


1

A
A VICTIM
LOST IN
SAQIFAH

ALI LABBAF



A VICTIM
LOST
IN
SAQIFAH

VOL 1 OF 4

xkps

Ali Labbaf

Chapter 1

Preface

***By: Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi
for the First and Second Editions***

In His Exalted Name

I have read this book with care and attention and found it a collection compiled with a motive emanated from an ardent belief in the fundamentals of Shia school, which is the only clear manifestation of Islam. The great deal of constancy and research is much appreciable, which is further espoused with truth, sincerity and openness in dealing with the doubts by way of evaluation and review. Furthermore, it rises from staunch love and affection to defend the sanctity of divinely ordained authority of Ahle Bayt of Prophet, peace be on them.

Regretfully it is being witnessed that there are individuals having long been fed at the widespread table of the Prophet's Ahle Bayt who are under mandate of reason and religion to strengthen the foundation of the school of those sacred rays of divine throne. However, they have no regard to the bread they have grown upon. They have weakened, rather ruined the very pillars of Shia school disguised as if adhering to truth and defending the sanctity of Islamic unity which is only a deceptive show and a polite blow. Tabarra; that is distancing oneself from enemies of the Prophet's Ahle Bayt and despising them is one of the two keystones of religion. They have created a question mark against it. They claim that it is against Quran and tradition.

Sometimes according to them, the office of Imamate is a separate entity independent from Caliphate. Sometime in principles of belief also they have created a base and a branch. They introduce belief in Imamate as a branch, as a subsidiary thing liable to personal jurisprudence. As such, it does not constitute any obligation on the part of the person in event of his denial.

Sometimes the words and deeds of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.), in his dealings with Caliphs is a ground to them to justify their allegation that Ali was totally in agreement with their Caliphate.

It seems that they have not heard the painful cries of that oppressed Imam that used to come out of his aching heart as he says:

“When Allah took the Prophet (to himself) a group of men went back on their tracks. The ways (of misguidance) ruined them and they placed trust in deceitful intriguers, showed consideration to other than kinsmen, abandoned the kin whom they had been ordered to love and shifted the building from its strong foundation and built it in other than its (proper) place. They are the source of every shortcoming and the door of gropers in the dark. They were moving to and fro in amazement and lay intoxicated in the way of the people of the Pharaohs. They were either bent on this world and taking support on it or away from faith and removed from it.”

(Nahjul Balagha, *Faid*, Sermon 150 End of Part Two)

Attention to it is a matter of absolute necessity. Research about a true religion is the most essential element of life for Islamic society. A tangible proof of its salubrity and originality of being from divine should be brought home to people. The minds of young generation should be enlightened with regard to its principles and fundamentals as well as to defend the precincts of its sanctity. This does not mean sedition among groups or creating differences in thoughts of people. It is a matter of regret that there are individuals who refrain from

discussing facts about religion and analyzing issues pertaining to beliefs and its literature. Their excuse is to preserve unity. Those who discuss and debate such matters perhaps are accused of sedition causing disunity and creating crevices in a concrete block of unity. It seems that this fact has escaped their sight. Unity appreciated by reason and religion – and at the same time a sacred one – is unity that should be framed over the pivot of truth rotating around truth. Otherwise it will be a unity at wrong (supposing if it comes into being). It will be unholy unity resulting in nothing but loss, havoc and emptiness.

It is natural first to know the truth. Then people should be invited towards unity based on truth. This needs to undergo a discussion and all-sided research in religion to find out what is there after truth except losing the way and going astray. **[1]**

Now the present collection which is an output of a year-long labor of a group of learned, believer youths and committed persons; to do justice to it, one should say honestly that it has originated from faith and a staunch love towards the most sacred position of divinely authorized Guardianship (*Wilayat*) of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) and Ahle Bayt of Prophet. Peace be upon them all.

[1] *Surah Yunus 10:32*

Those who are acquainted with the task of writing books know that constancy in discourses and in scattered writings of speculators is not easy. Grouping and collecting the doubted data from spoken words and writings and then their orderly arrangement and classification, then to make it coherent is not an easy job. Obvious it is as to what could be the corrupt aftermaths begotten by a doubtful belief. They have not allowed this to escape without replying. In this regard, they have made full use of books of great scholars of religion and faith. Considering all this, one should honestly acknowledge the difficulty and labor involved in it. One cannot undergo this burden unless one is blessed with moral impetus and love to defend the true faith.

Therefore all who love Shia faith, particularly the youths, will read this collection with interest in order to know how conjectures and allegations are spread which should not go without answering.

In the end, I beseech the Lord to bless the author and his colleagues with prosperity in both the worlds and bestow upon him bounty of service to religion in future also.

1-10-80 (9th Shawwal 1422)
Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi

By the Grace of the Almighty, this valuable book: *A Victim Lost in Saqifah***[1]** is being published for the second time, revised and with additional data on some parts of original text. After reading the additional matter, I realized that it was necessary for the original text as it completes it.

I hope for continuation of such a service to religion on the part of the author by the grace of God.

12-8-83 (18th Ramadan al-Mubarak 1425)
Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi

[1] *The title of this set of volumes is adapted on the work written by Martyr Dr. Paknijad under the same title with the hope that it will be published again after being out of print for so many years.*

Part 1
Fundamentals of Evaluation and
Criticism of Writings on Islamic
Unity

Chapter 2

Necessity of thought for Islamic unity

We are impelled to notice a particular sort of religious thinking named 'revival' as we go back a recent century and look into schools of Islamic thought.

These days revivalism is a term applied to opinions and views of many Muslims thinkers.

Most of us are acquainted with this term without having full knowledge of it.

If we want to simply describe this term on the basis of existing writings in this field, we must say that contemporary tendency of thought among Muslims aims at revival of religious system, which they consider either of these two: Comprehension of faith or practice of faith.

Revivalists consider revivalism a necessity towards preserving religion in this new world.

As such, it could be said that all religious revivalists in the beginning intellectually endeavor leaning on the belief that religion is workable in present society. It can attend or mend basic human difficulties, of whatever depth it be, in various dimensions. Therefore we can depend on it or desire it since it is a need.

But how?!

An immediate question that strikes the mind is how to prove it in practice and display worth and capability.

The real issue, from this stage onward, for this category of new thinkers of religion shall be to reply this query:

How it is possible to raise the issue of faith once more in these days of competition that has gripped human thought? Besides, how to face other schools fraught with consummate ability and respond to all other important ones of the day in a useful analysis. And this is the need.

Hence it is befitting to say that the most important efforts of new religious thinkers can be summed up in one sentence - in the present age, religion renovated by themselves is returned to appear on the social stage in a status of a powerful and energetic school.

Thought of Islamic unity is related to the same category of revivalist thoughts. Such can be understood from what in brief is told about the endeavors of revivalists.

Therefore it has always been the point of focus of those who desire to tread the path of revival in a way to provide a variety to the outlook.

This group of revivalists is mindful of the extent of influence of faith in individual and social life. Dispute and the fight of religious people and coming into being of divisions among Muslims has become a cause to move towards Islamic unity. This practical revival guarantees a kind of revival in fundamentals of Muslim thought or in the outlook of Islamic theory towards creating a change in social relations of Muslims.

It depends upon the activity of a revivalist as to its kind towards achieving Islamic unity whether by means of a social or cultural movement. Fundamentals of its theory shall differ accordingly.

Basically, a revivalist is a political and social activist. However he is also an intellectual and cultural activist. He spends his revivalist life in changing the beliefs of individuals

of the society by way of presenting theatrical views and spreading them among public.

Of course a seeker of unity too can adjust himself among various subjects of this group and at the same time exert his efforts in society through propaganda activities.

Chapter 3

Valuable Standards of Worksheet of the Thought of Islamic Unity

A perusal of various indicators of Islamic unity shows that advocates of this theory have utilized different methods for its achievement. Several methods, including occasionally contradictory ones, have found room in the worksheet of revivalists.

Exact knowledge of each of these methods is very much important. Type of practice in behavior and action is more useful than directing the belief of individuals and more important than seeking unity.

As we said, thought of Islamic unity is similar to that of revivalism. Therefore it follows the governing principles.

Hence it seems natural that we too, as a Shia analysts, should consider Islamic unity subordinate to principles and regulations pertaining to revivalism and standards of critical evaluation. Accordingly we must be able to evaluate these values.

In a critical evaluation of Islamic unity, we must treat each indicator independently. We must take the grounds of evaluation of worksheet of revivalism into consideration and set it for evaluation.

From here onward, we shall try to comment in brief about these standards and state our position.

Revivalists in their intellectual endeavors should maintain two important and fundamental rules because of their claim in this respect. A revivalist in the run of his activities is liable to observe:

First rule: ability and forwardness

Second rule: originality and sincerity

Though these two rules form the whole, yet through this whole itself difference is apt to appear. This makes the trend of criticism rather difficult. On the other hand it can be said that through Shia viewpoint in the whole history of revivalism these two real bases give ground to criticism and explanation. A revivalist cannot overlook the deep peeping eye of a critic of Shia society nor be indifferent towards the inquiry regarding the extent of consideration of the rule touching originality.

Because every religious thinker at least in a position of claim is willing to show that his religious thought is pristine and based on original teachings of religion and pure from irreligious conjectures or unauthentic additions. And on the other hand he wishes to attain a strong platform among religions and a stronghold enabling him to answer problems.

Therefore in the trend of revivalism these two distinguishing indicators should be pursued and sought.

In this analysis whatever we Shias employ under the title of standard of scaling originality and sincerity it is either in accordance with teachings of Quran or Prophet's Ahle Bayt; in other words beliefs that govern the Shiite school; because the real and true Islam is reflected in teachings of this school alone.

We, Shias, believe on the basis of teachings of the Prophet.

Whoever wants to lay his hand on religious literature or know about teachings of Islam must refer to Ahle Bayt (a.s.) after the Prophet. There is no source at all to focus the light of truth of this religion except by direct contact with Prophet's progeny through their teachings.

Any knowledge by name of religion of Islam, or on the whole any thought not supported by teachings of Prophet's Ahle Bayt, in the end is doomed to deviation and destined to go astray. Ahle Bayt of Prophet are the only origins to obtain therefrom

true knowledge of Islam. Besides, they are the only source to know a thought or a theory as to its being a religious one or in line with teachings of Shia school.**[1]** This is the only way of obtaining religious knowledge, which is knowledge of guidance. This is the only way to trust in correctness of thoughts on display in the name of religion.

Without any doubt, the very root of learnings of true religion is contained in teachings of Ahle Bayt of Prophet. If any knowledge or information with the label of Islam does not happen to be in line with their teachings, every certitude of it is wrong; it is a waste and rescinded.

Accordingly if a word about Islamic unity is put in, it should be based on very religion itself. In other words, it should originate from real teachers of religion; that is Ahle Bayt of Prophet. It must be so according to Shia belief. When this stage is still in dispute and the standard of sincerity and rule towards its

[1] *Shia school stands for the same teachings of Quran and Prophet's progeny. It does necessarily include all the views of Shia thinkers.*

achievement is yet unsettled, to enter into another theory; that is activities of revivalism, seems out of place and to no end.

In this criticism and analysis, the standard of truth is the wholesome and absolute application of thoughts without least leniency or a bent towards Shiaism or beliefs contained therein though this school is absolute truth.

The smallest slip or an overlook in application of thoughts of unity with fundamentals of Ja'fari Shiaism of twelve Imams has brought forward the ground that renders short the standard of originality and sincerity. This has further rendered the thought irreligious and without backing of Islam. No saying goes if there had been any deliberate amendment or departure from the basis of this school.

Although we have great respect for those who possess opinion and have moral duty towards critics and analysts, we never give sanction to ourselves to overlook truth or ignore the right being trespassed. In no condition and in no case we shall fall short. We have no right to do so. It does not serve as a platform to reach agreements thereupon for the sake of our or others' interests.

The absolute truth belongs to Ahle Bayt of Prophet. It is found in their persons and rests with them. Therefore if we entertain any kind of thought or conjecture in the name of religion, which is not in accordance with this school, it is as though we have trampled truth and rightfulness, which is their concern and tribute, belonging to them alone.

Shias are after originality and sincerity of thought when they confront Muslim revivalism. They are also after the ability or strength in this regard. They believe if they sacrifice one for the sake of other, it will certainly result in shortage. One will lack the other. It will be an incomplete and unconsummated thought. In other words, we are taking refuge in an irreligious conjecture.

