (7:11)** All humans are created from dust, then from a zygote, the union of male and female gametes. (Verses too many to mention). The Qur’an emphatically and repeatedly states that all human beings are procreated from both male and female chromosomes, without exception. (Again, verses too many to mention, but Surah Al-Baqarah should suffice).
- **Even God won’t have an offspring since He never had a mate (6:101).** Verse 19:22 narrates of Mary moving far off from her village. Since Mary had broken the rules of the shrine, she and her family kept the marriage with Joseph carpenter confidential. [Incidentally, much of this information also appears in The Apocalypse of Peter, Gospel of Mary and The Secret Book of James]
- The Qur'an describes Zechariah and wife begetting Yahya a.s. against some odds but not against Allah's Laws. 3:40 Zechariah prayed to Allah, but then wondered, “My Lord! How could I have a son when old age has overtaken me already and my wife is barren?” He said, “So it will be, Allah does everything according to His Laws.” (The infertility in his wife was cured 21:90).
- 3:43 She (Mary) was told by angels to gather courage, quit monasticism, submit to the Command of her Lord and join her family for leading a normal life bowing to the design that Allah has ordained for people. 3:45 Angels said, “O Mary! Allah gives you the good news through a word from Him. ----. 3:47 Mary exclaimed! “O My Lord, How shall I have a son when no man has touched me?” He said, “Just as Allah creates everyone according to His Laws (3:40). When Allah decrees a matter, it starts happening.” 19:20 **She said, "How can I have a son when no man has ever touched me? For, never have I been a loose woman!" (3:46, 19:28). About 3:45-47 please note that Mary is only engaged and not yet married to Joseph.**

Your own Beacon has been the first ever open and effective voice raising the following points (and these are just a few examples):

- The term, "Five Pillars of Islam" is man-made.
- Salaat is not prayer or Namaaz. The fabricated ritual of five daily prayers and their exact, consistent methodology cannot be found in the Qur'an and all the books of Hadith combined.
- Restrictions upon women during their physiological cycles are man-made.
- Contrary to the Mullah claims, all Ahadith combined together fail to give us the tafseer (explanation) of even 10% of the Qur'an.
- The use of microphones in Masjids violates the 'Sunnah' and human rights.
- The Qur'an condemns only those who eat up usury and not the needy that are exploited to fall for it.
- Hijab and beard are Imamist and cultural traits.

- That the food of the People of the Book except what has been expressly forbidden, such as pork, is Permissible.
- Digging out the Hadith La Talaqa Fil Ighlaaq (There is no divorce under duress. Ibn Majah). Divorce can take place only by following the Qur'anic procedure.
- **Proving that the Battles of Jamal, Saffain and Karbala never took place.**
- Highlighting that the Qur'an exempts from Saum (Abstinence, fasting) those who can undergo it with difficulty.
- That the Namaazis are the biggest violators of human rights. Please see: Who Contrived Namaaz?

And more! Now we are hearing strongly affirmative echos from all parts of the world, Al-Hamdulillah!

CLOSING

Respected readers, there are countless more examples of how, through its historical journey, the dynamic DEEN of Al-Islam has been distorted and ridiculed by 'great' names into the currently ritualistic, fatalistic and superstitious 'religion' with the obvious dismal results. But I think, sufficient exposition has been done and delving further might only consume more of your precious time. The author sincerely trusts his readers' intelligence to explore many more areas on their own. "Ignite their imagination and they will do the rest", said the great philosopher, Abu Raihan Al-Bairuni. In that sense, I hope I have been able to do some justice with the difficult subject of the "History of Islam" (not of Muslims) to a reasonable extent. I am greatly indebted to all the loved ones who have persevered and supported me intellectually or emotionally, through this protracted work, now my 35th book in the last 15 years. Finally, the author assumes full responsibility for any errors that may have remained in this book. All that is right comes from the Beacon of Light, Al-Qur'an.

Comments and criticism will always be welcome and help the author to improve on the next edition. Grateful for your time and contemplation,
Shabbir Ahmed, M.D.

Introduction to: A Response to “Kerbala, a Fact or Fiction”

In recent years there has been a growing propaganda against the shias the enemies are trying very hard to cover the truth hence they are using all possible means. At first they used to directly attack the shias by attacking their beliefs and so on but recently the enemies have adopted a slightly different way. Though they are now indirectly attacking the shias but directly attacking the ahlul-bayt one such book is kerbala fact or fiction also known as kerbala ki haqiqat. In this book the author by the use of his deceptive sweet talk and quoting references from anti-shia books has created a lot of confusion and hence a lot of ignorant people have been misled.

He has gone as far as claiming that the event never took place and its just a made up story by the historians. At first when I was reading the book I thought maybe the author is trying to prove something positive but all praise is for ALLAH when you read the entire book you realize that the main purpose behind the book was to attack the shias because kerbala is an event of great significance to us and hence by proving that such event is concocted and is nothing more than a fiction the whole religion of shia is shattered and its base destroyed.

The author has even went as far as denying Imam mehdi(a.s) which shows his ignorance. My aim here is to prove all the criticism in his book through mostly the Holy Quran because this ignorant man claims to believe in nothing else. So will try my best not to quote other reference unless it is deemed necessary. I hope after writing this book the truth will become manifest and people who were misguided by this wahabi agent will again revert to the truth. Because my efforts are only for the people as I was astonished to see that neither shias nor the sunnies came up with a response to this book although the great personality Imam hussain(a.s) has been insulted and humiliated. Hence I thought it is necessary that I write a book in response and expose this ignorant man's lies in his blasphemous book it is a pity that although he claims that he adhere to the Quran but even after that he is so ignorant coz if he has only read the Quran carefully he would have never written such foolish arguments. I also want to clarify that my style of writing in this book is both defensive and offensive so I apologize to my readers before hand if they feel I am being rude or have offended anyone because when it comes to the family of the Prophet (P.b.u.h) nothing is dearer to me.

“So they have indeed rejected the truth when it came to them; therefore the truth of what they mocked at will shine upon them”.(Sural-Al-Anam , Ayah 5) Quran

IN THE NAME OF ALLAH THE MOST GRACIOUS AND THE MOST MERCIFUL

Now when I cite the first example and expose his lies here the reader will at once get aware of this man's ignorance he says that he only believes in the Quran so lets see how

much he believes in it and how much he understands the Quran I will expose his ignorance through the Quran.

In his book he gives the following comment about Imam mehdi(a.s):

The Imam Mahdi is from the seed of the Kaiser of Rome from the mother's side and of Muhammad (the exalted) from the father's side. [We are not told how. Didn't he, if at all he was born, descend in the lineage of Abu Talib?]

Reply

Here he is trying to deceive the people by saying that he is from the lineage of Abu talib. The fact is that he is from the descendants of Imam hussain(a.s). And Imam hussain(a.s) is the son of bibi fatima(a.s) and in this way he is descendant of the Holy Prophet(P.b.u.h). Now ignorant people will claim that descent is recognized from the male side only. However this is not true and I shall prove this from the Quran. Now lets look the following verse of the Holy Quran;

:"And We gave to him Isaac and Jacob; each did We guide, and Noah did We guide before, and of his descendants David and Solomon and Job and Joseph and Aaron; and thus do We reward those who do good. And Zakariyya and John and Jesus and Elias; every one was of the good." (6:84-85)

Now I ask this ignorant man who was the father of Jesus? The reply is that it is a universal fact that Jesus had no father hence this verse proves that Hasan and Husain are the descendants of the Prophet of Islam. Since in this verse God has verified Jesus as a descendant of Abraham, and Jesus had no father, this relationship is from the side of the mother. In the same manner, Hasan and Husain are truly the descendants of the Prophet through bibi Fatima(a.s). Now tell me dear readers can this man claim to be a follower of the injunctions of the Quran? His lack of knowledge about such a simple matter is the greatest prove of his lies and deception he has used in his book. Because either he knows this fact but fails to recognize it however this is not possible because even a person not possessing that much knowledge is aware of this fact. Or maybe he doesn't know about this fact either way it only proves his stupidity. Because a man cannot claim to be a follower of something unless he has thorough knowledge of it. This is only a beginning dear reader there is much more to come.

Now let us examine his next comment:

Imam Mahdi bin Hasan Askari, (aforementioned) was born in the year 255 or 256 A.H. [i.e. if he was born at all!] In 260 A.H. at the age of

about five and just ten days before the demise of his father, he disappeared and hid in the nearby cave called Samera or Saraman Raee. With him he took away the entire Qur'an consisting of 40 (not 30) parts and 17000 (not 6200) verses. He also took with him all scriptures of the prophets and apostles of old, the Book of Ali, the Book of Fatima, the Science of Jafar, all miracles of the prophets, the staff of Moses, the shirt of Adam, and Solomon's ring. He will reappear before the Dooms Day . He will resurrect Abu Bakr and Umer from their graves. In the course of one day and night he would execute both of them a thousand times after bringing them back to life. According to some

accounts, he will dispense the same prescription to Usman. (Hablullah No.6, P.32).

Reply

Dear readers look at this man his lies have crossed all limits instead of quoting a reference from the books of the shias he is quoting references by anti-shia scholars, who wrote such books in order to defame shiism and instill hatred for them in the hearts of other people. If we judge the Jews and the Christians through the Holy Qur'an, they would not accept the judgment, despite the fact that the Qur'an is our absolute proof. Therefore, we should show their mistakes in their books, because then the proof would be stronger, in accordance to the saying: From among them, there was one who bore witness against them." So I challenge this ignorant man to give one authentic reference in the books written by the shia scholars who have mentioned such an incident. The truth is that there is not even a single book written by a shia scholar who mentions this event these are lies created by liars like him who want the people to hate and kill the shias.

Now lets see another ignorant comment by this ignorant man:

Ahsanul Maqal states that Imam Mahdi, the son of Hasan Askari will appear at the very end of this world. He will be around in this world only for seven years. He will uphold equity and justice and then there will be Armageddon. So that will be it. The one whose wait extended for so many centuries, heralded the end of the world! Best of luck to those who are waiting! All my study of the Qur'an, the Hadith and history tells me that be it today or tomorrow, whoever endeavors to bring about the triumph and ascendancy of Islamic faith, will have as his mission, the supremacy of the Qur'an. Every such person will, in his own right, be the Mahdi*. Readers, this is the lesson Allama Iqbal so aptly put forth after over forty

years:

Whose “self” manifests in action first

He is verily the Mahdi and the Promised One!