Ability or strength alone is not the concern of Shias. Sincerity in religious intention too is necessary. The excessive desire, on the part of newcomers to this thought, to exhibit strength could spoil sincerity and diminish its originality. Likewise, to create strength they might commit some additions to religion, which the true Islam is pure and purged of. As such, the brush-strokes they would apply could reduce elegance of real Islam or effect unwanted and undesired additions thereon making ugly the beautiful. Wrong feeding in a long run will result in the school losing its very entity. Such will be the consequence of revivalism taking to itself the twists and turns of deviation of belief.

Creating ability without sincerity and pristine originality shall result into a constant fear - not only in issue of Islamic unity but throughout the varieties of revivalism.

The output of revivalists must be a faith. Under pretext of revivalism, faith or religion should not be substituted by some other thought or conjecture.

First and foremost, sincerity and originality must be safeguarded in revivalism. Therefore the basic difficulty in confronting any type of revivalist thought is the religion to support these thoughts. Without purity and originality there will be confusion. This will be the case with all aspects of revivalism beyond Islamic unity.

To what extent these outlooks have been able to protect the real pillars of religion, remains to be seen. Further, originality

of religion must be in association with it so that Shias could take it in account of religious values and call it Religious Thought.

Contemporary revivalists have taken great steps from the position of strength. The originality and purity of religious thought remains uncertain. There are great many questions, which still need to be answered reasonably.

Islamic unity too is not exempted from this rule.

Chapter 4

Familiarity with Writings on Thoughts of Islamic Unity

When we read the writings and opinions of supporters of Islamic unity, we easily understand the bulk done in this respect. However, very little is done towards classifying and differentiating them scientifically.

Perhaps it is one reason for difficulty one has to face in analyzing their outlook. Further, it gives room to mistake the stand of critic to the effect that he is intentional and deliberate in his motive. Absence of classification between viewpoints stands as a cause in this regard.

To arrive at a correct analysis about Islamic unity depends upon these two packages of information:

A) Acquaintance with standards of evaluation of output of revivalism. Locating the position in this regard.

B) Accurate knowledge of various writings about Islamic unity.

We revert to history of contemporary thought while trying to lay hands on the theory of Islamic unity and its application in our social life. We become aware that in the first step we could follow two ways to reach 'unity' and to have a discourse thereon.

In other words, there remain two routes to tally towards attaining the aspired Islamic unity. They are:

One: Political and social movement

Two: Movement of belief and thought

As mentioned before, both these lines depend on theoretical foundations - unique in their kind. We shall try to comment on the basis of these packages regarding particulars about Islamic unity from the angle of thought and belief.

Chapter 5

Beginning of Discussion Awareness of Basics of Intellectual Movement - Research towards Creating Islamic Unity

By the efforts of Shaykh Muhammad Taqi Qummi an institute, Darul Taqreeb, was founded in Egypt in recent years. It can be considered a starting point of this movement. [1]

We pursue the movements - scientific, intellectual and those of research since then. We come across irregular and contradictory views and outlooks. Taking into consideration originality and purity of thought, they can be classified into two categories.

First Tendency: Outlooks which desire to create ability and achieve Islamic unity. However they ignore to maintain the rule of originality and purity. They believe:

“We must not immediately pass judgment that this is right and that, wrong. We must rather control and check differences. We should specify its limits.” [2]

“We do not say this is right and that is wrong...” [3]

“It should not be the concern of one who calls for unity among religions to say which one is right and which wrong or which one is correct and which erroneous. Of course deviation from Islam can serve a reason for him to put in a word as was the practice with men of sagacity like Sayyid Jamaluddin and some of his pupils and fellow thinkers.

We have witnessed the climax of such an invitation launched by JAMA'ATUL TAQREEB BAIN AL-MAZAHAB AL-ISLAMIA (i.e. Society for Reconciliation of Islamic Sects). We must point out that the two obligations should not be combined. One: Invitation towards unity and two: protection or support to religion. Books and articles written in this regard have little to do with unity. Generally their motive is to prove their religion is right while the others' is wrong. They add to confusion

[1] *The thought of nearness among Muslims and an invitation to it took ground in Egypt by the proposal of Sheikh Muhammad Taqi Qummi. The scholars of first category of al-Azhar besides Shia head of clergies. The late Burujardi supported the idea. A great number of writers joined the movement.*

[2] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nida-e-Wahdat (Call of unity) Pg. 121*

[3] *Ibid: Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 123*

and block the way of unity.” **[1]**

They also believe:

“Nearness has its own demands... that is this distinction should always be kept in view in order to protect it from a decree (Fatwa) someone might issue against it...in all activities of culture, intellect, scholastic theology, philosophy, jurisprudence, traditions and study of narrators (Rijaal) this distinction should be above all.” **[2]**

Therefore the basis of thought of our predecessors was established on conjecture that reality can always be sacrificed for sake of unity.

Second Tendency: The outlooks have paid utmost attention to the rule of maintaining originality and sincerity as well as seeking truth. This is in addition to creation of ability, belief and adherence to necessary Islamic unity. In view of these two tendencies, it can be said that Islamic unity has two meanings – one, correct and the other, wrong.

Islamic unity in the correct meaning: It is to create a **political unity**, which is good and useful against common enemy.

This keeps any type of dispute or war from taking place. Religious beliefs would not stand as a reason for bloodshed among Muslims.

There is no controversy between this type of Islamic unity, which should correctly be termed as Islamic unity and discussions of Shia beliefs. Therefore limits of right and wrong shall remain as they are. They cannot be abolished. However it gives ground for distinctly sketching the existing limits between right and wrong. Drawing of limits carries two benefits:

Firstly: The union overruns political boundary and that of interests. As such, it becomes real.

Secondly: In future - in a long run - protection of this political unity for the sake of interests cannot become a cause to forget or neglect right and wrong besides any deviation from beliefs from correct Shia faith. In addition to this, correct Islamic unity cannot give rise to any possibility of taking a wrong meaning to itself; that is Shia beliefs to melt into Sunni beliefs. **[3]**

[1] *Ibid: Article: 'Elements of Islamic unity and its handicaps' quoted in Book of Unity Pgs. 25 & 52-53*

[2] *Interview in 'Haft Aasmaan' (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 10-11*

[3] *Tazweeb = melting*

Chapter 6

Introduction to Applications of Two Tendencies by way of Criticism and Narration

Under this heading, we shall dwell on indications drawn with a motive of creating Islamic unity. However it has become a ground for serious criticism because of the standards of evaluation output.[1] It is of such a nature that we cannot see any religious origin in it; nor could it be turned into a religious thought. However in a particular period of time they might have shown a very good ability towards creating Islamic unity.

We shall introduce each of these indications. We shall treat the analysis done by religious scholars as source pertaining to second tendency.

These analyses are collected here to show correct outlooks and to scrutinize insincere writings.

[1] As our aim in this writing is identification of all types of conjectures that are being spread and to warn about them we have presented the actual quotations that mention those conjectures so that readers may gain complete information about them. It is also important to remember that acceptance of any of these propagated views is related to a type of acceptance of all other conjectures, so we must not be careless of any of these things. (The arrangement of Criticism and Scrutiny of these conjectures is done according to this relationship).

Part 2
Keeping Quiet and Prohibiting
Difference-Creating Activities

Chapter 7

Introduction

It is perhaps the most simple and at the same time, most insincere method of creating Islamic unity. It is completely based on narrations mentioned in the first tendency. It advocates restriction from difference-producing analyses and maintaining silence. Now at this advanced stage, the secrets are recommended not be told.

Hence it is said:

“Now, as it is said that these are secrets of progeny of Muhammad, then they must be kept confidential and not revealed.”**[1]**

Obviously, unity gained by negligence of knowledge will be imaginary unity. Furthermore, the outcome can well be judged if the steps, already suggested, are to be taken on road to Islamic unity such as:

“In controversial issues we should view afresh and anew. We should find new ways of friendship. We should give no room to new differences.”**[2]**

“Many differences in our time are groundless. As such, many differences should be forgotten and ignored. We should revise the method of debating issues or arguments.”**[3]**

“We must not dig graves under the sun in order to bring to life what is dead and buried.”**[4]**

“The subject matters that carry differences should not be discussed too openly in meetings or gatherings held under the title of ‘unity’! **[5]**

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Article in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, (1st Edition 1381) Vol. 2, Pg. 29*

[2] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 135*

[3] *Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 305*

[4] Sayyid Jawad Mustafavi: *Article: ‘Unity in Nahjul Balagha’ quoted in Kitab-e-Wahdat (Book of Unity), Pg. 127*

[5] *Ibid. ‘Unity in Nahjul Balagha’ quoted in Kitab-e-Wahdat, Pg. 138*

“What we say in this article can be summarized as: Muslims must not speak about differences that existed among their own leaders fourteen centuries ago: and more undesirable it is to speak about differences that have happened later and are constant and current.”! **[1]**

“Narration of any matter that might hurt our Sunni brothers is prohibited.”! **[2]**

“...There are certain matters which must be taken into consideration by broadcasting stations, television and media collectively. Besides, writers and speakers also must delete such matters, particularly about the Fatimid period in gatherings. Then alone unity is possible. Whatever, it could be, if it hurts the feelings of our Sunni brothers it must be avoided in our public gatherings and should not be mentioned at all. I can prove that whatever is being published in books and newspapers and told over the pulpits in religious gatherings and over TV and Radio is sufficient to injure the feelings of our Sunni brothers. Hence it is prohibited.”! **[3]**

“We Muslims are not allowed to behave in a way that could endanger Ummah’s unity: To protect a part of the Ummah or Faith - no matter if that Faith happens to belong to Ahle Bayt of Prophet - we cannot injure unity as a whole.”! **[4]**

“From the viewpoint of religious obligation anything that weakens Islam and strengthens infidelity or hurts Islamic unity, as a whole, is prohibited. It is obvious that consequent to such speeches there will not remain any unity in the Islamic front. As such, Islam will become weak against infidelity.”! **[5]**

Criticism and Analysis

Ustad Ali Iraqchi Hamadani has discussed in detail in his book, *Sad Dars Az Bahas-e-Imamat* the captioned topic. We have summarized them below retaining the original points:

“Perhaps before a discussion on Imamate takes place it comes to mind that in this age when Muslims are facing such terrible enemies, are such

[1] *Ibid.* ‘Unity in Nahjul Balagha’ quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 144

[2] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Ittelaat Daily*, 29th Khordad 1379

[3] Interview published in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue 4, Winter 79, Pg. 63-64

[4] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 11

[5] *Ibid.* *Payaam-e-Wahdat (Message of Unity)*, Pg. 274

discussions beneficial or not? Because the nature of this subject of Imamate is such that it necessarily renews differences, which are cornerstones laid immediately after the demise of Prophet. Various animosities and several bloodsheds have occurred since then. Because of these differences, the real enemy is neglected...as the unity of Muslims is most important necessity and discussions on Imamate cause disunity, for the sake of safeguarding unity, it is prudent to keep quiet... [because] the its harm is less than the harm of disunity which gives room to foreign influence.”**[1]**

In reply to this objection the following questions may be posed:

“Is unity and integration useful in every subject and matter? Or subjects differ in this respect? There is no doubt that any subject if it happens to be useful or reasonable for an Ummah, co-ordination and co-operation becomes necessary for its achievement. On the contrary, any subject of no benefit - its availability is not only unnecessary but even harmful-

Therefore elegance of the word 'unity' should not deceive us. As such, we must keep in view the aim prior to unity. Besides, Quran too approves unity if it be for truth and considers it harmful if it be in a wrong direction. Furthermore, it recommends having unity if it be for God's sake. But it prohibits unity for the sake of wrong and falsehood." [2]

"Consequently, according to reason and Quran every man is obliged to judge the matter first. If it is correct and right he may extend his hand of unity towards a group. If it is otherwise he must refrain from it. As such, unity is necessary and desirable. However the aim must become transparent ahead of unity. Truth will cast a shadow over unity. Now to arrive at the truth, there is no way other than a debate or discussion which is not workable in a friendly atmosphere." [3]

If we desire that the difference that appeared among Muslims immediately after the Prophet's passing away should disappear and vanish, we must search for a ground to pluck it from its root.

"We ought to know the events as to what they were; or persons as to who they were? Either events or persons are causes of difference after the Prophet. As a result, when we lay hands upon them we must draw a line

[1] *Ali Iraqchi Hamadani: Sad Dars az Bahas-e-Imamat (A Hundred Lessons on Imamate), Pgs. 9&12*

[2] *Ibid. Pgs. 12-13*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 14*

between them and Islam. In other words, we must separate them from Islam. The reality of Islam will be obtained. Then we must be united to preserve this reality.

It goes without saying that the issue of Imamate and leadership became the cause of difference. After the Prophet's passing away, a group claimed this position and therefrom sprung the difference.

So prior to unity, a debate is necessary into this subject in order to reach truth so that unity could be based on truth and

reality. Otherwise such a unity would be useless and impossible.”**[1]**

“Now this objection arises that: Whether it is good and sensible to be truthful about anything in any age or not? Most probably it might be said that to maintain silence is dictated by reason when telling the truth and narrating facts brings unwanted consequences. Such undesired aftermath must be avoided. Religiously too our infallible Imams have recommended dissimulation in cases when truth becomes a cause of mischief.**[2]** Therefore we should choose a way of protecting truth and safeguarding reality so that truth may not be totally sacrificed. The very prestige and entity of Muslims may not be destroyed. Instead of such discussions, we must try to make Muslims come closer. For the sake of protecting a greater reality we may overlook this.”**[3]**

In reply we say:

“Subjects and instances must be scrutinized case by case. If truth be useful, it is good to speak. Else, one must resort to silence.**[4]** But it should be understood that Imamate is a very beneficial subject. No harm comes from it. Of course it depends on the way it is dealt so as to not end in a fracas or foul-mouthing.”**[5]**

When one aims to reach truth through a debate or discussion, the trend will be logic, reason, proof and never abuse or inflexibility. Such a type of argument carries no corruption except benefits to a great extent.”**[6]**

“In short, discussion about Imamate in an atmosphere away from

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 15*

[2] *Ibid. Pgs. 15-16*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 18*

[4] *Ibid. Pg. 18*

[5] *Ibid. Pg. 19*

[6] *Ibid. Pgs. 20-21*

childish bigotry and remote from abuses and vilifications has had been beneficial in every age and in the present age also.”[1]

“Some short-sighted people imagine that since Shias believe Ali as immediate successor of Prophet and Sunnis believe Abu Bakr to be the immediate successor of the Prophet etc., so if Shias do not refer to the issue of succession of Prophet and show respect and affection towards the three Caliphs who preceded Ali this difference will be completely removed. Muslim all over the world could be united and become a power worth consideration! These people don’t know that if supposing such a thing ever took place, the enemy will seek some other way to ignite differences.”

Well, to reach a tangible result we have a suggestion. You separate Shia population from Muslims. Do all other sects of Muslims have unity among themselves although they share the same belief with regard to Caliphate? No. They are not united. Their respective governments too are not united with one another. Their nations too, although under the banner of Islam, are not in one row of Islam. The gap of disunity is more pronounced there.”[2]

“In fact the great block on way of unity is imperialism and imperialists who have been active in every age in fomenting differences and keeping alive disunity.”[3]

“Can these pains be assuaged by our silence regarding the right of Ali and his sons?

While it is that all these differences, mischiefs and bloodshed have been there only because the Shia society is loyal and devoted to the right of Ahle Bayt of Prophet and they do not entertain any friendly feelings towards their enemies. See how far has injustice gone! To what extent is this ignorance?! The body of Islam and Muslims is weakened due to shortage of blood which is the source of life in both the worlds (this and the next). God and His Prophet have pointed out this. All Muslim sects have narrated it. In other words, it is to be in line with Ali and his infallible sons. We must seek their embrace to

invigorate Islam and Muslims. We cannot act like those in the guise of open-mindedness and waste this minimum blood resulting in collapse of Islam, only for the sake

[1] *Quoted from same source Pg. 21*

[2] *Ibid. Pgs. 22-23*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 22*

of unity and attaining power and pomposity.”**[1]**

Those who claim unity desire Shias to give up their particular beliefs. Of course they are after their own interests. However they ignore the fact that the enemy will anyway persist in his task through some other means so that differences remain.

“In any case, the issue of Imamate if argued on basis of reason and evidence; will result in unity not disintegration.”**[2]**

“Because in this discussion, we shall cover beliefs particular to each of the two parties referring to original Islamic sources that is Quran and authentic traditions; unveil truth and bring to fore the divine rope of rescue. Then all will together hold the hand of unity under the rich shadow of truth. The glory and greatness gone long ago will be regained by crushing foreign enemies and their associates by means of oneness and sacrifice. Indeed, such a unity will be a living one and deep-rooted.”**[3]**

This type of discussion will give ground to:

“To discover reasons of difference through perfect scrutiny. Then to draw a line between right and wrong. Thus to know and recognize enemies who inserted the wrong into right by deception and cheating so that we can boycott them and those with them and discover Islam – pure, pristine, real and original – that the Prophet brought to us and introduced for our practice. Such an association that will come into being will be with knowledge and learning. Unity that will be gained will be fruitful among Muslims and fatal to outsiders and adversaries.

In such a case, the enemy will be deprived of excuse of differences of belief and other excuses would also become ineffective.

Because the enemy aims to gain from ignorance of people and thereby to obtain power over them and create disunity. Knowledge and awareness are strong walls to prevent the enemy from advancing his influence on Muslims. And discussion on Imamate leads to awareness, knowledge, exposing of realities and truth.”[4]

[1] *Ibid.* Pg. 24

[2] *Ibid.* Pgs. 27-28

[3] *Ibid.* Pgs. 26-27

[4] *Ibid.* Pg. 29

Through discussion on Imamate we can gain following things:

“Difference of beliefs can be repudiated. Muslims can know one another. And unity, which is fatal to enemy, can be achieved.”[1]

“To mend these defects it is necessary that Muslim people from Shia and Sunni community should come forward to form associations and programs where debates, discussions and teaching should take place. The light of Islam and Quran should be projected into depths of Muslim entity. We must know that Imamate is an important and fundamental issue. Muslims must discuss this subject since it is a cornerstone; because leadership is one of the pillars in Islam.”[2]

“If Muslims are acquainted with real and original face of Islam, all sects will come closer to one another – resulting in unity. Such a unity that comes into being on the basis of knowledge and learning shall be powerful and lasting. This unity can withstand foreign influences. Knowledge can be attained through classes and debating societies.”[3]

Ustad Ja’far Subhani in his analysis about the root of this type of tendency writes:

“Sometimes it is seen that simple-minded youths have a misunderstanding concerning unity which serves a good pretext in their hands. They try to criticize the truth-seekers. Their claim

is that discussion about Abu Bakr's Caliphate and Ali as to whose right it was, neither has a need nor is it fruitful..."[4]

Those who harbor such opinion have neglected the bright consequences of this discussion, and therefore they think that it is useless and a hurdle for Islamic unity. But in our opinion it is nothing but ignorance about philosophy of recognizing the Imam. It has no other root except in 'Sunni obduracy' or 'Wahabi tendency'.

This objection can bear meaning only in the event our belief about Imamate or Caliphate in Islam is same as that of Sunni scholars. In other words, to consider it a worldly office or position when its function will be to guard Islamic frontiers and strengthen defenses. However from Shia viewpoint Imamate is constancy of Message and continuation of divine

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 28*

[2] *Ibid. Pgs. 31-32*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 32*

[4] *[More will be said about this objection.]*

bounty through the Prophet. Therefore the discussion becomes not only necessary but obligatory about duties of Imam and it cannot be briefed in the foregone ones. He should expound and explain important divine regulations, the prohibited, the sanctioned; besides giving explanatory notes on Quranic data. Imam is the only source and oracle immediately after passing away of Prophet...

Here we see that intellectual succession of Prophet is something that demands a thorough discussion because the relative issue is alive and it takes to itself importance of utmost nature. It must be clarified that the Imam is Ummah's leader in knowledge, principles, divine commandments and its branches. Such a station and position as that of Imam if not completely understood, will yield no required or desired result.

...So much so if we[1] set aside the issue of Caliphate and overlook issue of leadership after the Prophet that goes to an infallible person; the issue that remains worth arguing is that of religion. Authority as to who it is or who must it be in

matters of faith or religion after the Prophet's passing away. This matter has an immediate bearing on prosperity and future of Muslims as a whole."**[2]**

The Ustad proceeds:

"There are some groups among extremists who aspire very much to establish a united government all over Islamic territories. They have prohibited any speech or discourse over issues of difference. They consider it as the cause of difference. They have even gone farther because they treat it as a factor that takes us backwards to the ages of battles of Ottoman Caliphs and Sultans of Iran."**[3]**

We must point out to this group that the matter is not as hot as they consider. There are debates and discussions – one differs with other. There are discussions, which open the way to see facts. Such discussions are far from blind bigotry. They depend only on documents, which both parties consider authentic. Through such discussions alone is possible to illuminate the dark spots in Islam concerning belief, traditions and jurisprudence, etc. Does Quran not itself invite towards contemplation and consideration on its verses?

Groups that have prohibited discussion of issues (having differences)

[1] *[It is not as a belief but continuity of the discussion.]*

[2] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Rahbari-e-Ummat (Leadership of the nation), Pgs. 12-14*

[3] *In the Safavid period*

regard the writers of such matters as provokers and instigators. They must know as to what would be the consequences of such a theory of theirs. A great part of Quran, the Prophet's traditions and Islamic history will vanish little by little into forgetfulness. No one will recall the events nor will lift the veil to see what has happened. Therefore matters of great importance will thus be missed and lost.

How much better it would be if we dwell upon reformation instead of prohibiting this and that or assassination of thought. The writers should be reminded of existing chaos of Muslims.

They should perform their job towards betterment of their position with utmost impartiality and neutrality. They should take care not to hurt feelings of others while they write on any of these critical issues. They should know that their writings will be judged on the Day of Judgment and it will constitute a part of the record of their deeds.

Briefly: Issues of belief that form the foundation of thought in every religion carry two views, which should be explained:

1- Unity cannot last long without knowing the branch matters or issues of difference. Unity founded on blind bigotry and without knowledge of branches will be feeble and shaky and of short duration.

2 - Our sons should be acquainted with this school by learning and reason because we are sure of the truth of this school - They must refrain from imitation in matters of belief. However it becomes necessary that these issues must be studied and taught. It is obligatory that our school must be transferred to our successors. Otherwise all will go by the winds and in days to come nothing will remain.

Every type of argument if handled with the method mentioned in foregone pages it will neither be harmful nor create differences. Rather it will be good and useful for unity. If scholars of each sect explain these difference-bearing issues openly, honestly, and without any cheating, most accusations, misconceptions and misunderstandings will fade away. Only truth will remain as it is.

...We have witnessed in our life that any book if written through conscience and based on truth and Quran without any trick or malicious motive; has served in bringing two opposite groups closer. And the tree of integration has borne fruits at the earliest.

...Such a book has never produced any difference.**[1]** It is remarkable to

[1] *[Reference to Fatwa of Shaykh Shaloot that permits following Shia Imamiyah*

point out here that the work so far done in this respect is the effect of the cause. It is towards defending truth, logic and the reason of Shia sect about its belief, principles and branches of its regulations. If pretext of Islamic unity goes as far as over-running Shia school then no truth, no reality would have survived. Nor honor and prestige remained for Shia.

The argument based on reason and sense with correct Islamic outlook, purged of bigotry and foul language cannot be objected or blamed. It brings closer the two disparate groups.”**[1]**

Therefore any discussion or argument cannot be restricted by some or other pretext or a superfluous excuse. Islamic unity generally has become an excuse only.

Allamah Askari writes about this in his article:

“If in the past writing the sayings of the Prophet were prohibited under excuse of remembering Quran by heart. Today also the same is repeated under pretext of protecting Islamic unity. They want to close the door of learning and research. The policy is the same. However religion demands keeping the door of learning and research open.

Don't argue! How strange it is! How dreadful and dangerous this sentence is. See the hurt and harm hidden therein. Is it not tantamount to say: Don't go after knowledge? Do not speak about the conduct of the Prophet. In other words, do not learn these sciences. It is harmful what they are saying under pretext of religion that one should not hold any discussions!

Why at all should we give up argumentation and research? For the sake of Islamic unity? Whether all these differences among Muslims, in opinions, thoughts, religious commandments, will subside by just giving up argumentation? How should a discussion be given up when so many made-up traditions and altered history exists? In the face of so many

controversies in Islamic belief, Prophet's behavior, commandments of Quran and Islamic history that exist, argument should be set aside or it is the need of the day?