Reply

I pity this fool who says he follows the Quran. It says in the Quran

"And whatever the Apostle gives you, accept it; and from whatever he forbids you, keep back." (59:7). And this man is rejecting all the hadith which confirms the existence of Imam mehdi(a.s) which are accepted by both the shias and the sunnies. And yet this foolish man is trying to exert his own opinion along with the opinion of Allama iqbal. I want to ask this man who gave allam iqbal any authority over the Muslim? Did the Prophet (P.b.u.h) tell us that there will be a poet in the 20 century listen to his poetry and accept it. What a shame he is accepting a poetry which is contradicting the words of the Prophet (P.b.u.h) which is against the teachings of the Quran and yet this man claims to follow the Quran. I say to this man you do not follow the Quran you follow your own conjecture a conjecture of Satan who is cured and so are you. I will cite some hadith on Imam mehdi(a.s) from the books of Ahl-e-sunna.

The Chosen One (ﷺ) clarified that this awaited man is from among his own family; he (ﷺ) said, “The world will not come to an end before the Arabs are ruled by a man from among my own family whose name is similar to mine..., etc.”

Abû Sa`îd al-Khudri is quoted as having said that the Messenger of Allâh (ﷺ) said, “The Hour shall not come till the earth is filled with oppression, suppression and animosity, then will come out of my family one who will fill it with equity and justice after being filled with oppression and transgression.” Abû Hurayra is quoted as having cited the Messenger of Allâh (ﷺ) as saying, “If only one day remained of the life in this world, Allâh, the most Exalted One, the most Great, would have prolonged it till a man from among my Ahl al-Bayt (‘a) rules the Daylam Mountain and Constantinople.” Umm Salamah is quoted as having cited the Messenger of Allâh (ﷺ) saying, “Al-Mahdi is from among my offspring, from the offspring of Fâtima (‘a).” The Messenger of Allâh (ﷺ) said that Jesus, peace be upon him, would appear at the end of time and would pray behind al-Mahdi. Abû Hurayra quotes the Messenger of Allâh (ﷺ) as saying, “How will you be if the son of Maryam (Mary) descends among you and your own Imâm is your king?!”

Al-Hâfidh, in *Sharh Sahîh al-Bukhâri*, has said, “Narratives are consecutively reported that al-Mahdi is from this nation, and that Jesus son of Mary will descend and pray

behind him.” The Fiqh Assembly of the Muslim World League (Rabitat al-Aalam al-Islami) issued the following *fatwa* (verdict) dated May 31, 1976 about the Awaited Mahdi: “Al-Mahdi, peace be upon him, is Muhammad ibn Abdullâh al-Hasani al-Alawi al-Fatimi al-Mahdi, the Awaited One. The time of his appearance is at the end of time, and it [appearance] is one of the signs of the Great Hour. He shall come out from the west, and he will receive the oath of allegiance in Hijaz, in Venerable Mecca, between the Rukn and Maqam [of Ibrahim], between the Honored Ka`ba and the fixed Black Stone. He will appear when there is a great deal of corruption, when disbelief spreads and when people oppress, and he will fill the earth with justice and equity just as it was filled with injustice and oppression. He shall rule the entire world and everyone will be his subject, once through conviction and once through war. He shall rule the earth for seven years, and Jesus, peace be upon him, will descend after him and kill the Dajjâl [anti-Christ] or descends with him and helps him kill him at the Ludd Gate on the land of Palestine. And he is the last of the twelve righteous caliphs about whom the Prophet (ﷺ) spoke as recorded in the *Sahîh* books... The belief in the appearance of al-Mahdi is obligatory, and it is one of the tenets of the followers of Sunnah and Jamâ`ah and is not denied except by one who is ignorant of the Sunnah and one who brings an innovation into the creed.” Now it is understood that even the sunnies believe a man who doesn’t believe in Imam mehdi(a.s) an innovator and yes a great innovator this man is. Here I would also like to clarify is that although both the shias and sunnies believe in Imam mehdi(a.s) but there are some differences regarding him. Some sunnies believe he is already born and is in concealment(hidden from the eyes of the people) like the shias while some say he is yet to be born and the second difference is the sunnies believe that he is descendant of Imam hassan(a.s) while the shias say he is from the progeny of Imam hussain(a.s) but none of them deny his existence like this liar.

Now let us examine the next comment by this ignorant man:

Refer to writings of Imam and Hafiz Muhammad Ibn-I-Jareer Tabari and you will know whether assassins of Hussain were Sunnies or not.

Many scholars declare this Tabari as a Shia. We, on the other hand, vouch to the research of the esteemed Allama Tamanna Imadi that the so-called Imam tabari was in fact a Zoroastrian.

Reply

When a fair minded person reads such a comment he will be shocked? Firstly because this ignorant man himself is testifying that in the battle of kerbala which side the sunnies were as most of the sahabas

had paid allegiance to yazeed. Hence it becomes clear why this man is denying this great historian so that people who are seeking the truth do not end up reading the history of tabari in which many hidden issues are uncovered. Now I will cite some references to prove that this man tabari was infact a sunni historian.

The person of Tabari is a leading authority in the eyes of the Ahl'ul Sunnah and the celebrated Allamah Shibli Numani (the greatest Hanafi scholar in the Indian subcontinent during the twentieth century) writes in his acclaimed *Sirath-un Nabi, English version, v1, p25* praising Tabari as follows, and also rebutting the minority of bigots amongst his own Sunni community who would call the foremost Sunni historian a Shia:

"Among books of historical character, an authentic and very comprehensive book is that of the Imam al Tabari, known was Tareekh Kabir. Al Tabari is a writer whose scholarly attainments and whose sure and extensive knowledge are unanimously recognized by the traditionists. His commentary by far is the best of the commentaries. The well known traditionalist, Ibn Khuzaima, says that he knew no man more learned than al Tabari. Al Tabari died in the year 310 A.H - 921 C.E. Some (minor) traditionists, al Sulaimani in particular, have remarked that al Tabari coined traditions for the Shia. Regarding this charge against al Tabari, Allama al Dhahabi, in his Mizan al-I'tidal says: 'This is an allegation based on false misgivings. The fact is that Ibn Jarir is one of the most trustworthy Imams.' al-Dhahabi has further remarked: 'All the authentic and comprehensive books of history, such as Tareekh al Kamil and those written by Ibn al Athir, Ibn Khuldun, Abual Fida etc, are based on his work and abridged Tareekh of al- Tabari'"

Al-Dhahabi's own rank amongst Sunni scholars is impeccable, none have criticised him and the above is what he said of Tabari. He testifies that Tabari was trustworthy and indeed should be regarded as the father of the Sunni historians. Incidentally, Numani and Dhahabi also here both extol the work of Abul Fida, whose reference to the issue of the burning of Fatima (sa)'s house, has already been noted by us.

Numani, as we later see, also goes on to comment in detail on Umar burning the house of Fatima (as), and states it as a fact that cannot be denied, as we shall see later.

Similarly in *al Faruq Volume 1 page 9* Numani states:

"Tabari (died 310 Hijri) is acknowledged as a leading authority not only in history but also in jurisprudence and hadith. Hence it is that the people have pronounced him a jurist along with the four Imams. On history he wrote a detailed and voluminous book covering thirteen massive volumes".

How could Tabari at the time of his writing have been a Shia? As these great Sunni scholars have implied, only some diehard bigots amongst the Sunnis, and not a single major traditionist, have said such a thing. To do so, is to remove from the Sunni hall of

fame their greatest historian. It's like saying William Shakespeare was French. Indeed, conclusive proof of Tabari's staunch Sunni faith is found in the work of that bastion of Sunni'ism, the legendary Ibn Hajar al Asqalani. Here we find that Tabari firmly believed in the institution of khilafat that was established in Saqifa, and this above all can only mean one thing: he was a Sunni. If any doubt remains over this matter, then allow us to narrate this event recorded by classical Sunni scholar Ibn Hajr al Asqalani in *Lisan al-Mizan* (5:101):

"In one of his classes al-Tabari asked: "What is the status of one who says: Abu Bakr and `Umar are not two Imams of guidance?" Ibn al-A`lam replied: "He is an innovator." Al-Tabari said: "An innovator? Just an innovator? Such a person is put to death! Whoever claims that Abu Bakr and `Umar are not two Imams of guidance is definitely put to death!"

And guess who says exactly that? We the Shia do. These ignorant man should know that their own serious scholars call his assertions at blacklisting the Sunni 'greats' as baseless and counterproductive by reducing the academic standing of Sunni Islam as a whole - you even blacklist with the title 'Shia' not just renowned Sunni scholars who have also narrated a tradition that go against Abu Bakr and Umar, but even those who issue Takfir against the Shia and issue fawtas condemning them to death like Tabari. It's like McCarthyism in America when anyone who said the truth was called a Communist, even if he was anticommunist and a firm American. It's like saying Ayatullah Khomeini was a Sunni! We suggest that this ignornat man opens his eyes..

Take a look at this insult by this so called learned man:

When people would caution the Imam against going to Kufa, the Imam would say, 'I am destined to martyrdom in Karbala on the 10th of Muharram'."(Had this been so, the Imam, a model of endurance and patience, would not weep and wail!)

Reply

It was the words of Holy Prophet[s] which prevented him The way Prophet[s] had foretold that Allah will bring about an agreement between two sects of the Muslims through Imam Hassan[as]. Similarly the Prophet (s) had told him that he would have to travel to Iraq and be martyred on the path of truth. Imam Husayn [as] was aware of these words of the Prophet[s] so how could he have accepted the advice of others proving the words of Holy Prophet[s] false? When the Prophet (s) had instructed him to proceed in this manner, then after the order of the Prophet (s) the advice of the Sahaba becomes

irrelevant, no Sahaba is entitled to express a different opinion. At the time of the peace treaty of Hudaibiya, Umar opposed the decision of the Prophet (s), yet the Prophet (s) gave no consideration to Umar's objections, likewise in this instance the order of the Prophet (s) was one that placed a specific duty on Imam Husayn (as). That is why Imam Husayn (as) deemed the advice of the Sahaba to be irrelevant, the words of the Prophet (s) made their advice null and void.