The fact is that arguments have become a persisting essentiality to invite debate or to publish reality for public scrutiny. After Infallible Imams,

school]

[1] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Peshwayi az Nazar-e-Islam (Leadership in the view of Islam), Pgs. 8-16*

our (Shia) scholars have followed this path. They have sacrificed their life. They put themselves to danger and risk.

However they did not give up disseminating true Islamic knowledge."**[1]**

Invitation to Silence as Open-mindedness

We are invited to keep quiet and historical research and analysis is banned. All this is done under the mask of open-mindedness. Likewise, this statement:

“So what for are present differences between Shia and Sunni? Does it concern election, [2] which took place 1380 years ago? The scrutiny of the things is made such as to make it invalid or of no worldly advantage to you and me. Of course it is advantageous only in the next world when we die. It is so to say, if we carry the love of Ali in our hearts – whose right was usurped in Saqifah – after death we will enter heaven. While those who support the other candidates will go to Hell...” [3] At a single instance they have shown Shiaism in form of historical loves and hatreds...while it has a value for our life of today and tomorrow or an effect on our opinions.”! [4]

It seems such type of viewpoint is a reflection of a deviated outlook about Imamate. [5] That *Wilayatis* being compared to rulership and all discussions about Imamate are confined to this environment.

It is expressed that:

“Usurping the Caliphate immediately after passing away of Prophet that took place in such a way is an obvious and an open tyranny and atrocity against reality and truth. A person who was the self and shadow of the Prophet was deprived of power and office of administration. As a result, Islam was deprived of the bounty of such a person. However whatever it was; did happen. To recover the right to whomever it concerns is

[1] Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Hamasa-e-Ghadeer (Collected Articles)*, Pgs. 506-507

[2] [Election here means the meeting of Saqifah Bani Saada and other candidates means Caliphs. As if it was based on election and it made a mistake only in selecting a befitting individual.]

[3] [Regarding the exalted position of correct belief in Imamate and its effect in gaining success and happiness in the next world refer to the book: *Dar Justujoo-e-Ilm-e-Deen (In search*

of religious knowledge) by Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi (Pg. 131-161)

[4] *Dr. Ali Shariati: History and Study of Religions (Collected Writings 15) Vol. 2, Pg. 26-27*

[5] *Refer: Ali Labbaf, A Victim Lost in Saqifah Vol. 4, Section 2 impossible. To talk about it is now a hue and cry."**[1]***

In their camp Caliphate is regarded only a worldly office, that is an executive of an administration. In other school, it is seen through quite a different angle, which is:

"They only consider Imamate to be in sense of leadership of society. They say that the Prophet had installed Ali to succeed him for leadership and guidance. And Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman came inopportune."

Shias are of the same caliber and there are two other issues also. [Absolute religious point of reference and total divine Guardianship]. Either they have no belief in this or they are silent in this regard. There are also those who acknowledge the second stage. However they have not reached the third."**[2]**

Ustad Ja'far Subhani replies:

"The issue of Imamate or leadership of Muslims depends on the nature of argument. If the argument is framed: Who occupied the social and political office of Imamate and administered after the Prophet? This becomes a historical question. After fourteen centuries, it would not interest the youth of present generation. Besides, it has nothing to teach or provide any useful information. To know that person was a matter of necessity in its age. The passage of time has made this issue lose dignity and importance.

If the trend of argument is changed, the issue will take the real entity to itself. In this issue, there are two things. The political and social leadership of Islamic society after Prophet and besides this there is another thing, which is authority in religion, its principles and its branches. The question is who it is to administer this school after Prophet? Who are and must be those to show or explain to the masses God's

commandments - what is allowed and what not and so forth. They must be of such a caliber that their word and actions must stand an authority, an absolute - unshakeable and unalterable one until the last Day. What they said and what they did must serve as a model to man. Therefore from this stage the argument bears sense and carries weight. It becomes needful to know the personage and personality of the Imam. The nature of this issue is such that it becomes a part of life. As such, nobody can ignore or overlook it. To know the Imam as to who and what he

[1] *Haider Ali Qalamdaran: Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 141*

[2] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imamat-o-Rahbari (Imamate and Leadership), Pg. 57*

should be becomes obligatory because it is a part of religion.”**[1]**

“In Shia view the Imam holds the office, which is continuity of message and extension of Prophethood. A matter of such an import should not be argued. It is an issue full of life. It is obligatory to know this station of Imam. Otherwise it will remain inconclusive...”**[2]**

Invitation to Keep Quiet as Mark of Sympathy

There is another suspect in the margin of this very tendency, which makes silence obligatory. That is:

“Occupation in differences has kept the youth from reaching truth and basic principles of Islam. The spirit of faith is taken away from the people leaving them with the name of religion only.**[3]**”

Ustad Mutahhari writes while describing this type of outlook:

“The present generation of our current age is fed up of faith and less interested in Islam as a result of discussion about Caliphate, Imamate and unpleasant events that took place and its repetition. They are already suffering by spiritual chaos.

Such discussions could have had desired consequences in the past. They could even have diverted attention from one branch to another. However in present times bringing it back to memory weakens thoughts with regard to structure and its root. We see in other schools they always try to hide the ugly part of their history. But on the contrary, we Muslims try to keep it alive on narration and rather magnify it more than its actual bulk.

We cannot concur with the above opinion.

We do acknowledge that criticism of history if it be narration alone or a reflection of events, the effect that will be exercised will be same as above. If the glorious side of history should be sketched and ugly or shameful part of it overlooked, it will be deviation of history rather than criticism or analysis. Supposing if it were customary to forget, neglect or avoid disgraceful and ugly parts of history, what its aftermath will be with regard to issues that concern the very gist of Islam. What will be the fate of the issue relating to leadership of Islamic society? To ignore such

[1] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Rahbari-e-Ummat, Pgs. 7-8*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 13*

[3] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Azaar Shirazi: Islam Aaine Hambastigi (Islam, the Constitution of Solidarity), Pg. 13*

an issue tantamount to ignoring the prosperity of Muslims. Besides, if the rights of some persons had been trespassed or taken away by force and those persons happened to be of dignity and decorum; what will be the case if historical facts are overlooked? It will be nothing but called verbal and written support of oppression.”**[1]**

Invitation to Keep Quiet for Confidentiality

Invitation towards silence on part of unity-seekers and their insistence to avoid arguments that create differences is continuation of their same thoughts with same aim but in a different form. We can see this if we are mindful of the extent of its influence.

This change is a tricky one. It invites to not argue issues that create differences, particularly Saqifah and attack on the house where divine revelation descended, confiscation of Fadak and martyrdom of Zahra. This time their pretext is quite different and charming too; that is secrets should not be disclosed or made public.**[2]** Where would this end? In a long run its end will be deviation and denial of realities, which will be totally forgotten because of no argument whatsoever about it.

Dr. Muhammad Asadi Garmarudi writes in this respect:

“Secrets of the Prophet’s Ahle Bayt were of two categories: one: They themselves were insistent to not disclose them. They revealed them only to their close companions. Generally everyone had neither capacity nor ability to accept or bear them.

The second category consists of secrets by necessity of dissimulation and conditions of time and place. However it was not throughout history.

As such, the season for keeping secret has already passed. Therefore ignorance about those realities will entail deprivation of bounties and benefits of true religion. Zahra herself has pointed out in her address to chiefs of Migrants and Helpers the mandate that rests upon their lot to convey realities to coming generations and make them aware of truth.”**[3]**

[1] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imam-at-o-Rahbari, Pgs. 13-16*

[2] *Refer: Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Jam-e-Jam Daily 10th Bahman 1379*

[3] *Dr. Muhammad Asadi Garmarudi: Haqeeqat-e-*

Sookhte (The Burnt Fact), (Critical Essays on Wahdat-e-Islami by Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani.) Pgs. 63-64

Part 3
Adopt Common Things and
Ignore Differences between
Islamic sects

Chapter 8

Introduction

One wrong conception formed by the term 'Islamic unity' is to accept what is common among Islamic faiths and leave the points of differences.

Within the folds of this conception lies a point, which must not be ignored. It is commonly used to block the way that raises issues of Shia belief.

In this method, we come across the same idea that necessitates silence. It invites discourse only in matters of common beliefs. Discussion is very much encouraged from this outlook. However the case is not the same with regard to subject of Imamate. Therefore under pretext of Islamic unity, the most fundamental issue particular to Shia school, which is belief in Imamate, goes into oblivion.

It is thus declared:

"All our efforts are towards this: Religions must wipe out past from their mentalities. Discussion should take place within framework of logic and reason including the most sensitive issue we have, i.e. Caliphate and Imamate..."

In this said ground, discussion is possible away from sympathy with reason. The aim must not be to remove differences, but rather to control differences and create mutual understanding between two sides. Both sides should be brought home to the effect that presently these discussions do not cater

to the need of Muslims. On the contrary, they do more harm than good.”!**[1]**

Criticism and Analysis

Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari writes concerning the erroneous results of Islamic Unity:

“The second fault is: by raising these issues what would be the status of Islamic unity? The thing that befell Muslims was that their glory was snatched away from them. They were belittled and brought under

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Nida-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 120
domination of other non-Muslim nations. Imperialism, new or old, utilizes this tool towards igniting old differences. This has served as a good tool all over Islamic countries without exception. For imperialism is, in the name of religion, showing sympathy for Islam but aiming to enlarge the gulf and deepen rancor among Muslims themselves. Does it not suffice whatever we have suffered and endured through this way? Should we go on again? Will not raising such designs result in helping the aims of Imperialism?

The answer is: Unity and co-ordination forms the most essential need of Muslims. However the old rankling rancor is mother-pain of Muslims; now it is contagion in the world of Islam. The enemy too benefits from it always.

It seems that the accuser has mistaken the sense of Islamic unity.

Islamic sects must overlook principles of their respective beliefs for the sake of unity. This was not the conception of Islamic unity among clerics and scholars of faith and open-mindedness a century ago. In other words, it means to accept joint material of belief among sects and to set aside the very particulars of their own belief. Such a thing is neither reasonable nor practicable. How is it possible to ask followers of a faith to ignore or give up certain principles, which are in belief or practice, in his view constitutes a part of text of Islam? That is for the sake of unity of Islam and Muslims he should turn a blind eye at a portion from the whole of Islam in the name of Islam?

There are several other ways to make people committed to a religious principle. The most natural one is reason and logic. People cannot be made faithful by means of request or in the name of interests nor can they be stripped of faith.

We ourselves are Shia. We are proud to be followers of Ahle Bayt of Prophet. We do not consider a least thing, whether be it an appreciable or undesired, worthy of transaction against interests. We do not entertain any request from any in this regard. Likewise, we do not expect from others also to give up a principle among principles of their belief for sake of Islamic unity. To accept common elements of belief and to repudiate particulars of a sect is a kind of transgression on absolute consensus.**[1]** Moreover, it is not a true Islamic product. In any case, particulars of any sect among sects of Islam are parts of Islamic text. There cannot be Islam

[1] [A new statement different from the one having consensus (Refer: *Lughta Name Dahe Khuda*, Vol. 26, Pg. 450)] if it happens to be devoid of these distinctions and specifications. In usual terms, it is a difference in one party and in one single front.

Unity of a party demands that all individuals be at equity with regard to ideology, thought, way and vogue with the exception of personal matters.

Nevertheless, unity of a front means something different. All parties and groups, no matter however different in their taste, ideology, customs and norms must stand in one row against their common enemy because of combined elements common among them. It is obvious that arranging a row against enemy does not contradict with defending objectives and criticizing objectives of other brothers or inviting to their own objectives by associates of the same front. However inviting to or supporting Islamic unity cannot bar the truth. Things that provoke bigotry or old rancor must not take place. Scientific discussion has an immediate bearing on reason and not on sympathy and feelings.”**[1]**

[1] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imamat-o-Rahbari, Pgs. 16-19*

Part 4
To Make Difference between Two
Schools so light as to appear
depthless

Chapter 9

Introduction

This is one of the ideas since the beginning of unity in question, which still can be seen in a scattered thought. It is to show differences between school of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) and that of Caliphs at a very low level.

If difference between beliefs of two schools be wider and deeper, to bring followers of these schools closer becomes very difficult. Therefore it is in the interest of unity-seekers to display this gulf of difference as too narrow as far as their claim is concerned.

If we appoint one as a neutral judge and assign him to study beliefs of both schools and then give his judgment or opinion. Without doubt, his reply will be that differences in beliefs of Shia and Sunnis are much wider and deeper than what claimers of Islamic Unity pretend.