Islam is a religion based on nature. Wailing or weeping is the innate instinct of a human being. A newborn child starts his life crying. Weeping is not prohibited in any religion or creed of the world. Tears are automatically shed when a man is confronted by any physical, mental or spiritual mishap, and tears are not only the sign of grief but also a kind of reimbursement for that grief. Now in whose grief does a newborn child weep? That's the question, which can be answered by the one who remembers his own weeping when he was born. It is said, that when Adam (as) was sent to this earth from heaven, he wept on that migration and hence every child of Adam (as), weeps when he opens his eyes in this world. If this is true, then this reason for wailing certainly supports our point of view that in the grief of a departure, wailing is a natural habit. Wailing or weeping is a natural instinct hence Allah (swt) has also praised this act and has said in the Holy Qur'an:

We read in Surah Maryam 019.058

YUSUFALI: Those were some of the prophets on whom Allah did bestow His Grace, - of the posterity of Adam, and of those who We carried (in the Ark) with Noah, and of the posterity of Abraham and Israel of those whom We guided and chose. Whenever the Signs of (Allah) Most Gracious were rehearsed to them, they would fall down in prostrate adoration and in tears.

Surah An-Nahl verse 53

YUSUF ALI: And ye have no good thing but is from Allah. And moreover, when ye are touched by distress, unto Him ye cry with groans.

It is quite clear from these words of Allah (swt) that He praises this act and dislikes mocking the concept of weeping. Therefore, during mortification or humility before Allah (swt) and during the situations of calamity and catastrophe, wailing is the act of the praised ones and since 'wailing' is a composite act of mourning it serves as evidence for mourning.

And yet this man claims to love Imam Hussain(a.s) and yet he claims to follow the Quran. Did he not read verses like these in the Holy Quran or is he so blinded by his prejudice against the Ahlul-bait(a.s)

He further continues with his blasphemy against Imam Hussain(a.s):

45. "In a dream I saw some dogs biting me. Most ferocious among them was one with white spots."

Mujtahid Allama Muhammad Hussain writes that that description of the dog points to Shamar son of Joshan who was a leper (and so had white spots).

(The exalted prophet had admonished against relating sad dreams! The language cannot be that of Imam Hussain!)

Reply

Again this man shows his complete ignorance, I ask this man to please refer to ayat 60 of Sura 17 (Bani Israel). Commentators from the sunni ulema, like Tha'labi, Imam Fakhru'd-din Razi, and others say that the Holy Prophet saw in a dream that the Bani Umayya, like monkeys, ascended and descended his pulpit. Thereafter Gabriel brought this holy ayat: "And when We said to you: Surely your Lord encompasses men. And we did not create the vision which We showed you except as a trial for men and the cursed tree in the Qur'an as well. And we cause them to fear, but it only adds to their grievous transgression." (17:60) I guess this man has a habit of believing whatever he likes from the Quran and rejecting whatever he dislikes.

He further goes on and won't stop at nothing with his blasphemy and lack of knowledge:

Imam Zainul Abedin relates that when Imam Hussain spoke verses about his death, his aunt i.e. Hazrat Zainab started beating her face with hands and tore up her clothes. She then fainted. Zain's father i.e. Imam Hussain said, "My sister, I serve an oath on you. Please keep my

oath. After I am gone, do not tear up your clothes, do not scratch your face, and do not wail"

(Offenders against Islam insinuate that nobody, not even Zainab complied with the oath.)

Reply

Here he has failed to give any reference what so ever of this account. To prove that Imam hussain(a.s) could not have objected it we shall support our view from the Quran:

From the Holy Quran from the Chapter ADH-DHAARIYAAT we learn that Hadhrath Sara (as) struck her face when she was told that she would conceive a baby.

"Then came forward his wife in grief, **she smote her face** and said (what! I) an old barren woman?" (51:29). Thus it is evident that smiting the face was not an objectionable act in the sight of Allah, otherwise Allah would have reprimanded her for doing so and when ALLAH did not object how can Imam hussain do?

Lets examine his next comment:

That day there was hue and cry in the tents. (Allama Mujtahid Muhammad

Hussain writes that it was a God-ordained calamity for them. The Imam kept briefing them about the oncoming events many times a day after these were revealed to him from God. According to the Allama this was not an unforeseen calamity.

Why then the hue and cry?

At many places it has been written that the Imam broke down in tears at martyrdom of a certain person or at such and such happening.

(The Rasoolullah said that Sabr (patience) is something that is to be exercised at the time of a misfortune and not later. Suggesting that a brave and great person like Imam Hussein broke down time and again is an insult to him).

Reply

ALL Praise is for ALLAH yet again I will reply to him through the Quran:

[Yusufali 5:83] And when they listen to the revelation received by the Messenger, thou wilt see their eyes overflowing with tears, for they recognise the truth: they pray: "Our Lord! We believe; write us down among the witnesses.

This proves that crying is an act of the believers and according to the Holy Qur'an flowing of tears is a sign of believing in the truth.

This verse was revealed when some Christians from Habsha visited Madina. Shah Abdul Qadir Mohaddis Dehlavi gives its explanation in his "Tafseer e Moza al Qur'an".

"When the persecutions by the pagans of Makkah were no longer bearable, the Holy Prophet(s) ordered the Muslims to migrate to some other country. That same day nearly 80 Muslims (some alone and some along with their families) migrated towards Habsha. The ruler of Habsha in those days was a very just man; the pagans of Makkah approached the king and lied to him that this new group of people calls Jesus Christ a slave. On hearing this, the king asked the Muslims to recite something from their book, which the Muslims did. After hearing the recitation of the Holy Qur'an some of their saints started crying and said that this is exactly what they have come to know by his Excellency Jesus Christ, and he had further said that after Him, another apostle would come and no doubt this person is that apostle. The king accepted Islam secretly, and this verse has been revealed for him."

The flowing of tears from eyes is called crying and crying is one of the aspects of mourning, therefore the relation of this verse with mourning is automatically proved.

Of relevance is Abu Bakr's very own admission that the Sahaba would weep when reciting the Quran. We are citing the comments of Ghazzali in "Ahya ul Uloom Adeen" Volume 2, Urdu Translation by Maulana Nadeem Al Waajidi Fazil Deobandi, Published in Karachi:

"When Abu Bakr saw an Arab man weeping while listening to the Holy Quran He said : "We used to weep in the same manner as you are weeping but now our hearts have become stoned"

The entire content of the Qur'an is true as is Husayn (as)'s martyrdom. Just as the eyes of believers are filled with tears when they hear the recitation of the Holy Qur'an, they also shed tears when hearing of Imam Husayn's (as) martyrdom. Husayn (as) was the Talking

Qur'an and the moment one hears about the hardships faced by Imam (as) one laments over his death and shed tears.

We read in Surah Bara'at verse 82:

Therefore they shall laugh little and weep much (as) a recompense for what they used to earn.

The Verse clearly sanctifies weeping and crying else it would have prohibited it. History stands as clear proof how Prophets, Messengers and Messiahs from Allah (swt) have wept and cried, singing the glory and greatness of Allah (swt) and expressing their own humbleness and fragility before Him (swt). Also each and every one of these men have wept and cried for Imam Husayn (as) long before the Tragedy of Karbala took place! We ordinary men should follow these great men of Allah (swt) and adopt their ideals and practices.

Moreover, see this verse in the chapter of weeping:

[Shakir 9:92] Nor in those who when they came to you that you might carry them, you said: I cannot find that on which to carry you; they went back while their eyes overflowed with tears on account of grief for not finding that which they should spend.

This verse descended with regard to some sahaba who asked the Prophet(s) for horses in order to participate in jihad.

There were seven men of the Ansar who came to the Holy Prophet and told him that they did not have provisions for going with him on the expedition of Tabuk. On hearing from the Holy Prophet that there was nothing left with him after providing others, they went away weeping.

One of the reasons that we weep for the tragedy of karbala is that we were not present at that time otherwise we would have helped the besieged grand son of Holy Prophet(s) and participated in jihad. If Sahaba can weep for not been able to participate in jihad at their time, than why cant Shi'a weep for the same reason?

Wailing has been permitted and nothing against it is found in any Book; on the contrary, there is the word "La yateni" from Verse 40 of Chapter 78, Al Naba' The Great news in Part 30.

"Oh! Would that I were dust"

The word underlined from the Verse above shows that it is an indication for wailing, which is crying with a loud voice at loss of something dear to one's heart, and this is a Verse from The Holy Qur'an. The comments of Deobandi scholar Anwar Shah

Kashmiree are worthy of note:

"There is nothing against Islam in expressing grief, sorrow or in crying and weeping at the loss of a loved one".

Fayz al Bari fi Sharh Saheeh Bukharee, Volume 12, Page 462, Printed in Egypt

I appeal to all the readers who are reading my text aren't these verses from the holy Quran? Why didn't he pay attention to these verses when writing his book as he says he only follows the Quran. Or maybe he doesn't just follow the Quran he follows the wahabi mullas who for centuries have tried to end azadari of Imam hussain(a.s). And since their every effort failed they now deny the whole event.

Let us examine the next criteria:

The second line is very fitting for the Eastern mind. Whoever lagged behind or became a loser neither surveyed himself nor observed others; only cried for creating a scene. Look, those who did not embark on the journey, got to the destination! An entertaining idea. However, it is odd that author of the book Saadatud Darain has used this couplet for alluding to the Companions of the Rasool. How? He says, "The true successors to the seat of the Rasool were cast aside and others captured the Khailafa."

We think that the Honorables Abubakr, Umar, Uthman or Hadrat Ali could possibly not have appropriated to themselves the right to govern, they could not have sought it either. In fact that office was offered to them and they treated it like a burden. The Rasool [SAW] had declared, "We would not confer an office upon someone who seeks it. So the Khilafa or the government could not have been the goal of these high personages. Nor could the Rasool authorize the establishment of a hereditary rule. Loftiness of character should be the only measure of a person's esteem. Do you know that Muhammad Ali Bab of Iran who launched the Bahai creed in the Nineteenth century was a descendent of the Rasool? Father of (late) King Hussain of Jordan, the Shareef of Makka, was a descendent of the Rasool too. He was the one who joined the Lawrence of Arabia for pitting Arabs against the Turks? If the

criterion of esteem is the ancestry or race, all Muslims should accept

Prince Kareem Agha Khan as the Imam and unite under his leadership because he is a descendent of the Rasool! And yes, Josh Maleehabadi of Yadon Ki Barat also claimed to be a descendant of the Rasool!