Although topics of the subjects of discussion between two beliefs are common, its contents differ very much. To depend on common topics would produce only fictitious unity. Because the following discussions that are publicized have the same titles but have a vast difference between them.

Just take a look at the books:

Be With the Truthful Ones, Ask Those who Know and other work of Dr. Muhammad Tejani. He has written these books after having had been guided to Shia School. This will rightly prove what we have stated above.

Tendency towards unity, in any case, is bereft of originality and truth. It might be having strength and salubrity in its early stage. Even then it is said:

“We find out at a careful scrutiny that around eighty five or ninety percent of matters concerning belief, jurisprudence and moral are common among all faiths. Therefore we must persist on these common principles with adherence, since they result in unity of Muslims.”!**[1]**

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 151*

“The fact is that schools are having common principles.”!**[1]**

“Islamic sects are common in jurisprudence, principle, speech, conduct, tradition and Islamic culture.”!**[2]**

“Principle and approximately total absolute beliefs are common and final among schools. The branch issues mostly are causes of difference because each aims at a particular view.”!**[3]**

“...followers of schools since the second century have a record. They have jurisprudence and speech. They are bound to a divine legislation. They do not differ from one another as far as principle is concerned. They differ only in branch issues.”!**[4]**

“We Muslims also have the same story. All have one God, one Prophet, one Book and one prayer direction. Other mandates such as prayers, fasting, Hajj and so forth run the same in all sects. Since we have no knowledge of others we become the butt of wrong allegations about one another.”!**[5]**

“One thousand three hundred and ninety odd years have elapsed since the initial call of Islam. Six hundred and fifty million Muslims exist among three milliard people over this globe. Although elements of difference in belief have separated them from one another, yet we do not see any basic difference in faith or religion among them. A Chinese Muslim, an Indonesian one, or a Muslim from Tatar or an Arab or an Irani – all are together under a belt of one faith and one religion.”!**[6]**

“If Sunnis get acquainted with their Shia brothers and likewise Shias with their Sunni brothers, it will dawn upon them that the difference between them is not a basic one. The conjecture that exists in one’s mentality regarding the other is nothing but a product of false

[1] Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring , Summer 80, Pg. 13

[2] Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 235

[3] Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 270

[4] Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring , Summer 80, Pg. 12

[5] Abdul Kareem Bi-Azaar Shirazi: Islam Aaine Hambastigi (Islam, the Constitution of Solidarity), Pg. 11

[6] Muhammad Moheet Tabatabai: Sayyid Jamaluddin Asadabadi wa Beedaari-e-Mashriq-e-Zameen (Awakening of Eastern land), Pg. 168

assumptions.”!**[1]**

“Islamic legislation is not a product of any fanciful imagination. It stands on a fixed principle. There does not exist any Muslim from any sect of Islam who might differ with another Muslim. If there is a difference, it is in the branch of the principle not in the very principle itself...”!**[2]**

“Those who are in agreement with regard to God, religion, Prophet, prayer direction and Quran, which are foundation stones of faith, must be mindful of principle that is the pillar of their own faith. They should regard it as an unshakable factor of unity, solidarity and integration.”!**[3]**

Dissemination of such foul and fake thoughts in the first place will harm and hit the body of Shiaism and the base of its belief. Consequently, the original and real face of this school will fade into oblivion.

In this way the monopoly of guidance that lies in following Ahle Bayt of infallibility and purity (a.s.) will be defeated and the most important pillar of Shia school will be demolished.

Today we ignore Imamate of Infallible Ahle Bayt of Prophet while we dwell on belief of two schools. This we do to protect or seek unity. It is quite clear where we will end. The propagation of such thoughts will carry us to an undesired and unwanted wilderness.**[4]**

As for Imamate and its position in Islam, we would like to dwell upon it since it has been criticized.

We refer here to views of scholars who themselves are fast pro-Islamic unity in its true sense.

One will realize, after a scrutiny of this analysis, that Imamate is a great difference between two schools. This difference has become a cause for differences in all discussions of belief entailing there to difference between teachings of two schools.

[1] *Shaykh Muhammad Taqi Qummi: Article quoted in Islam Aaine Hambastigi, Pg. 138*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Mughnia: Article quoted in Islam Aaine Hambastigi, Pg. 103*

[3] *Sayyid Jawad Mustafavi: Article: 'Wahdat Dar Nahjul Balagha' (Unity in Nahjul Balagha) quoted in Kitab-e-Wahdat (Book of Unity) Pg. 120*

[4] *Refer: Dr. Abdul Kareem Saroosh: 'Civil & Religious Constitution', Pgs. 169-182. From his speech delivered in Unity Conference, Tehran University, 1367*

A school that believes in Imamate of Prophet's Ahle Bayt will naturally grasp all elements and factors of belief and its data or literature from them - the infallible one. Similarly a school which has no belief in their Imamate has nothing to do with them. To gain Islamic information the school will refer to sources other than them.

Difference in belief in Imamate itself can be like a lighthouse that guides the way in dreadful oceans. In all subjects such as conduct, jurisprudence and belief between the School of Caliphs and that of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) through the scale of Imamate, truth and facts can well be sketched.

Criticism and Analysis

Shias believe:

“Imamate is a principle that gives a special distinction to Imamiyah sect. This sect is distinguished from all other sects of Muslims for this very reason. This difference has made Shiaism prominent among the rest of sects.”**[1]**

In this regard, Ustad Mutahhari writes:

“The issue of Imamate is too important to us, Shias. Nevertheless, to other sects of Islam it is not so important. The sense Shias draws from Imamate varies with that which other sects draw. This is the reason.**[2]** Indeed, there are some dimensions common to both schools. Nevertheless, there is a certain dimension particular to Shia belief. This particularity of issue of Imamate makes it an element of top priority to Shias.

When we Shias want to mention principles of faith we say: Monotheism, Prophethood, Justice, Imamate and Day of Judgment.

We regard Imamate a part of religion. The Sunnis also acknowledge something of a sort of Imamate. They do not basically deny Imamate, but Imamate they acknowledge is something else in a different form.

[1] Shaikh Muhammad Husain Kashiful Ghita: *Asl-e-Shia Wa Usoolaha (Fundamental of Shia and its principle)*, Pg. 107

[2] Sunnis do acknowledge leadership and Imamate in some cases. But the attributes of Imam are different from those of Shia belief. As for some conceptions of Imamate they altogether deny. It is not that they differ from Shias in qualities of Imam. The difference runs in the gist of Imamate besides the qualifications of the Imam. Imamate means (to them) leadership of a society. Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: *Imamat-o-Rahbari (Imamate and Leadership)*, Pgs. 46-47

Moreover, that form, according to them, is not a part of religion. It is only a branch factor of faith. However we have difference in this issue of Imamate. For the Sunni sect Imamate is

one thing else while to Shias something else. How it is that Imamate stands as a part of principle for Shia sect while it is a branch to Sunnis? The reason runs the same as referred to. In Shia sect, it is quite different from what it is with the Sunnis.”[1]

“If the issue of Imamate could have ended at the frontier of political leadership of society after Prophet we too would have shifted it to branches of faith and never elevated it to grade of principle. Shias acknowledge Imamate and do not stand on that extent nor do they suffice at that. Ali was one of the Prophet’s associates. Others were too - Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Salman and Abu Zar. Ali was superior to all, above all, more in knowledge, in piety, in eligibility.[2] The Prophet had already nominated him. Shias do not stop at this. They argue two other issues. The Sunni sect never acknowledges anyone as far as these two issues are concerned. It is not that they accept these couple of issues and reject Ali to be attributed with them.

One: Imamate in a sense of final and absolute religious authority to be referred to. The Prophet was the conveyor of divine Revelation. People used to refer to him when they stood in need of knowledge about any aspect of Islam. They used to inquire from the Prophet what they could not or did not find in Quran. Here is a point worth considering. The commandment, legislations, the data that Islam wanted to convey, is it all same as mentioned in Quran and told by the Prophet? This is not the case. Time did not allow the Prophet to convey everything to the people. Ali was the Prophet’s successor. The Prophet conveyed to Ali all that ought to be said and conveyed. He taught Ali to the extent to make him his like. He molded Ali into an extraordinary scholar. He made him by his teachings such as not to make mistake in his sayings and to not say what is not from God. Therefore the Prophet introduced Ali and declared:

[1] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imamato-o-Rahbari (Imamate and Leadership), Pgs. 45-46.*

“As a matter of fact it should be said: Sunnis from the very base reject Imamate that exists in view of Shias. They do not question its conditions and its very core is subject to denial.”

(Ibid.) Pgs. 117-118

[2] *[This much suffices: Negligence about appointment and divine text (Nass) has repercussions which we can also see today.]*

O, People! Whatever religious issues you want to know, when I am no more, you ask my successor and successors.

As a matter of fact, here Imamate becomes something like an expertise of Islam. Expertise from the divine side; and the Imams means those who know Islam and are experts therein. In other words, they are persons who have attained all sciences of Islam from the Prophet. The method they learnt from the Prophet is so concealed, unseen and a secret one that it is unknown to us. Islamic knowledge was first transferred from the Prophet to Ali. And from Ali it sought the bosoms of subsequent Imams one after the other. As such in all periods of the Imams, Islamic knowledge or source was one and the same – infallible, without any deviation or error.”**[1]**

“In Imamate in the first place is the issue of succession to the Prophet.**[2]** This naturally entails the office of explanation of faith or religion excluding revelation. It was the person of the Prophet to whom revelation used to descend. Message and revelation ended after Prophet’s passing away. The content or gist of Imamate runs thus: Divine instructions or teachings are such that none can insert therein his personal opinion nor can he build up on his own taste. These instructions and teachings were vested in the person of the Prophet. People were convinced that whatever of religious problems they ask; the answer is true as they used to receive from the Prophet. They knew that the answer was not based on personal opinion of the Prophet. Therefore there was not at all possibility of any error or mistake. Therefore the teachings remain the same without any change, addition or reduction. It never happened that the instructions might have been amended or corrected on the next day because the previous day the Prophet had forgotten to tell something or told erroneously. Indeed we do not say such a thing about the person of the Prophet. We told this by way of explanation. The Prophet passed away. The question that arises is: Whether after the Prophet there existed a person like

him to perform the office of absolute point of reference to comment, explain and expound divine religious commandments? Indeed, there did exist one to take over this office and perform the duty the Prophet used to discharge. But there is only one difference. What the Prophet conveyed and expounded, his source was Divine Revelation. And when the Imam or Imams discharged the same job, their source was the Prophet himself. The Prophet was based on revelation and the Imams, on

[1] *Ibid. Pgs. 50-52*

[2] *[Of course after the subjects of Wilayat and Imamate.]*

the Prophet. The Prophet taught them. How the Prophet did so we cannot understand. A glimpse of it appears in the words of Imam Ali (a.s.) when he says: 'The Prophet opened a door of knowledge to me. At the opening of that door one thousand doors got opened.' We cannot explain how the Prophet received knowledge from God nor can we understand the type of spiritual relation between Prophet and Ali. The Prophet taught the facts only to Ali and not to others." **[1]**

"Islam is a wholesome, consummate and magnificent religion and Imamate is its spirit. How can we say whether it reaches the extent Quran narrates about its principle and perfection? Or to the extent of the Prophet's words while explaining it and which the Sunnis too have referred? Whatever was Islam, whether is it the same? Indeed, the call of Islam was completed to the Prophet. However the question is whether Islam was wholly conveyed? Is there not such a probability that Islam might have descended after the Prophet? As such, there could be many issues, which were not told because of lack of need or lack of demand of time. They might have been held in reserve to be told at a proper time. Therefore the stock of such issues could have been in the custody of knowledge of Ali. And Ali should have been supposed to convey to the masses." **[2]**

"The Sunni sect does not acknowledge such a position to any. They do not accept such a type of Imamate at all nor do they accept existence of Imam. It is not such that they refuse Ali as an Imam and accept Abu Bakr instead. No. They do not accept the office of Imam. Sunnis refuse such a status to all - Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and other companions of Prophet.

The theme of the argument runs in this sense that revelation descended on the person of the Prophet only and nobody else. We too do not say that revelation descended on Imams. It was the Prophet who conveyed Islam to humanity. God told the Prophet what He wanted to be told of Islam. There is nothing either partly or little or more that remains untold. Sunnis further go to say that whatever the Prophet said, constitutes Islam.

There are issues about which the Prophet has not spoken even to his companions. About such issues, they (Sunnis) are confused and entangled in a puzzle. A thing not spoken is a quandary to them. They depend on

[1] *Ibid. Pgs. 71-73*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 75*

precedent. They judge or decide upon comparing a similar case if it occurred in the past. Imam Ali (a.s.) has criticized this practice of comparison. In Nahjul Balagha, he says that such a practice means that God has sent an incomplete religion that you have to substitute by the system of comparison. Shia logic is: Whatever God revealed to the Prophet was full and complete. He did not keep anything short. The Prophet too conveyed the same in the same measure to the people. He too did not keep anything less or short. Besides delivering the message to the people he told all the commandments and instructions to his special pupil and enjoined him to convey it to the people.”**[1]**

“It is here that we differentiate the duty of Shias and Sunnis in matter of explaining and understanding religion.”**[2]**

In accordance with this fundamental Shia belief in Imamate, Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi has written:

“We differ with them in all things – in principle of religion and in its branches as well, that is right from monotheism down to the branches.

In two issues we have a deep and salient difference with Sunni sect. One runs in principles of religion and the other in its branches. As far as principles of faith are concerned our difference is in Imamate, which is a fundamental item to us.

We believe that Imamate holds in its fold foundation of all religious recognition and information. Therefore the difference with Sunni sect is that of sky from earth. We deem that belief in monotheism, prophethood and Day of Judgment will be of no avail if there is no belief in Imamate.

In other words, Imamate is a pillar and foundation of religion. If this item be deleted, our faith will be incomplete and our religious bases will be in want and will result in no good to us. Without Imamate, branches of faith will be wrong and principles will be of no worth; neither will its recognition be of any value.”[3]

[1] *Ibid. Pgs. 52-54*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 76*

[We shall dwell later in the subsequent chapters on the claim of those who separated from the school of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) under the pretext of their having an excuse. It will be useful in the course of discussion to remember the publicized sources.]

[3] *Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi. Booklet: Guidance (Quoted portion from his speech on 21/11/79. Commentary of Verse 41, Surah Anfaal Pgs. 10-11)*

“Sunnis claim that Imamate has no role in faith; and that Ali too had no part in religious issues.

Faith consists of monotheism, prophethood and Resurrection day.

This is what the Prophet introduced to humankind. Finally, the matters are vested to the Ummah. The aspect of government is upto the Ummah to decide or to handle as deems fit.

They consider Imamate as rulership and social leadership, which the people themselves can manage or run.

Thus Ali has no role in Faith. This belief stands quite opposite to our point of belief.

We say that Ali has the real and main role in Faith. The message of prophethood depends on Ali's Imamate. Had there not been Imamate of Ali, the message would not have progressed.

As such, distance between them and us is to the extent of the sky from the earth.

We say that without Ali, Islam would be no more. They say Islam exists without Ali also.

What is a shell to its kernel such is the relation of Ali with Islam. Islam loses its spirit if there not be Ali. But they say the opposite; that is Islam exists with its spirit without Ali. So the gulf between us and them is too wide and large.”**[1]**

Even though for the sake of creating unity it may be claimed:

“To know the Imam is not a subject but it is an adherence. It is the way to get acquainted with religious commandments. It is not like belief in God and resurrection so as to be subjective.”**[2]**

[1] *Ibid. Pgs. 12-13*

[2] *Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: Majmua Maqaalaat (Collected Essays), Pg. 176*

Part 5
Deviation in Principles and
Branches of Faith

Chapter 10

Introduction

As we all know, one of the aims of unity of Islam is to avoid clashes, disputes, wars and bloodshed between Muslims.

Every Muslim is safe under Islamic civil regulations according to Islamic legislation. Life and property of a Muslim comes at the top of this civil law. On the other hand differences in belief have been ground for destroying sanctity of ones life and property throughout history. Proponents of Islamic unity desire to have a word about sectarian differences among Muslims. Their end is that these differences may not hurt individuals because of their being Muslims. As a result, any excuse for any kind of separation among Muslims could be repudiated. Therefore they usually say:

“...all of them (Muslims) are together in basic beliefs. In other words, beliefs which have bearing on one’s being a Muslim. The difference that lies in certain matters is not to the extent to deny one’s being a Muslim, but it is an adherence to a particular faith.”!**[1]**

“What we mean is that unity or proximity with one another should push Islamic faiths to be together on those conditions that are subject to being a Muslim. All are Muslims. The difference among them is not a fundamental one. It is a marginal one which does not rescind one’s Islam.”!**[2]**

“Issues of difference existing in between are not of a category that could qualify one to blame the other of infidelity. The difference lies outside the principle and foundation.

Therefore it is not a reason to say that these faiths have fundamental differences with each other.”!**[3]**

“In this way they should seek real truth, fact and knowledge. As far as they can, they should settle their disputes by reason and proof. Thus they can reach mutual agreement on any issues of difference. What good it would yield to reserve for himself what he likes and to be a cause of

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 257*

[2] *Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 258*

[3] *Shaikh Muhammad Taqi Qummi: quoted in Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pg. 57*

dread for others? On the other hand difference in branches is not harmful nor does it push them out of the circle of Islam.”!**[1]**

Criticism and Analysis

Declarations such as these towards gaining political unity are acceptable. Perhaps they may prove strong enough to achieve the aim. However in view of the highly exalted station of Imamate in Islam and Shia belief, they are bereft of originality and sincerity of thought.

We rather make divisions between teachings of Islam and principles of Islam and religion instead of maintaining Islamic principles and religious fundamentals. This is the important point overlooked that results in this outlook. The negligence is: We do not distinguish between worldly jurisprudence and fate of human beings in the next world.

Against the above division, unity-seekers have erroneously divided the principle (the common belief) and branches (the belief on personal make out) into two batches:

1 - The basic faith: i.e. common among all sects. It constitutes the basic principle of Islam. This gives the identity of being a Muslim.

2 - Branches of faith: i.e. beliefs particular to its relative faiths or sects. They are independent from fundamentals of Islam. They have no bearing on limits of Islam. **[2]**

Hence it is said:

“Principles means pillars on which rests the entity of a Muslim. If one rejects all of them or a part of it, he is no more a Muslim.”! **[3]**

“Branches are same issues that revert to the principle irrespective of views.”! **[4]**

“The meaning of branches is not only the side commandments but it also means issues stretched out of the basic principle in both dimensions prior

[1] *Ibid. quoted in Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pg. 56*

[2] *One of the wrong consequences of this is that Imamate is shifted to branches as we shall explain in coming pages.*

[3] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in 'Haft Aasmaan' (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 13*

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

and after the commands and beliefs. In beliefs too we have a principle and a branch.”!**[1]**

Here rises a question: When we can attain the goal without injuring the quality of thought and attain knowledge of all beliefs by personal conclusion why should we stick to unpleasant ideas or thoughts? Besides, according to real teachings of religion in this respect, which is agreeable to both sects, political unity too can be attained.**[2]** Descriptions about principles of faith and its standards; we make appear as brief knowledge is sufficient because principle is a scale agreed by all sects. As such, Islamic sects have no difference at all in principles and fundamentals of faith. Their religious differences, considering these narrations, consist of beliefs as a whole except common subjects related to branches!

It is thus said:

“Data mentioned in Quran and traditions; that is the principles Muslims had accepted and in the time of the Prophet too all Muslims were in agreement.”!**[3]**

“By the common sum of principle we mean final principle of Islam acceptable to all Muslims. They are proved and established by Quran and traditions which Muslims have necessarily accepted.”!**[4]**

“In this respect also we must go after deeds**[5]** of a category, a necessity of Islam and which are acknowledged by all faiths as an obligatory mandate in Quran and traditions. As in principles of belief, here too standard of acceptance of these actions is agreement of all upon it.”!**[6]**

“Muslim unity rests on the pivot of basic Islamic principles and all Muslims agree upon it.”!**[7]**

[1] Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 13

[2] *That is the principles of Islam that shall be dealt in detail.*

[3] Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 15

[4] Ibid. *Nida-e-Wahdat,, Pg. 26*

[5] *[Religious acts (Laws)]*

[6] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Essay quoted in Kitab-e-Wahdat, Pg. 210*

[7] Ibid. *Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 235*

[Of course, this question remains unanswered: How agreement among Muslims equals

“The difference of Muslims does not lie in issues of jurisprudence alone. It runs partly in side beliefs too. Besides, it also exists in common principles.”!**[1]**

Because of this narrow-mindedness, like the Muslims are excused in their differences about contents of common subjects they are also excused about belief in Imamate!**[2]**

Rather it is said that their faith will not be harmed because of not having such beliefs.**[3]**

Whether a claim like this:

“A brief knowledge about principles and belief in it to the extent of common understanding is sufficient. Not in sense of comprehension that embraces principles in detail. It suffices to form a standard of being a Muslim and a ground for Islamic unity. Belief in this principle runs to the extent of a common understanding to all.”!**[4]**

Is there something that goes beyond testimony of oneness of God and prophethood?

The above element creates confusion. Beyond necessary knowledge of principles which is a combination of subjects and general comprehension all arguments are side and branch ones. As a result they rest on personal conclusions! Therefore:

“Muslims in matter of branches should allow each other to have different beliefs.” **[5]**

religions concurrence that has resulted in a standard to distinguish the principles and decide its absoluteness? What is a reason or a proof for it?!!]

[1] Ibid. *Payaam-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 228

[This claim includes all matters of belief in which there are differences in side and common principles.]

[2] We shall deal in the following pages about the claim that the Ummah is excused in *Usool* (beliefs) and *Furu* (Laws).

[3] Regarding the difference between Islam and (Imaan) Faith, please refer to the book, *Marefat-e-Imam-e-Asr (a.t.f.s.)*, (Knowing the Imam of the Age) by Dr. Bani Hashimi.

[4] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pgs. 207-208

[5] Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issue 9 & 10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 13

Now according to faith one who gives testimony of God being one (i.e. monotheism) and prophethood, is a Muslim. And he is obliged to obey the commandments of Islam and enjoy the rights thereby.

As such, there is no need for a Muslim to know followers of all Islamic faiths and to claim wrongly:

“Justice and Imamate are principles of faith not principles of religion. Why they say so? Because Shias considers them Muslims who do not believe in this issue. Yes, they are Muslims though they may not believe in the said issue.” **[1]**

Because to consider followers of other Islamic sects Muslims has a root in fundamentals of other than Ja’fari (Shia) jurisprudence.

Conclusion

On this base:

“Principles of faith are elements that constitute a faith. Principles of faith in Islam are of two categories. One is the same, which entitles one to be called a Muslim according to issues[2] of jurisprudence[3] that is: testimony of God’s unity and prophethood.[4]

The other is salvation in the next world from divine punishment and resurrection to attain God’s pleasure and entrance in heaven. This depends upon that alone. Entering heaven is subject to acknowledgement of that principle. Otherwise heaven is prohibited. He who does not believe in this principle is regarded as infidel and thrown into hell. This part of principle is called principle of faith[5] that is to believe in Imamate and to accept the Imam.”[6]

Allamah Sayyid Abdul Husain Sharafuddin has dealt with this issue in two chapters in his book *Al-Fusool al-Muhimma Fi Taleef al-Ummah*. According to him, sanctity of being a Muslim is preserved and protected by rights of Islam by uttering two testimonies. This is agreed upon by Shias and Sunnis.

[1] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 155*

[2] *[That is it includes Islamic rights]*

[3] *[This part is called the principles of Islam]*

[4] *[To pronounce the two testimonies of faith]*

[5] *[Having the right and correct belief in Islamic sciences]*

[6] *Allamah Marashi Najafi: Ahqaaq al-Haqq, Vol. 2, Pg. 306*

He in the same way writes in the third chapter that: A great part in this regard is narrated by Sunni sect to the effect that whoever says: There is no god but God and Muhammad is the Prophet of God is a Muslim and his life and property is entitled to respect and regard. We shall evaluate it.

He further writes below the subsequent chapter: We shall dwell on a few traditions of Infallible Imams who have given

sanction of Islam, i.e. of being Muslims, to Sunnis. They have regarded Sunnis in all respects entitled to rights[1] that a Muslim enjoys like Shias.”[2]

“Authority of jurisprudence and faith, the Second Martyr (Shaheed Thani) says after arguing about the reality of faith: From the data above you know that acknowledgement of Imamate of Imams forms a principle of faith in Imamiyah sect and a necessity of their religion. A thing if it be a part of another thing will vanish at disappearance of its origin or main source. There is no doubt about it. It is same as the matter in question. Accordingly decree becomes necessary to declare one an infidel if he be not at home with the testimony of Imamate although he might have uttered the two testimonies. Some have said this decree varies with what you say: Who admits the two testimonies is a Muslim not infidel. The answer is there is no difference between the two decrees. We issue a decree that whoever does not admit the said testimonies is an infidel in the sense of the gist itself and a Muslim outwardly. As such, these two decrees on this subject are different but there is no negation in it.