Reply

By reading the above lines specially he says that the Prophet could not authorize the establishment of an hereditary rule. Loftiness of character should only be a measure of self esteem. I ask this man does he mean to say that Imam Ali(a.s), Imam hassan(a.s) and Imam hussain(a.s) lacked in character? Or were they not worthy of it like Hazrat Abu bakr and Hazrat Umar?. And we never say caliphate is an hereditary rule we only say that after that Prophet(P.b.u.h) there were twelve Imams who are the direct descendants of the Prophet(P.b.u.h) who were to guide mankind and to prove this we will yet again support our view from the Quran which proves that the descendants of the Prophet(P.b.u.h) were real his real successors. Did Prophet Muhammad (s) leave the matter of Khilafat to the people? We reject such a notion. Prophet Muhammad [s] left complete instructions for the people in the form of the Holy Qur'an. Anyone that has studied the life of the Prophet (s) will soon recognize that such a notion is false. While the Prophet (s) was alive he taught the Deen to the people. And when misunderstandings arose the people could turn to Rasulullah (s) for guidance, and he always clarified matters to them. Unfortunately following the tragedy of Thursday, it became clear that a group amongst the Sahaba were not willing to listen to the final behest of Rasulullah (s) and they sought to frustrate Rasulullah (s)'s efforts in putting his final instructions onto paper. If Rasulullah (s) was unable to resolve this matter at that time, and that this dispute / misunderstanding took place during his lifetime, such a misunderstanding would not have been clarified after his death. There was an inherent risk of people having different interpretations of Islam, and there was a risk that people might deviate from the right path, that in consequence could harm the fabric of the Muslim community. This is why Prophet Muhammad (s) on several occasions warned his followers:

Abdullah Ibne Umar narrates:

“Do not revert to disbelief after me by striking (cutting) the necks of one another”
Sahih al Bukhari Arabic-English Volume 9 hadith number 198

Other companions also narrated the same hadith.
Sahih al Bukhari Arabic-English Volume 9 hadith numbers 197, 199-200

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 172:

Narrated Asma:

The Prophet said, "I will be at my Lake-Fount (Kauthar) waiting for whoever will come to me. Then some people will be taken away from me whereupon I will say, 'My followers!' It will be said, 'You do not know they turned Apostates as renegades (deserted their religion).'" (Ibn Abi Mulaika said, "Allah, we seek refuge with You from turning on our heels from the (Islamic) religion and from being put to trial").

In light of these traditions and similar ones in Saheeh al Bukharee one can conclude that it was incumbent upon the Prophet to nominate his successor after him, who would:

- Guide the Muslim Ummah in the same way that Rasulullah (s) did,
- Solve religious disputes, and would have the final say when disputes arose,
- Be a figure behind which the entire Ummah could unite.

So that people should adopt his religious commandments and precepts with full certainty and confidence, submit to his instructions considering them to be those of the apostle himself and believe in him wholeheartedly with complete peace of mind. Moreover, it is incumbent upon the vicegerent to be the most knowledgeable of all in his time because he not only has to meet the obligations of being a guide to all in this world in the place of the holy prophet (s.a.w) but also has to ensure the continuity of succession to this responsibility which is the greatest of all tasks. Therefore, it is very important for such a person to be the bearer of the attributes of prophecy (Nubuwwah) and inherit the apostle's knowledge. Such a vicegerent is known as an 'Imam' in jurisprudential terms after the completion of prophecy (Nubuwwah), and the office of vital responsibility of grand religious leadership is known as 'Imamah'. It is also important for such an Imam to be specially nominated by Allah (s.w.t) Himself and it is necessary for the religious legislator (Shari`ye Islam) to have announced by himself the divine nomination of such an Imam, meaning the Imamah of an Imam is to be known and proven through the explicit texts of both Allah (s.w.t) and the holy prophet (s.a.w) otherwise, as a result of the desire for power, there always remains the danger of war for the throne. This crucial responsibility could not be left at the hands of general public because the decisive factor of Imamah is infallibility and only Allah or his apostle or those associated with the holy prophet (s.a.w) can be aware of it. This is the very Godly custom which is not possible to change. Beginning with Adam (a.s) through to the seal of prophets (s.a.w), this is how the vicegerents have been nominated. The holy Prophet (s.a.w) not only announced who his vicegerent was going to be after him but also reiterated the leadership of his Ahlul Bayt [as] and by asking his Ummah to hold fast to the book of Allah (s.w.t) and his Ahlul Bayt together, he has made it very clear till the day of judgement that his Ahlul Bayt were the very true leaders of Islam.

We shall now prove from Qur'anic verses that the Imams of the Shia Ithna Asheri sect were indeed the real vicegerents of the holy Prophet (s.a.w).

In the Qur'an there are several circumstantial narratives pertaining to past prophets and incidents, one might think that the purpose behind it may just be to either educate us on history or to make the book more interesting but remember that such a thought would be subjugating to a purposeful and holy book like the Qur'an. Allah (s.w.t) has clearly informed us that the past events have been narrated in the Qur'an for the sole purpose of

enabling us to deduce examples from them. Therefore, this Ummah should be extracting lessons from every event described in the Qur'an and should not consider them simply as entertaining stories.

Allah says in Qur'an 7:176

Therefore relate the narrative that they may reflect

And He says:

[12:111] In their histories there is certainly a lesson for men of understanding. It is not a narrative which could be forged, but a verification of what is before it and a distinct explanation of all things and a guide and a mercy to a people who believe.

He further says:

[11:120] And all we relate to you of the accounts of the apostles is to strengthen your heart therewith; and in this has come to you the truth and an admonition, and a reminder to the believers.

[73:15] Surely We have sent to you an Apostle, a witness against you, as We sent an apostle (Musa) (a.s) to Firoun.

The above verse clearly elucidates the similarity between Hadhrath Musa (a.s) and Hadhrath Muhammad (s.a.w), therefore the Ummah of the holy Prophet (s.a.w) are also similar to those of prophet Musa (a.s.)

Allah has stated in very clear words that:

[32:23] And certainly We gave the Book to Musa, so be not in doubt concerning the receiving of it, and We made it a guide for the children of Israel.

[32:24] And We made of them Imams to guide by Our command when they were patient, and they were certain of Our communications.

This makes it very clear that Allah (s.w.t) had Himself nominated the Imams to succeed Musa (a.s). The prestige of these Imams of Bani Israel has also been known in that their commandments and guidance to their people have been in accordance with the will of Allah (s.w.t). Mistakes or disobedience to Allah (s.w.t) could not at all have happened

with them. Meaning, the way their nomination as Imams has been announced, the same way their infallibility has been manifested.

Note that, if the holy Prophet’s [s] vicegerents were not to be nominated directly by Allah (s.w.t), the Ummah of Musa (a.s) would have assumed superiority over the Ummah of Muhammad (s.a.w), therefore it has to be accepted that, the nomination of the holy prophet’s Imams also, in accordance with the custom of Allah (s.w.t), should have been and has always been divine, this way the superiority of the Ummah of the holy Prophet (s.w.t) has been consistently established.

[5:12] And certainly Allah made a covenant with the children of Israel, and We raised up among them twelve chieftains; and Allah said: Surely I am with you; if you keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate and believe in My apostles and assist them and offer to Allah a goodly gift, I will most certainly cover your evil deeds, and I will most certainly cause you to enter into gardens beneath which rivers flow, but whoever disbelieves from among you after that, he indeed shall lose the right way.

In the above verse, Allah (s.w.t) announces that the number of chieftains of the people of Musa (a.s) had been twelve, the children of Israel were bound by a covenant to obey them, Paradise had been promised in recompense to obedience to them and a message of destruction had been conveyed to them in case of disobedience.

It has also been indicated in different places in the Qur'an, that the first vicegerent of prophet Musa (a.s) had been his own brother Harun (a.s.)

[25:35] And certainly We gave Musa the Book and We nominated with him his brother Harun an aide.

On one occasion, Musa’s (a.s) supplication and its acceptance has been stated as follows.

Musa (a.s) said:

**He said: O my Lord! Expand my breast for me
And make my affair easy to me
And loosen the knot from my tongue
(That) they may understand my word;
And give to me an aide from my family:
Haroun, my brother,
Strengthen my back by him,
And associate him (with me) in my affair**

**So that we should glorify Thee much,
And remember Thee oft.
Surely, Thou art seeing us.
He said: You are indeed granted your petition, O Musa
20:25-36**

With this matter, the Ummah of Muhammad (s.a.w) have been clearly informed that in the Ummah of Musa (a.s) the one to be nominated as the first successor of Musa (a.s) was not someone out of the family but it was Musa's (a.s) brother. That is why in the Ummah of Muhammad Mustafa (s.a.w) also, the first person to be nominated as his vicegerent was Ali (a.s) who is the brother of the holy Prophet (s.a.w). The word 'Brother' has been clearly mentioned in the Qur'an. That is why the holy prophet (s.a.w) referring to Ali (a.s) has said, **'Ya Ali, Anta Minni Bimanzilati Haruna Min Musa Illa Annahu Laa Nabiyyu Ba'di'**, O Ali your position in relation to me is tantamount to that of Harun with Musa, except that there will be no prophet after me. He also said **'O Ali you are a brother to me in this world and the hereafter'**.

Challenge

The above two traditions of 'Position' and 'Brotherhood' are accepted by both the sects. Therefore, there is no proof whatsoever regarding the holy Prophet (s.a.w) having referred to anyone else apart from Imam Ali (a.s) as his brother or as someone whose position to him was like that of Harun (a.s) to Musa (a.s)! The enemies have tried very hard to put a cover over this tradition but fortunately light could not be blocked from shining.

[35:31] And that which We have revealed to you of the Book, that is the truth verifying that which is before it; most surely with respect to His servants Allah is Aware, Seeing.

[35:32] Then We gave the Book for an inheritance to those whom WE CHOSE from among Our servants; but of them is he who makes his soul to suffer a loss, and of them is he who takes a middle course, and of them is he who is foremost in deeds of goodness by Allah's permission; this is the great excellence.

The word '*Istefaa*' is that special word that has always introduced Allah's chosen guides to us.

[3:33] Surely Allah chose Adam and Nuh and the descendants of Ibrahim and the descendants of Imran above the nations.

The status of Istefaa is the very status that portrays the great qualities of the holy Prophet (s.a.w), which is the reason why his holy name is followed by the title ‘Mustafa’. This word manifests Allah’s (s.w.t) special selection. With this very word, Allah (s.w.t) has introduced those personalities to us who from the Ummah of Muhammad (s.a.w), He has specially selected and made them the heirs of the Qur’an. (Refer to tradition of Thaqalayn).

The prophets and apostles enjoy the peak of faith and wisdom as they are the leaders of mankind. Transmitting the same leadership onto another person from the people is known as ‘Wisayah’ or ‘khilafah’ and ‘Succession’ or ‘Imamah’. After a prophet or an apostle and a leader of a nation, his son is preferred by God for succession as is mentioned in the Qur’an:

[52:21] And (as for) those who believe and their offspring follow them in faith, We will unite with them their offspring and We will not diminish to them aught of their work; every man is responsible for what he shall have wrought.