He further says: Outwardly, a Muslim means that most religious commitments take shape thereat. Consequently, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has fixed two testimonies as ground to carry out religious obligations or mandates on the person who confesses.

The chief of jurisprudents and researchers, Shaykh Muhammad Hasan author of al-Jawahir says: Perhaps the numerous narratives that have come regarding infidelity of denier of Ali and denier of Imam are in the sense of absolute infidelity against faith... ”[3]

[1] *This does not mean that believers do not enjoy special rights such as back-biting which is prohibited for believers. Refer: Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani. Translation of Ali bin Abi Talib (by Husain Ostadoli) Pg. 665*

[2] *Allamah Sharafuddin: Mubaahis-e-Ameeqi Dar Jahat-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Deep discussions about Islamic unity), Pgs. 33-45*

[3] Ahmad Rahmani Hamadani. *Translation of Ali bin Abi Talib (by Husain Ostadoli) Pgs. 201-202*

As observed in religious teachings, we do not have divisions by name of principles of faith and principles of religion or basic principles and branches of faith. Principles of religion are of two kinds. Principles **of Islam** that is to pronounce two testimonies and its acknowledgements, the other is principles**of Faith** that is to have correct beliefs. Therefore it is distinguished as religious recognition.

Conclusion

What are principles of religion and how they are specified and fixed, is in itself a debate. And what kind of denial it is with regard to principles that results in exit from jurisprudential obligations leaving only an outward appearance of Islam in this world? This constitutes another debate that the standards that fix principles of religion have no part. It enjoys special calculations particular to itself. In other words, conditions and standards of exit from the borders of being a Muslim and from the circle of outer Islam has no bearing on the main or branches of argument of Imamate in Islam.

Therefore from religious viewpoint belief such as Imamate can be a principle and a cornerstone of Islam as well. But an open denial of it based on any interests could cause exit from borders of being a Muslim in this world.

It is never allowed to create a new description for principles and branches of religion and belief and introduce self-made standards for religious base wherein the station of Imamate is shifted to a lower grade; all this for sake of preserving the outcome of fake and feeble facade of Islam.

Therefore in accordance with sagacious religious decree an open denial of Imamate and *Wilayat* of infallible Imams will not qualify one to be discarded as a Muslim had he adhered to testimony of oneness of God and the testimony of prophethood.

Although Imamate is the basic element of faith yet the testimony of monotheism and prophethood holds one from going out of the circle of Islam[1] unless he has enmity to Infallible Imams or he denies both testimonies, i.e. monotheism and prophethood.

Therefore it does not befit necessary to consider contents of belief in field of monotheism, prophethood and resurrection as branches. As a result contents could be considered as personal conclusion and wrong beliefs of Sunni sect

[1] *The wrong beliefs can be treated with the same status. could be justified.***[1]** *It is not necessary to discard Imamate from category of principles of religion and make it a branch discussion.***[2]**

Reminder

“Ayatullah Kashiful Ghita says with regard to Imamate, which is the only basic cardinal difference between Shia and Sunni sects: **[3]** Shias regard Imamate a principle among principles of religion at the level of monotheism and prophethood. Further, their belief goes to extent that Imamate too, like prophethood is choice of God. Imam is chosen and appointed by God and Prophet. Ummah has no choice in appointment of a prophet and it is out of its reach and choice.

But our Sunni brothers do not treat this issue as a principle of religion. They have lowered and downgraded it to a political issue that can be accommodated by consensus or election which has no bearing on principles or branches of faith.

Yet, inspite of that...

Do you find a Shia pronouncing infidelity of one who has no belief in Imamate? Never!...

On the basis of this:

Acknowledgement of Imamate or its denial has nothing to do with Islamic society and relative commandments. The blood and properties (of both sects) is respectable and liable to protection...” **[4]**

[1] Refer: Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10 Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 12, 16 & 24

[2] Refer: Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10 Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 13, 14 & 18

[3] [The root of all differences, i.e. those of belief, behavior and jurisprudence, etc. go back to this fundamental difference.]

[4] Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 2, Pg. 205 quoted from *Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami*, Pg. 46

Part 6
Deviated Side-effects of this
Conjecture

First Wrong Result

As you may have realized some seekers of Islamic unity have divided followers of all Islamic sects into religious discussions irrespective of beliefs, commandments, principles and branches. They have done so for sake of preserving Muslim sanctity. They have displayed principles such as to comprise arguments - absolute and final ones and common and combined ones among Islamic faiths. It has been declared such:

“Root of religion means the established facts, strong realities, absolute decided elements and common issues of religion.”!**[1]**

“Principles are same comprehensive ones on which all Muslims have agreed.”!**[2]**

Consequently, branches were mentioned as matters that had become separated from this absolute principle, which were final and common and a sign of distinction of differences between Islamic faiths.

To say it more clearly: unity-seekers distinguish branches and separate them from principles on the ground that viewpoints differ in branches while in principles, viewpoint of all Muslims is coherent and consistent. It is thus said:

“Principles and sum of beliefs is nearly final and common among faiths. Mostly side and branch issues cause difference because each sect has its own view.”!**[3]**

“Matters subject to differences are side issues.”!**[4]**

On the other hand there exists no doubt at all that the prime issue of difference in Islamic Ummah is Imamate and Caliphate of Infallible Ahle Bayt of Prophet. In this regard it is said:

“The issue of Imamate and Caliphate heads issues of differences among Muslims. Most differences - those of belief and

jurisprudence, originate therefrom. None of these two fundamentals, Imamate and Caliphate, has

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 28*

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

[3] *Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat Pg. 270*

[4] *Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat Pg. 191*

had ever been a subject of common agreement between Muslims. In the era of the Prophet, it did not attain a level of serious consideration. In case it had been at that level it has lost importance by now.”!**[1]**

Therefore the thought of seeking unity has pushed this issue into side branch or at the margin because it creates difference among Muslims. As a result, it has been treated as a branch or side issue and as such it assumes particularities significant to subsidiary or subordinate matters. They are:

A - “Branch issues which often are a source of differences should not be set in the middle of Islamic fundamentals or principles nor should they be treated such as to befog main issues.”!**[2]**

B - “Muslims are at difference with one another only in little and branch issues. Such issues do not form the main spirit of Islam. In fact, they originate from wrong conclusions and various viewpoints of scholars or jurists.”!**[3]**

C - “Side issues and non-principles are objects of differences which should be resolved by scientific methods and exchange of views. If they could not be solved, do not let them dominate your mind and create fresh disputes among you. Islam does not deny difference in views. But the difference is natural and it is not supported by proof or reasoning.”!**[4]**

Second Wrong Result

As could be gathered from preceding narrations, unity-seekers have brought belief in Imamate and Guardianship of Infallible Ahle Bayt down to a branch level. They have utilized the excuse of preserving unity in the Ummah. All arguments relating to faith under the title of principle or fundamental and essentialities of religion would have to face this basic objection to the effect that there exist differences between School of Infallible Ahle Bayt and School of Caliphs. The differences are deep and rooted. Therefore founders of unity-seeking concept suggest a brief knowledge of these handy matters for solution of this problem. The extent, they say is enough that could provide information to people of common understanding.[5] Besides, it must comprise branches. Consequently, the matter turns to rest at personal conclusion of a jurisprudential merit. They say:

[1] Ibid. *Payaam-e-Wahdat* Pg. 272

[2] Ibid. *Payaam-e-Wahdat* Pg. 135

[3] Ibid. *Payaam-e-Wahdat* Pg. 176

[4] Ibid. *Payaam-e-Wahdat* Pgs. 199-200

[5] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 210

“A brief knowledge of this fundamental belief at the level of common understanding suffices. A detailed knowledge of it is not desired.”! [1]

“Accordingly we must know and even acknowledge that most religious matters are of personal conclusion of jurisprudence. The matters of need or those of necessity are common ones. For example: God is attributed with attributes of perfection, beauty and glory. Quran too mentions it. But when details are dealt with, question too arises accordingly. For example, the attribute or quality – is it the very self or added thereto? Or intention (i.e. the will) as to whether it is a quality of an action or quality of self? This issue is in the range of jurisprudence. The laity cannot understand it totally. There is also no need for them to understand.”! [2]

As for this conjecture, all discussions under these fundamental beliefs that go beyond common borders in glittering titles do not comprise principles because of their being within category of subsidiary character. It can be said in more clear words:

As far as this outlook goes, all deviated and wrong beliefs of Islamic sects in the chapters of monotheism and prophethood and... encompassed by jurisprudence are beyond the circle of deviation and crookedness! And stand in need of justification!

Because all these beliefs are absolute and beyond common understanding!

Third Wrong Result

Division of religious arguments that have taken place in beliefs and commandments is to preserve Muslim sanctity. **[3]** This causes exit of important arguments such as Imamate and Guardianship of Infallible Ahle Bayt from category of prime matters of religion and become a subsidiary matter of less care. However it goes even farther, embracing issues, which were main ones in the sphere of branches. **[4]**

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Kitab-e-Wahdat, Pg. 210*

[2] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 92*

[3] *Refer: Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pgs. 83-84 & Pgs. 92-93*

[4] *As it has been pointed out: Monotheism is the self of God. Prophethood is from the principles of Islam – the common ones. No one can deny it. In a detailed discussion it is said that in the next word God is seen. Whether can He be seen or not? This is a branch. According to texts about possibility of seeing God many arguments have been launched. This must be regarded a subsidiary matter.*

Consequently, wrong conception gives shape to shifting of issues from main to branch and from the foundation to a side, irrespective of beliefs or commandments. It is said that:

“Religious matters are in two categories. One is the final and decided one. The other one is not final. The final and decided matters are those, which must be as wholesome, of unanimous agreement of all Muslims. We have other matters in religion that are not of much transparency. Or they might have been previously. But by the passage of time, lost importance and became ground of difference between Muslims. All issues pertaining to belief, jurisprudence and practice are common between two sects (Shia and Sunni). **[1]** But branches of it are the ground of difference. We shall deal what exists in the domain of jurisprudence; all issues are not final.” **[2]**

“Jurisprudence has an immediate bearing on issues of theory. Its authority and validity runs in issues that are outside essentialities and final say of Islam...” **[3]**

“If we accept that religion consists of two series of issues. One is final, which does not carry any difference because there cannot exist any difference in it. Difference in these matters will make one to be regarded a deserter of religion. The other series of this is not a part of final matters and absolute essentiality. This is among theoretical issues. This is liable to create difference and arguments. There are various proofs and grounds in it. The method to reach to knowledge in the subject matters of this series is same as already mentioned. All ways end at conclusions of jurisprudent. As such, we must know and acknowledge that there are many issues in religion that lie in domain of

[1] *In fact, he says: About Imamate and Guardianship of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) this much is mutually agreed upon that religion of Islam dwells on politics too. The rest of the matters such as the very Imamate and Guardianship of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) are subject to differences. Therefore they are branches and liable to personal conclusion of jurisprudents.*

“Yes, we confirm this policy. I go even so farther as to believe this issue as totally among the essentialities of faith and common elements of all Islamic faiths. But as to the method of appointing a ruler as an Imam, or a Caliph is dispute among Islamic schools. Likewise, what qualities he should have, is a matter of dispute.” (Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 106)

[2] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 83*

[3] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 101*

jurisprudence....”!**[1]**

Fourth Wrong Result

When religious issues (related to belief or jurisprudence) are divided into two categories, principles and branches, the branch issues yield to jurists' ruling. When this formula is accepted, it should also be accepted that each branch consists of its own peculiarities or special effects related to differences of rulings among jurists. And they are:

1 - This Difference must be acknowledged:

“Religious issues are divided into absolute and final ones on one hand and on the other in issues that are otherwise i.e. not final. Issues of the first category do not yield to differences. In other words, no difference can creep therein. But issues of second category are subjected to difference. In other words, they undergo differences. Sometimes, we have no way but to tolerate differences.”!**[2]**

“Differences in non-principle issues are tolerable within framework of reason and proof. This difference is harmless. It is to a certain extent unavoidable because every jurisprudent has his own opinion in matters of jurisprudence.”!**[3]**

2 - This Difference in Religion is neither rejected nor blamed:

“There are issues perhaps never raised in early Islamic period, or if at all raised, they were limited and unclear. As centuries passed, clerics and scholars paid much care and attention to issues. Their findings brought in differences. Such differences are outcome of scholars’ research, therefore cannot be called differences. It cannot be blamed on either.”!**[4]**

3 - This Difference is desirable and useful:

“Difference in any faith neither decays nor vanishes. So no saying goes about a difference when several faiths exist. It has a root in conclusions of jurisprudents. As many viewpoints as many differences. Islam acknowledges different thoughts or views; if thoughts be useful, so much better.”!**[5]**

[1] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 92*

[2] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 84*

[3] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 134*

[4] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 93*

[5] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 128*

4 - This Difference is not Harmful, it solves difficulty:

“There are many differences in Islamic faiths in fields of jurisprudence and speech. These differences originate from difference in views of jurists and they do not contradict basic principles of Islam. Hence they do not carry any harm but they occasionally solve difficulties also.”!**[1]**

5 - This Difference is Good - there is nothing wrong in it:

“Efforts should be made to open door of jurisprudence in all faiths of Islam. Thus ruling of jurisprudents will be established by support of reason and proof in all aspects in branches as well as fundamental. The rulings can rescue matters from going under disputes and the Ummah going into disintegration. There remains only a difference in view which is not harmful but rather advantageous...”!**[2]**

[1] *Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 271*

[2] *Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pgs. 136-137*

Part 7
Excusing those who turn away
from Imamate and School of Ahle
Bayt (a.s.)