For example, in another place it is mentioned:

[57:26] And certainly We sent Nuh and Ibrahim and We gave to their offspring the (gift of) prophecy (Nubuwwah) and the Book; so there are among them those who go aright, and most of them are transgressors.

Now it has become obvious that after Nuh (a.s) and Ibrahim (a.s), their children were nominated for succession with the prestige of prophecy (Nubuwwah). Now that prophecy (Nubuwwah) has terminated, the book has definitely remained and Allah (s.w.t) has introduced its heirs to us in the verse:

Therefore, one has to admit that the right of succession to the holy prophet (s.a.w) belongs to his offspring only and not to a stranger.

[17:71] (Remember) the day when We will call every people with their Imam;

The above verse clearly necessitates the existence of an Imam in every period, every generation and every age. Referring to certain personalities, Allah has mentioned the following in the Qur’an which shows who the Imams who would have their people called with are:

[2:143] And thus We have made you a medium (just) nation that you may be the bearers of witness to the people and (that) the Apostle may be a bearer of witness to you; and We did not make that which you would have to be the qiblah but that We might distinguish him who follows the Apostle from him who turns back upon his heels, and this was surely hard except for those whom Allah has guided aright; and Allah was not going to make your faith to be fruitless; most surely Allah is Affectionate, Merciful to the people.

So we realise that these personalities who would be called with their people are those who are under the holy Prophet (s.a.w) and who are the governors and guardians of all people. And only these can be called ‘Imams’. Every generation has been instructed to follow these very personalities. (‘O you who believe, guard yourselves against evil with full awareness of divine laws and be with the truthful’) with this we come to understand that such entity remains in every generation who in the real sense of truth both in words and actions is an infallible.

[13:7] You are only a Warner and (there is) a guide for every people.

This shows that for every generation of human beings, the existence of a true guide is a sure thing.

All Praise is for Allah Again we proved from the Quran the status of the Ahlul-bait(a.s). Strange this man has yet again not able to acknowledge these verses of the Holy Quran.

His criticism never ends let’s see what he says next:

As it happened, Ali son of Imam Hussain (Zain) set off towards the desert. His slave followed him. He heard him wailing loudly. The slave wanted to calm him down and asked him whether the wailing and crying would ever stop. He (Ali) said that Yaqub had twelve sons. One of them Yusuf was away from his presence for a while and even though he was still alive, he had become almost blind crying for his son. I, on the other hand, have seen seventeen people of my household lying dead

including my father, brother and others. So my wailing cannot stop" (Malhoof) This story would not throw favorable light on an ordinary person of faith, let alone a person of the stature of the Imam. Those people, shiny examples of steadfastness and fortitude, could not have spent lives in wailing and crying.

Reply

His heart is so blinded by his prejudice and his love for those wahabi mullas that he denies everything and since his heart is locked he cannot seem to understand anything. Lets analyse the incident of Hazrat Yaqoob(a.s) from the Quran:

Allah (swt) reveals in Surah Yusuf, verse 84:

[Shakir] "And he turned away from them, and said: O my sorrow for Yusuf! and his eyes became white on account of the grief, and he was a repressor (of grief)." Quran 12:84

'*Fahu Kazeem*' means the 'one who absorbs the anguish' but it is proved from the Qur'an that Prophet Yaqub (as) this in no way means that he fought off impulses to fight off his grief. He (as) always exhibited his grief both by his eyes and his tongue. Maulvi Ashraf Ali Thanvi has translated the word '*Fahu Kazeem*' in this way that "Yaqub (as) used to be tormented within his heart" and that's the translation based on rationality while the Qur'an also testifies this. The Qur'an reveals the discussion between Yaqub (as) and his sons in the following:

[Yusufali 12:85] They said: "By Allah! (never) wilt thou cease to remember Joseph until thou reach the last extremity of illness, or until thou die!"

This discussion revealed in the Qur'an proves that the intensity of Yaqub (as)'s grief was to the extent that his sons thought that Yaqub (as) would die on account of his anguish. The pain and agony that Yaqub (as) was confronted with seemed to be the one that is done in a loud voice:

"Alas, my grief for Joseph!"

When the sons commented on the mourning ritual of Yaqub (as), He replied:

[Shakir 12:86] He said: I only complain of my grief and sorrow to Allah, and I know from Allah what you do not know.

Verily, it is evident from the Qur'an that Yaqub (as) lamented to the extent that he not

only lost his eyesight but also came close to death. Now the most important thing here is that even after such intense lamentation (Azadari) Allah (swt) called this mourning of Yaqub (as) as 'Sabr e Jameel' i.e Perfect Patience. Therefore, according to the Qur'an it becomes very clear that to be aggrieved in the exhibition of one's anguish i.e. to perform Azadari isn't against patience. Hence, the notion of some ignorant men like him that the meaning of "*Kazeem*" is not to show the grief of one's heart has been has no Qur'anic basis. Rather its meaning is to tolerate or to bear and which does not in any way prove evidence that mourning for Imam Husayn (as) is Haraam.

Another critical point that we can derive from this story is that the people who were the main cause of Yaqub (as)'s grief also turned out to be the critics on the Azadari of Yaqub (as)! Therefore readers can clearly conclude to which group the critics of Azadari should be counted!

After reading the following comment any fair minded person will instantly realize this man's lies and it is further proved that his sole aim is to show that shiism has no basis, and is in fact created by jews. The Wahabies have been propagating these lies since centuries.

Now let us examine the position regarding Ibn-I-Shahab Zahri. Hujjatullah Abdul Qadir, Ali al-Qadiri Almusavi, author of Mizanul Faris states that this person passed in the second century A.H. and his real name was Ibn-I-Shahab Toosi. He was one of those hundreds of thousands of migrants who, after the Arab conquest of Persia, had settled in Iraqi cities of Koofa, Basra and Baghdad etc. A great number of our history books have named him as the second founder of Shia theology. (The first founder being Abdullah bin Saba, the Jew.) Another character was Abdullah Bin Saba (also called Alsaudah). He was a Jew with a vowed aim of breaking up the central core of the Muslim power. In the time of Hadrat Uthman he rose to political eminence in Iraq in the guise of a Muslim. He fashioned Shia tenets such as that every apostle has an executor and Hadrat Ali was the inheritor of the Prophet Muhammad (pbuh), that the Caliphate was Hadrat Ali's by right and those others occupying the caliphate were usurpers and tyrants. With the collusion of Jews, Nazarenes and the Magians, Abdullah Bin Saba, whose real name was Rayan Bin Saba, succeeded in his evil design.

Reply

The summary of this myth is: “A man named Abdullâh ibn Saba`, a Jew from Yemen, pretended to be a follower of Islam during the reign of `Uthmân in order to cause mischief to the Muslims. He moved about the main Islamic metropolises in Egypt, Syria, Basra and Kûfa, spreading the “glad tidings” that the Prophet (ﷺ) would return to life, that Ali (a) was his *wasi*, and that `Uthmân was the usurper of the right of this *wasi*. Groups from among senior *sahâbah* and *tâbi`în* such as `Ammâr ibn Yâsir, Abû Dharr, Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah and others. He was able to raise armies to kill caliph `Uthmân at his own house.”

Thus does the series of events of this fabricated myth continue till it ends with the Battle of the Camel when Abdullâh ibn Saba` orders his followers to sneak into the army of Ali (a) and of `Â`isha without their knowledge in order to stir a war, and “thus did the Battle of the Camel take place.” Sayyid Murtadha al-`Askari, who stood to expose the fallacy of this imagined myth, states that “The person who fabricated this personality [Abdullâh ibn Saba`] is Sayf ibn `Amr al-Tamîmi al-Barjami al-Kûfi, who died in A.H. 170 (A.D. 786), and from him all other historians quoted it. Then this fabricated incident gained fame and spread in history books across the centuries and till our time, so much so that it has become one of the famous incidents the authenticity of which nobody doubts. The vast majority of writers and historians in the East as well as Orientalists have been blinded to the fact that this incident was the brainchild of one single narrator, a lone individual who acted on his own, and that this narrator, namely Sayf ibn `Amr, is very well known by ancient scholars of *hadîth* as a fabricator and is even accused of being an unbeliever. Ibn Dâwûd says the following about him: “He is nothing; he is a liar.” Ibn Abd al-Birr says, “Sayf is rejected. We have cited his tradition only to inform you of it.” Al-Nisâ`i says this about him: “His traditions are weak. He is not trusted, and nobody has any faith in him.” Yet this same lying narrator is quoted by al-Tabari, Ibn `Asâkir, Ibn Abû Bakr, etc., and al-Tabari has been and is being quoted by all other writers and historians till our time. (Allâma al-`Askari, *Ahâdîth Umm al-Mu`mineen*, p. 272)., (Besides him, a number of scholarly researchers, such as Taha Husayn in Vol. 1 of his book titled *Al-Fitna al-Kubra* (the great dissension) and Dr. Kâmil al-Shaybi in his book titled *Al-Sila Bayna al-Tashayyu` wal Tasawwuf* (the relationship between Shi`ism and Sufism), have all rejected the notion that such an individual ever existed in reality). (Excerpted and edited from the book titled *Abdullâh ibn Saba`* by `allâma Sayyid Murtadha al-`Askari.)

It is well known that incidents narrated by one single person do not satisfy the scientific thinking, nor can they be used as evidence. How is it, then, when this same narrator is not trusted and was famous for being a liar and an unbeliever? Can his narrative be accepted? How can one accept to pass a judgment against a large segment of the Muslims by simply relying on incidents related by lone individuals who have been proven to be liars while there are *ahadîth* that are consecutively reported [*mutawâtir*] from the Messenger of Allâh (ﷺ) which prove the opposite?

One of the greatest historical farces is to attribute Shî'ism to a mythical man, namely Abdullâh ibn Saba`, claiming he was the one who disseminated the concept of “Ali (ʿa) the *wasi*” despite the existence of a huge number of authentic texts proving that Shî'ism has always been to follow Muhammad (ﷺ) and nobody else. Refer to the Imâmate texts on the previous pages to see where this Abdullâh ibn Saba` fits. Is Abdullâh ibn Saba` the one who said, “I am leaving among you that which, if you uphold them, you shall never stray: the Book of Allâh and my *`itrat*, my Ahl al-Bayt”? Or is he the one who said, “Anyone who has accepted me as his master, Ali is his master”? Or is he the one who said that the Imâms are twelve in number? What a ridiculous tale it is that says that a Jew has come from Yemen to hypocritically declare his acceptance of Islam then carries out all these extra-ordinary deeds which reach the limit of getting Muslim armies to battle each other without anyone discovering his true identity?! Is it reasonable to accept that Imâm Ali (ʿa), about whom the Messenger of Allâh (ﷺ) said, “I am the city of wisdom and Ali is its gate,” fall a victim to the trickery of this Jew? Surely one who says so has strayed far, far away from the right track.

Let's see a contradiction in this man's statement after which no fair minded person can rely on this ignorant man:

He was the Zoroastrian Hormuzan who had been a military commander of the last Persian ruler Yazdgard as well as governor of his eastern provinces.

His was the brain behind the plot for assassinating Hadrat Umar Farooq.

Readers, our history leaves us only a brief remark in the passing for this tragedy, that a non-Muslim Persian slave Abululu attacked Hadrat Umar during Fajr prayers because of some personal grudge! (Tarikh Tabari)

Reply

At one hand he is rejecting the history of tabari on the basis that he is a zoroastrian and on the other hand he is quoting reference from that same historian what a contradiction.

It is ironic that when it suits them, they expose their hypocrisy whole heartedly by quoting events narrated by Tabari and others like him as HISTORICAL FACT to the masses. Now, aside from the fact that men like these are acclaimed Masters by their own kind, look at it from another perspective...take a step back and look at the big picture. By rejecting these scholars this man should know that they are in effect pressing the self destruct button on Sunni Islam, for it was the likes of Tabari that GAVE you

the majority school its image of what the Holy Prophet (s)'s life was? it's not found in Hadith, that's sayings, history is found in the works of the big historians and biographers, so if you wish to go and call the William Shakespeare of Sunni historians a Shia or a zoroastrian, why don't you

obliterate from popular Sunni consciousness any record of the Battles of Badr and Uhud, the fall of Makkah, and just about any other event in the life of Muhammad (saws)? because they're all based on Tabari and you are quoting his testimony as fact? a Tabari who clearly detests the Shia and passes a fatwa putting them to death.

Such is the tendency amongst these ignorant people to call everyone a Shia or a zoroastrian that even that modern-day champion of Wahibism, Big Boy Bilal Philips, has been recently deemed a deviant by his fellow wahabis because he has espoused the works of the now deceased Pakistani Deobandi scholar, Maudoodi, who the likes of some ignorant masses now claim also had Shia inspiration because he condemned the khilafat of Uthman?. Maudoodi and Shia inspiration?

This type of reasoning is as ridiculous as saying the Pope is Jewish. Shabbir and his kind have also claimed that the Ayatullah Khomeini was an American agent! We must confess, even most Sunnis we have seen have been embarrassed by that one, as well as the one about Maudoodi having had Shia inspiration? embarrassed at the pathetic nature of these arguments from men who decide to take on the Shia and in the process humiliate Sunni Islam when they are intellectually cornered by producing warped arguments, the worst forms of illogic, that turn undeniable facts and truisms upside down? all because they don't have the conscience and the courage to admit that shiism is the the right path instead they write books like "The Pope is Jewish."? and sad people believe them!!

Allah (swt) says in the Qur'an that He puts a lock on some people's hearts. They try to confuse the Sunni masses so they just give up in their quest for truth and stay put in Sunnism? so compelling are the Shia arguments that the people like shabbir will even resort when cornered to the most desperate and pathetic techniques and say the Islamic equivalent of the Pope is Jewish. These are the kind of diehard bigots who have locks on their hearts?. They are the kind of people who'd say they didn't see a murder when they saw it take place? they delude themselves and try to delude thinking people also? it doesn't work though with thinking people, and alhamdulillah the Shia community ARE a thinking people.

Alhamdulillah, the Shi'a, whilst acknowledging that the Shaykhain were political leaders of the people, do NOT deem them to be Imams of Guidance. While Tabari's firm belief was that they were and that one who rejects this notion should be executed clearly indicates that he had extreme Sunni views close to those espoused by today's Salafi and Deobandi Nasibis. By Tabari's fatwa, Shias should all be killed. Yet he is called a shia or a zoroastrian if the so-called learned man like shabbir claim such things then we cannot blame the ignorant people or followers of such a creed.

The following comment by the ignorant author will prove that his only effort was to cover historical truths, elevate the position of some companions and degrade the position of the ahlul-bait:

Readers, it is remarkable that, we Muslims consider these the most accurate books, their correctness being second only to the Quran, although they are outrageously insulting to the human intelligence. Some describe Bukhari and Muslim to be the most accurate books while others ascribe this distinction to Alkaleeni, Tabari and Toosi. A celebrated mullah like “Maulana” Maudoodi, looking at this balderdash in the twentieth century, observes, "If we do not believe these fables, what are we left with?" We shall be left with the Book of Allah, of course, but that did not strike his small mind! In fact, for Muslims this should be an easy task. What the historians and Muhaddiseen have recorded, should be double-checked with the Quran. For example, does the Quran at all say that companions of the honored Prophet would turn heretics as soon as he would leave this world!

Reply

I say to this man you why do u falsely claim to adhere to the Quran, because if you would have read the Quran properly you would not have said a word you would have left the way of your ignorant ancestors. Now lets look at the following verse from the Holy Quran:

Allah - the Most High - says in His Glorious Book: "And Muhammad is no more than a messenger, the messengers have already passed away before him, if then he dies or is killed, will you turn back upon your heels? And whoever turns back upon his heels, he will by no means do harm to Allah in the least, and Allah will reward the grateful." Allah, the Great, has told the truth [Holy Qur'an 3:144].

This Qur'anic verse is clear about how the Companions will turn back upon their heels, and only a few will stand their ground, as the above Qur'anic verse indicated in the expression of Allah about them. Those who stand their ground and do not turn back are the grateful, for the grateful are only a small minority, as in the words of Allah- the Most High: "And very few of My servants are grateful" [Holy Quran 34:13].

The important thing is that the "turning back" verse refers to the Companions who lived with the Messenger of Allah in al madina indicates the immediate "turning back" after the Prophet's death. Again the ignorance of this man is proved his every comment proves that he never studied the Quran properly. I will cite further proves about this matter later on in this text.

Let examine the next comment:

55. "Imam Hasan had handed over the Caliphate to Amir Muawiya for his life time with the stipulation that the Caliphate should return to him."

(Istiaab)

What happened to the Quran's injunction of the Shura (mutual counsel)?

Reply

I want to ask this man who brags so much about the principle of shura If shura really is the basis for appointing an Imam/caliph or successor of the Prophet(P.b.u.h) than why did Abu bakr appoint Umar as his successor and impose it upon muslims rather than leaving the matter open for mutual consultation as you claim.? Historians like Al-Tabari, Ibn Qutayba and Ibn Al-Athir all relate

this incident in their Tarikh al khulafa(History of the caliphs). Now why doesn't this man reject the caliphate of Umar as it was not according to the principle of mutual consultation? Infact the principle of mutual consultation was never applied even at the time of abu bakr to which umar testifies "Disragaring the fact that the caliphate of abu bakr was a sudden event, through which Allah shielded the muslims from evil" (Sahih bukhari 8/26 The chapter on stoning the pregnant woman who fornicated"). The fact is just like the Prophets are appointed by ALLAH even their successors are appointed by ALLAH. But this man who has rejected the history has also reject the teachings of the Quran where this fact has been made clear.

(28:68) "And thy Lord creates what He wills and chooses; they have no right to choose."

(2:30) "Verily, I am about to make a Caliph on earth."

(38:26) "O Dawood! Verily, we have made thee a Caliph on earth."

(2:124) "I am about to make thee an Imam to mankind" (About Hazrat Ibrahim).

(21:73)"And we made them Imams who were to guide by our command."

His ignorance of such verses cannot be ignored and it only testifies that either he has a different Quran where such verses are not present or either he gives more importance to the words of the wahabi mullas. Either way he has lost his track and is indeed misguided.

Let's look at his next comment and how he is deceiving the people:

I affirm, with all my heart that I do not belong to any sect.

Reverence and love for the Prophet of Allah forms the anchor of my life. It is the Quran's verdict that whosoever assigns a sect for himself, loses all links with the Prophet (6/160). I cannot court that fate at any price. As

regards disliking certain beliefs, I think my like or dislike carries no weight. Yes, I do dismiss the non-Quranic dogmas wherever they are.

Reply

Ignorant people like him claim that a Muslim should not call himself other than Muslim. They quote the verses of Quran which denounces sectarianism, and as such, they conclude that being a member of any party is not allowed for Muslims.

It is true that Islam is against sectarianism and dividing into sects. However, being a member of a party does not necessarily mean sectarianism unless such party is a sect itself.

The opinion that one should not call himself other than Muslim, contradicts Quran. As a matter of fact, Allah sometimes has used other terms than Muslim, when referring to a subset of Muslims. For instance, in a couple of places in Quran, Allah mentions a group of Muslims with the name "Hizbullah" which means "The Party of Allah". If being a member of ANY party is resented in Quran and one should call himself Muslim and Muslim only, then Allah will become sectarian (may Allah protect us) by promoting His own party! The fact is that, Allah uses a different name because He wants to address a

highly virtuous subset of Muslims. In fact, any member of "The Party of Allah" is a Muslim, but the reverse is not necessarily true. Some Muslims are weak Muslims, and some are just Muslim in ID, and as such, these people do not belong to the Part of Allah about whom Allah said:

"Verily the Party of Allah are the real prosperous." (Quran 58:22)

This goes to prove that not any party within Islam are condemned. In fact, the origin of the word Muslim goes back to Prophet Abraham (AS). Quran states that Prophet Abraham (AS) was a Muslim:

Abraham was not a Jew, nor yet a Christian; but he was an upright man and MUSLIM, and he was not of the idolaters. (Quran 3:67)

Also in another verse Allah states that Prophet Abraham is the one who has named us Muslims:

It is the religion of your father Abraham who has called you MUSLIM from before and in this (revelation). (Quran 22:78)

In another verse, Prophet Abraham (AS) advises his sons not to die without being Muslim:

And this was the advise that Abraham left to his sons and so did Jacob; "O my sons! Allah has chosen the faith for you; then die not except in the faith of Islam." (Quran 2:132)

Now, surprisingly enough, Quran testifies that the Prophet Abraham was a Shia (follower; a member of the party) of the Prophet Noah (AS):

"And most surely Abraham was among the **Shia** (followers) of him (i.e., Noah)" (Quran 37:83)

One may ask, why Prophet Abraham (AS) who has been called Muslim and also advised others to be Muslim till death, has been named Shia? This leaves no room but to believe that his being the Shia of Noah (AS) does not contradict his being Muslim.

Now, we realize that being a member of a party does not contradict our identity as being Muslim AS LONG AS the leader of the Party is assigned by Allah, or at least, as long as the leader does not order something against the order of Allah and His Prophet.

Suppose there exists a party with a leader whose name is Imam xxxx. One may subscribe to this party as long as he does not prefer the order of Imam xxxx over the order of the Prophet (PBUH&HF).

When does a party become a sect and thereby denounced by Allah? The answer is that it will be a sect if Imam xxx states something against the commandments of Allah or His Prophet, and when we as followers prefer the order of Imam xxx over the order of Allah and his Prophet (PBUH&HF). This has been severely condemned in Quran, and such party is no longer a school of thought within Islam but it rather has divided his followers from the religion of God and has split into a sect. May Allah protect us from such parties.

Now tell me dear readers if people like him claim to follow the Quran then I don't blame the Jews and the Christians who have rejected the Holy Book of Allah and follow the way of their ancestors. This man repeatedly says in his book I follow the Quran I follow the Quran and yet he wrote in his book things which clearly contradicts the Quran. I am sorry to say mister shabbir ahmed you do not follow the Quran you follow the enemies of Quran.

THE PURPOSE BEHIND WRITING SUCH A BOOK:

As I mentioned in the beginning the wahabites like shabbir ahmad have been trying their best to put an end to azadari of Imam hussain(a,s). But centuries passed away but all their efforts went in vain. Hence they adopted another technique a very bizarre one this time they denied the whole event what so ever because if they are able to convince the masses that such a significant event is fabricated shiism will lose all its foundation and so seeker of truths and other fair minded people will then be deviated from shiism and eventually the religion of shiims will lose all grounds but INSHALLAH all their efforts will be in vain no matter what technique they adopt.

Now the question comes to the mind why deny such an important event?

Reply

This is one of those questions that automatically comes to mind when one analyses the event of karbala. The reason lies in aqeedah, and goes to the heart of where the Sunni / Shi'a viewpoints diverge. The core difference between the two schools is on the topic of Imamate: who has the right to lead the Ummah. Shi'a Muslims believe that this leadership is religious guidance and hence the appointment is the sole right of Allah (swt), for He (swt) knows what is best for his Servants and He (swt) shall appoint the man best suited / most superior to lead the Ummah through all times. Allah (swt) will select an Imam who is best in character, most excelled on the components of Deen, who shall only rule via justice (if you want details see a 'moderate' article by a separate author but which we have copied and pasted onto this site called "The Khalifatullah in Shia Belief" for proof of this). There is no need for ijma, or votes since Allah (swt) appoints and no one has a voice in the matter.

The Ahl'ul Sunnah believe that the appointment of the Imam is a duty of the Public - they decide on who comes to power. The importance in relation to appointment is the act of

giving bayya - once the Khalifah has received ijma then his imamate is legitimate. The act of bayya is the crucial factor here - the people decide who is in power (a democratically elected dictatorship for life), and the khalifa's character has no further bearing since once in power the Khalifah has to be obeyed. Any opposition is squashed, with violence. From the time of Mu'awiya onwards, all the khalifates become monarchies.

When this is the basis for Ahl'ul Sunnah aqeedah, then over time their jurists have sought to revise the concept of imamate with stipulations over certain characteristics that Imam should possess, such as bravery, piety, and justice, especially after the embarrassing debacle (for Sunni Islam) with Yazeed and certain other members of the Banu Umayyad dynasty - for example the khalifa Waleed who expressed his desire to drink alcohol on the roof of the Ka'aba. Unfortunately these writings have been nothing more than a 'Dear Santa Wish List' since an analysis of early Islamic history will quickly lead to us learning that characteristics such as justice were completely devoid in these Khalifahs, and there is no better example than Yazeed. Indeed with the exception of perhaps Umar bin Abdul Aziz in 1,100 years of khilafat after Yazeed, barely a pious man acceded to this position. Most were as bad as kings anywhere were. This left many classical Salaf scholars with a very difficult problem:

- If they reject Yazeed, they are then rejecting the concept of ijma that had been allegedly created at Saqifa Bani Sa'ada, and underpins Sunni Islam
- Rejecting this ijma'a in effect discredits Sunni aqeedah that the duty to appoint the imam is the right of the public.
- If this concept is discredited, by highlighting Yazeed's demonic character and satanic actions, then the Ummah is forced to consider the alternative option of appointment as ascribed to by the Shi'a school of thought.

Rasulullah (s) said that he would be succeeded by twelve khalifahs

We are quoting from Sahih Muslim hadith number 4483, English translation by Abdul Hamid Siddiqui:

"The Islamic religion will continue, until the hour has been established, or you have been ruled over by 12 Caliphs, all of them being from Quraish".

This is what we read in Mishkat al Masabih:

"I heard the Apostle of Allah say 'Islam shall not cease to be glorious up to twelve

Caliphs, every one of them being from the Quraish". (And in a narration) "The affairs of men will not cease to decline so long as twelve men will rule over them, every one of them coming from Quraysh." And in a narration: "The religion will continue to be established till the hour comes as there are twelve Caliphs over them, everyone of them coming from the Quraish"

Mishkat al Masabih: (Vol 4 p 576), Hadith 5

The Salafi and Hanafi Schools of thought have graded Yazeed as the Sixth Khalifa of Rasulallah (s)

Sharh Fiqh Akbar page 50 Dhikr Fadail Uns Bad un Nabi

Sawaiqh al Muhriqa page 12 Chapter 3

Tareekh al Khulafa page 11 Fadail Dhikr Khilafath Islam

Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 291 Dhikr Khilafat Hasan

Umdah' thul Qari fi Sharh Bukhari Volume 11 page 435, Kitab al Ahkaam

We read in Sharh Fiqh Akbar:

Rasulullah (s) said that the Deen shall remain strong as long as these twelve Khalifahs are at the helm, and the twelve are Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, 'Ali Mu'awiya, Yazid, Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Walid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Sulayman bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Umar bin Abdul Aziz, Yazid bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan, Hasham bin Abdul Malik bin Marwan

The sixth Imam of truth according to people like shabbir is Yazeed, but this is a fact that these Ulema often don't mention to the public.

Abdullah Ibn Umar deemed the bayya to Yazeed to be in accordance with the conditions set by Allah (swt) and Rasulallah (s)

We read in Sahih al Bukhari, Narrated Nafi':

When the people of Medina dethroned Yazeed bin Muawiya, Ibn 'Umar gathered his special friends and children and said, "I heard the Prophet saying, 'A flag will be fixed for every betrayer on the Day of Resurrection,' and we have given the oath of allegiance to this person (Yazeed) in accordance with the conditions enjoined by Allah and His Apostle and I do not know of anything more faithless than fighting a person who has been given the oath of allegiance in accordance with the conditions

enjoined by Allah and His Apostle , and if ever I learn that any person among you has agreed to dethrone Yazeed, by giving the oath of allegiance (to somebody else) then there will be separation between him and me."

Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 9, Book 88, Number 227

This fatwa epitomises the entire Sunni aqeedah on Imamate. We leave it to those with open minds to now decide which concept of Imamate holds true. One that deems this to be based purely on Allah (swt)'s selection, or one that deems it man's choice no matter who, so much so that reign of Yazeed, a drunk, fornicating, Dhaalim is also in accordance with the conditions prescribed by Allah (swt) and Rasulullah (s). Would Allah (swt) really bless the reign of such a man?

Our Ahl'ul Sunnah brothers should know that 'you can't keep your cake and eat it' - if you want to reject the khilafat of Yazeed, then you are in effect rejecting Sunni aqeedah on Imamate. If you accept the khilafat of Yazeed, you are in effect joining the camp of the Salafi and Deobandi Nasibi shaped around the fatwa of Abdullah ibn Umar. On the plains of Kerbala the two concepts of Imamate came to a head - man-made appointment (Yazeed) versus Allah's appointment (Imam Husayn (as)). We pray that this text shall shed light over the consequence of believing that man, not Allah (swt) decides on the appointment of the Imam. It took the Imam appointed by Allah (swt) to lay down his life and that of his dearest blood family to save the religion for you. Further we see that:

Imam Ghazali said that to mention the martyrdoms of Hadhrath Hassan(r) and Hadhrath Husayn(r) is forbidden as the Martyrdom of Hadhrath Husnaayn (r) inflames malice against the companions of the Prophet.

This sums up the reason for their opposition. Why does hatred of the Sahaba arise while recollecting the martyrdom of Imam Husayn (as)? The reason is that whosoever will listen to the assassination of Hadhrath Husayn (as) he will try to locate his killer who was Yazid. The next question will be 'how' he attained the seat as Khalifa over the Muslims. The answer, Mu'awiyah appointed him. The next question will be who helped Mu'awiyah to attain this seat? The answer, these favours were bestowed upon him during the reign of the Shaykhayn (Abu bakr and Umar). The veils will be removed and the deeds of this party will be there for all to see. Its fearing this investigation that led to Ghazzali issuing this Fatwa; after all *prevention is better than cure*.

It is amazing that every form of gathering / congregation is accepted and tolerated, but Azadari somehow seems to be unpalatable to Deobandis and Salafis! This is because these rituals highlight the plight of the victims, the tyranny of their killers, and the 'names' of these killers come to light. These gatherings and mourning rituals rightly lay bare the atrocities committed by these marauders, and people like shabbir ahmad share physical and spiritual ancestry with these killers. After all they deem Yazid their Imam, and deem people like Shimar, Ibn Ziyad & Ibn Sa'd to be truthful narrators of Hadeeth. That is why these people try in vain, to quash the memory of Imam Husayn (as) from Sunni consciousness by declaring such Dhikr to be Haraam or it is a fabricated and a concocted event. Their efforts are doomed to fail, as truth will always overcome falsehood.

The time has come to answer these ignorant people in the language that only they understand. If some readers feel tortured and tormented with these responses then I apologize in advance but we deem love for Rasulullah (s) and his Ahl'ul bayt (as) as our foremost duty and believe that all good deeds are accepted only if one has love for the descendants of the Prophet.

If a reader is still confused I will cite another example from his book the criminals of islam where in the chapter sahaba and the criminals he has rejected all the texts which exposes certain companions so that people searching for the truth remain confused about this matter. Lets examine his last comment:

Let us reiterate that according to the Qur'an:

- ❖ **The holy companions were staunch and practical believers (8:74).**
- ❖ **They had exemplary respect, love and regard for one another (3:103).**
- ❖ **Allah was pleased with them and they were pleased with Allah (9:100).**

The righteousness of all the companions and their worthiness of confidence are matters about which the Shi'ites and the Sunnis argue.

The majority of the Sunni scholars believe that all the companions are righteous and worthy of our confidence. The Shi'ite scholars are selective.

The Sunni scholars cite Qur'anic verses for substantiating their claim:

"Muhammad is the Apostle of God; and those who are with him are firm against unbelievers, compassionate towards one another. You see them bowing and prostrating, seeking grace from God and His satisfaction ... The mark of prostration shows on their faces... Allah has promised those among them who believe and do righteous deeds forgiveness, and a great reward." (ch. 48. v. 29)

Thus, the Almighty described the companions of the Messenger as firm against the unbelievers, merciful among themselves; and that they bow and prostrate. The mark of their prostration shows on their foreheads; and that Allah promised those who believe and do righteous deeds forgiveness and a great reward.

All these descriptions substantiate the piety and virtue of the companions. The verse, however, does not include all the companions. It only includes the companions who were firm against the unbelievers, merciful among themselves.

Thus, the companions who were not firm against the unbelievers or were unmerciful to the believers would not be included by the verse.

It would be only logical to say that those who shed the blood of Muslims without justification in civil wars such as Talhah, Zubayr, and Mu'awiyah are not included in this Qur'anic statement, plus all companions who joined them in their unrighteous wars against Imam Ali, and those who divided the Muslims and destroyed their unity.

Furthermore, the end of the verse clearly indicates that the praise was not to include all the companions because it declares that only those who believed in Islam and did good deeds will be entitled to forgiveness and great rewards.

One of the verses which is offered as evidence of the righteousness of all the companions of the Prophet is the following:

"And the early Muslims from the Meccan migrants and the Medinite Ansar (the helpers) and those who followed them with their good deeds, Allah is well pleased with them, and they are well pleased with Him; and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, to dwell therein forever. That is the mighty achievement." (ch. 9, v. 100)

This verse, however, speaks of the virtue of the migrants and Medinites who adopted Islam at the early state of the Islamic era. Thus, it does not include the thousands of the companions who adopted Islam after the Hudaibiyah truce or after the conquest of Mecca. These were not from the early Muslims. Their Islam took place about twenty years after the proclamation of Islam and about eight years after Hijrah.

Another verse which is cited for the righteousness of all companions is the following:

"Allah was well pleased with the believers when they swore allegiance unto thee beneath the tree; He knew what was in their hearts, and He sent down tranquility to them and rewarded them with a speedy victory..." (ch. 48, v. 18)

This verse also does not include all the companions who declared their Islam after signing the Hudaibiyah pact which took place during the sixth year after Hijra. The declaration of the allegiance to the Prophet under the tree took place shortly before signing the pact.

The companions who gave allegiance under the tree at Hudaibiyah were about fourteen hundred.

It is worthy to mention that a number of students of the companions (such as Sa'id Ibn Al-Musayyab and Al-Shi'abi and Ibn Sirin) said that the early migrants were those who prayed to the two Qiblas (Al-Masjid Al-Aqsa and Al-Ka'bah). (Abu 'Umar Yusuf Ibn Abd-Barr, *Al-Isti'ab* part 1, pages 2-3)

The Shi'ite Muslim scholars did not put all the companions in one rank; nor did they say that all of them were righteous. Some of them were righteous to the highest degree. Some of them were truthful and worthy of confidence, but they were not entirely righteous. Some of them were not known to be righteous or unrighteous, and some of them were known to be devious.

These scholars who view that some of the companions were neither righteous nor in a place of confidence support their view with a number of Qur'anic verses:

"And they say: 'obedience'; but when they leave thee, some of them spend the night planning other than what they say to you. Allah records what they plan by night. Disregard them and put thy trust in Allah. Allah is Sufficient Trustee." (ch. 4, v. 81)

This verse declares that a number of those who were residents of Medina were Muslims, and they prayed with the Prophet and attended his gatherings and heard the Messenger commanding the Muslims to do some good deeds. They used to say to the Prophet: "We heard you and we will obey you;" but when they left him, they did not obey the Messenger.

We find in chapter nine of the Holy Qur'an many verses which indicate that some of the companions of the Messenger were people of hypocrisy, and the Messenger did not know their hypocrisy.

"And among those around you of the wandering Arabs are hypocrites and among the people of Medina there are some who persist in hypocrisy whom thou (O Muhammad) know not. We know them and We shall chastise them twice; then they will be relegated to a painful doom." (ch. 9, v. 101)

"O Prophet! Combat the disbelievers and the hypocrites and be hard on them. Their abode is Hell, a hapless journey's end. They swear by Allah that they said nothing (wrong), yet they did say the word of disbelief. They disbelieved after they declared their Islam, and they plotted that which they could not carry out, and they sought revenge only because Allah and His Messenger enriched them of His bounty..." (ch. 9, v. 73)

"Among them are men who made a covenant with Allah (saying): If He gives us of His bounty we will give alms and become of the righteous. Yet, when He gave them of His bounty, they hoarded it and turned away, averse. So He made a consequence (to be) hypocrisy in their hearts until the day when they shall meet Him, because they broke their word to Allah and because they lied." (ch. 9, vs. 75-77)

We also find in chapter 33, "The Confederates":

"And when the hypocrites, and those in whose hearts is a disease say 'Allah and His Messenger promised us nothing but delusions.' And when a party of them said: 'Oh folk of Yathrib! there is no stand possible for you; therefore, go back.' And some of them even

ask permission of the Prophet, saying: 'Our homes are exposed to the enemy, and they lay not exposed.' They only wished to flee." (ch. 33, vs. 12-13)

The chapter of *Al-Munafiqun* is a clear evidence that a number of Muslims (who declared their Islam at the time of the Prophet, and lived with him in Medina, and prayed with him, were hypocrites. They came to the Prophet to defend themselves by taking an oath in the presence of the Prophet that they did not betray him, and they were liars. They had believed in Islam then deserted it and Allah sealed their hearts.

"When the hypocrites come to thee (O Muhammad), they say: 'We bear witness that thou art indeed Allah's Messenger. And Allah knows that thou art indeed His Messenger, and Allah bears witness that the hypocrites indeed are speaking falsely. They made their oaths a shield so that they may turn (men) from the way of Allah. Verily, evil is that which they wanted to do. That is because they believed and then disbelieved; therefore, their hearts were sealed so that they understand not.' " (ch. 63, vs. 1-3)

These numerous verses which are in many of the Qur'anic chapters testify clearly that many of the people who declared Islam during the time of the Prophet, and who lived and prayed with him, were hypocrites. What testimony could be bigger than the testimony of the Qur'an?

These hypocrites were living with the rest of the companions, and their names were not known. Therefore, it is impossible to avoid taking hadiths from them or know how many they were. Historians, among them Al-Tabari in his History, part 2, page 504, and Ibn Hisham in his *Al-Sirah Al-Nabawiyyah*, part 2, page 64, reported that when the Messenger went with his army to Uhud, he had with him one thousand companions. But Abdullah Ibn Abi Salul left the Prophet and went back to Medina accompanying three hundred from the Medinites. Islamic history did not inform us of the names of any of the three hundred except the name of their chief, Abdullah Ibn Abi Salul.

Knowing that the situation was so, how can we say that all the companions were righteous this not only contradicts the Quran but also sound logic.

Al-Tabari says in the introduction to his history: “Let the person who reads through our book know that my reliance on whatever I recorded is on news and history with attribution to their narrators, without using intellect except in rare occasions. The knowledge of what had happened before, and what is going to happen at present time, is not reached to those who did not see and their time did not allow them for it without being told by people and without the interference of intellect. Therefore, whatever news you find in my book about history that the reader may deny it, or the listener may abhor it because he did not find it truthful according to him, then let him know that we did not present it ourselves, but it came from some of the people who narrated the story to us. We just presented what we have been told.” [Tareekh Al-Tabari, Introduction, p.13]

Hence we come to a conclusion that we cannot say that all what is reported in the history and hadith are fabrications, yes there might be some exaggerations or fabricated hadiths

and we should only accept what is in accordance with the Quran and not contradicting it. We cannot rely solely on the Quran because this divine book is concise. It contains many general principles but few details, which have been left for the chief commentator, the Holy Prophet, to explain that is why ALLAH says "And whatever the Apostle gives you, accept it; and from whatever he forbids you, keep back." (59:7). If this so called learned man says he only relies on the Quran and nothing else I challenge this man to teach from the Quran how should we perform our prayers? The ritual prayer is perhaps the central act of worship in a Muslim's life. The Holy Prophet emphasized its performance. He said: "The ritual prayer is the pillar and protector of religion. If the ritual prayer is accepted, all other religious performances will be accepted. If it is rejected, all other religious performances will also be rejected."

Of course, there is no mention in the Holy Qur'an of the number of units (rak'ats) to be performed for each prayer or any of the other specific details regarding how the prayers are to be performed. Does this mean that we should abandon the prayers? The Holy Qur'an simply says: "Establish salat (prayer). There are no details distinguishing required from optional acts. These were explained by the Holy Prophet.

In the same way other commands have been stated in the Holy Qur'an in principle only. Their details, conditions and relevant instructions were explained by the Holy Prophet..

Muslim commentators, whether Sunni or Shia, cannot make their own interpretations of the Holy Qur'an. The Holy Prophet said: "If someone gives his own interpretation of the Holy Qur'an, his place is Hell."

Accordingly, every sensible Muslim turns to the real interpreter of the Holy Qur'an, the Holy Prophet. And not any poet like allama iqbal or a deobandi reformer like sir syed ahmed khan.

CONCLUSION

Dear reader why such books have sprung is because when you read the history and other famous books of the ahl-e-sunna many hidden issues are uncovered and any fair minded researcher gets closer to the truth and realizes that except shiism there is no true islam. A very famous example is of a renowned researcher Syed Muhammed al-Tijani who previously being a sunni after considerable research and digging deep into the history books realized the essence of shiism and thus adopted the beliefs of the followers of the ahlul-bait. He wrote many books which includes 1) Then I was guided 2) With the truthful ones 3) Ask Those who know 4) Shias are the real ahl-e-sunna, hence anyone wishing to study further about the shia-sunni issue can find these books very valuable as he always uses the references of the ahl-e-sunna as his absolute proof. Finally, we do not have save ALLAH to judge.

My last prayer is that all praise is for Allah the Lord of all the worlds, and the choicest praises and blessings be for Muhammad and his progeny, the most cleansed and pure.

BY:

SYED ALI MEHDI JAFFAR GARDEZI