Chapter 11

Introduction

Proponents of Islamic Unity have adopted a wrong method. They pose the distance and crevice between two schools as very little, indistinct and faint. On the other hand this distance and difference runs between followers and leaders of these two schools. As such, there exists depth in it.

A plan must be charted out to prevent differences among followers of various sects of Islam, in comprehension of religion from producing any kind of dispute. Further, a justification should be found for their religious beliefs and various religious conducts. Somehow or other, peace must be created between them and all Muslims. Then it will be natural that this scheme will be beneficial to unity-seekers who always sacrifice originality for sake of power. They say:

“Difference is outcome of personal opinions emanating from different conclusions of jurists. Therefore it should not become a cause for separation.”**[1]**

“In remaining matters subject to difference among clerics, jurisprudence is kept open. In matters of jurisprudence, conduct, moral and speech they should come closer to each other through exchange of views and discussion.”**[2]**

All groups look upon themselves as jurists. The difference in religious thoughts and conduct among various sects pushes them towards defense. This is the consequence of such an attitude.

“If Islamic clerics could prove by their jurisprudence that both sects, Shia and Sunni, have their wages reserved with God and they both will be dwellers of heaven provided they

follow and practice their own religious rules and regulations. In this case alone a true unity can be brought about.”!**[3]**

[1] *Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: Majmua Maqaalaat (Collected Essays), Pg. 176*

[2] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pg. 151*

[3] *Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: Majmua Maqaalaat, Pgs. 177-178*

Every Muslim while discharging his religious conduct in accordance with his belief in faith will see himself at a crossroad, taken by his jurisprudence and that is be excused or attain a reward.

“Religion itself has suggested that jurists in such cases must proceed according to their personal conclusions. Difference that occurs therefrom is already acknowledged. A jurist who derives God’s commandment by his own correct conclusion will have two wages. If a jurist happens to make a mistake in his conclusion he will be eligible for only one wage.”!**[1]**

As though religion has not drawn any framework or formula for jurists’ conclusions.**[2]**Therefore in every case a view of an individual is respected and valid. It cannot be viewed as real difference.

It is enough for one to be sincere in jurisprudence. He will be a subject to the formula. It does not make a difference what method he chooses or which source he refers to. In any case, his judgments or conclusions should not be influenced by personal inclinations or selfish motives. This base embraces all Islamic sects, particularly Sunni sect. It is said:

“If the difference originates purely from thought and variety of conclusions not influenced by political motives, self lust, arrogance or self centeredness, religion tolerates such a difference. This is the principle much desired and favorable on tongues of Muslim clerics whether Sunnis or Shias. It is said that a successful jurist has two wages from God. On the other hand a jurist not reached to reality will have only

one wage. As such, both categories will be paid. Religion does not reject difference thereby and reasons such as political, self-interests, transgression into others' rights so on. Individuals might not have attained due results. But their sincerity in pursuit of truth and earnestness of efforts towards comprehension of faith is enough to gain a desirable position to them.”! [3]

As can be seen the only thing in this viewpoint is that attention is not paid to fundamentals and fixed standards of jurisprudence. Sources of information are also of utmost importance. As for validity and authenticity of sources, it is already prescribed by religious regulations. Therefore the formula of exception

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nida-e-Wahdat, Pgs. 27-28*

[2] *For more details refer to the translation of Maalimul Madrasatain Vol. 2.*

[3] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 63*

(i.e. being excused) and wages or reward has bearing only on one who exercises and acts within framework of divine religion. A jurisperdent must derive his conclusions from traditions of trustworthy and reputed sources. In other words, traditions narrated by weak sources, such as Ayesha or Abu Huraira do not bear any weight against renowned sources. As we said if one acts on feeble base he cannot be liable to exception or excuse and wage or reward.

Consequence of such policy could be seen in the words of Ibne Hazm touching the standards of deriving conclusions in jurisprudence. Ibne Hazm was a scholar of School of Caliphate. He has commented about Muawiyah and Amr Aas:

“These two climbed to make out things for themselves at the ladder of jurisprudence as far as the issue of bloodshed goes. They acted after the method of those who issue decrees in domain of jurisprudence. For instance, one allows killing a magician while the other prohibits it. Then what is the difference between jurisprudence of Muawiyah and Amr Aas and others?

It is nothing but ignorance, blindness of sight and heart, lack of information and a wrong argument.”!**[1]**

In view of unity-seekers they propose to make them live in brotherhood. Each one must let his brother live in freedom with regard to his opinion and outlook. This wrong standard or base that a jurisprudent enjoys excuse or exception and wages or rewards opens the way for all sects of Islam to differ from each other and also enjoy a reward, or wage and right to be at excuse according to occasion under umbrella of jurisprudence. In fact, no attention is paid to conditions prescribed by Islam to qualify a jurisprudent. So under such a chaos how all sects will be at home with each other? It is thus said:

“The difference among faiths of Islam mostly is attributed to difference among jurisprudents.”!**[2]**

“It is jurisprudence that has been the reason for appearance of sects in Islam. In the beginning, the difference among Muslims was based on political ground only. Later, ultimately and gradually it took to itself a trend and a tincture of faith which continues to this day. In fact, jurisprudence was originator of differences. We come across this fact in history of faith that a new faith has come into being by a cleric as he

[1] *Quoted from: Allamah Askari: Doo Maktab Dar Islam (Two Schools of Islam) Vol. 2 (Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation) Pg. 105*

[2] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 101* acted upon conclusion he reached in his jurisprudence. His followers too followed him. In the first half of second century when faiths took shape, each one according to his belief concluded something from his jurisprudence. Then he demonstrated his opinion to others. And others too followed his track. This is a reality. We must admit the facts. In the beginning each faith rested on proof and opinion concluded by jurisprudents. This is fundamental. We should argue thereon accordingly. I do not say that their knowledge was correct and coherent with facts. When we say jurisprudence, it does not mean that the grasp or conclusion of jurisprudents has been correct and crisp. A jurisprudent sometimes is also liable to mistakes. But on the ground of jurisprudence he enjoys excuse and is

absolved. So in the background of each faith there is care, attention, a kind of grasping and concluding of opinions.”!**[1]**

“The subject that faiths among Sunni sect has sprung on basis of jurisprudents’ conclusion of opinion needs to be dwelled extensively.”!**[2]**

Consequently:

“With regard to branches of Islam**[3]** all can debate and argue therein without preferring a faith over another. The door of jurisprudence is open for all. They can make a choice of a proper one among several opinions. As every faith has support of proof, we must respect it. If it is found reasonable, one should acknowledge it without a grudge.”!**[4]**

On the basis of majority thought, it is befitting and desirable that a jurist must refrain from voicing his opinion if that happens to cause a rift in the Ummah or its affairs. He should pay attention to the interests of Ummah and safeguard unity. Although his opinion might be right; yet, the wider interests**[5]**(although erroneous) should be overlooked.

His right belief and view must be set aside due to the reason of its being single while the majority (though wrong) must be respected. Any ground that could cause division among Muslims must be waived off.

[1] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pgs. 178-179*

[2] *Ibid. Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 180*

[3] *[As mentioned in the domain of jurisprudence]*

[4] *Ibid. Payaam-e-Wahdat, Pgs. 151-152*

[5] *That may results in safeguarding unity.*

It is said thus:

“One of the greatest virtues of Imam Ali (a.s.) is holy war against his opinion and feelings at the time of difference. All Muslims must follow him in similar cases as he is a model.

The greatest of the holy wars he performed was immediately after the demise of the Prophet. He could have fought to regain his right. He could have created parties or groups in this

regard. He could have withdrawn himself from Muslim gatherings. But he did not do any of those things. He pledged allegiance to Abu Bakr. He thus rescued and saved Muslims from divisions. He kept his own opinion and right apart from the scene. He kept common interest above his own. He is a model in this respect for all leaders to be followed... ”!**[1]**

It could be concluded from what preceded that unity-seekers think that if personal opinion of followers of schools could be known, it will help in preserving unity. No matter if their opinion be wrong, since opinion springs from jurisprudence, adversaries could be maintained!

We witness endeavors towards lifting and waiving aside differences in belief and in religious legislation among sects of Islam, though it is based on a wrong foundation.

Some examples are:

“Whether a Sunni, whatever, acts thinking it correct, has he any wages and excuses with God; though his performance could be against true divine command? Our answer to this question is positive.”!**[2]**

“All sects of Islam are bound into one Ummah. They all are liable to enjoy excuse and a wage with God because of the difference being a jurisprudential one.”!**[3]**

“Discussions of belief and worldly differences in branches originate from principles. And they do not differ from dispute of jurisprudence in

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Inquilaab-e-Farhangi-O-Tableeghi (Revolution of culture and propaganda)*, Pgs. 71-72. *Quran-o-Tableegh*, Pg. 69 (Facsimile New Essay Vol. 4, Pg. 26)

[2] Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: *Majmua Maqaalaat*, Pg. 174

[3] Dr. Ali Shariati: *Tashayyo-e-Alawi o Tashayyo-e-Safavi [Alawite Shiaism and Safavid Shiaism] (Collected Writings 9)* Pg. 75, quoted from statement about belief of Alawite Shias. practical side and rules of worship acts. Such different viewpoints will never end in enmity, row and quarrel. But it is

similar to a difference between two experts and specialists in sciences and arts etc.”!**[1]**

“Difference between Shia and Sunni is difference between two jurisprudents of one faith in their conclusions in deriving a command.”!**[2]**

“Contradictory discussions are not divine descended revelations. They are all from category of jurisprudents conclusions.”!**[3]**

“Muslims should not show any sensitiveness against beliefs relating to adversaries. Each Muslim should know that others too are human beings like him. They too think and meditate as he does. They too are free in their choice of religion. As he regards his faith right and true according to reasons and proofs he argues, he too believes his faith correct and true. He too has his own reasoning and arguments.”!**[4]**

“We, in this secondary matter**[5]** must take it for granted that some or other issue we understand is in a form particular to us. Likewise, others too understand issues in a manner of their own. Furthermore, it is quite likely that they could be right.”!**[6]**

“Shia might be at this belief in his heart that a Sunni could be dear to God and even liable to wages for his actions according to his own jurisprudence.”!**[7]**

As it could be noted from foregone quotations, differences first sprung from

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article: ‘Elements of Islamic Unity and its Hindrances’ quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pgs. 222-223

[2] Dr. Ali Shariati: *Tashayyo-e-Alawi o Tashayyo-e-Safavi* [Alawite Shiaism and Safavid Shiaism] (Collected Writings 9) Pg. 74, quoted from statement about belief of Alawite Shias.

[3] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issue 9 & 10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 25

[4] Sayyid Jawad Mustafavi: Article: 'Unity in Nahjul Balagha' quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat (Book of Unity)*, Pgs. 144-145

[5] He says: Branches means issues sprung from basic principle in both the dimensions of rules and beliefs.

(Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in 'Haft Aasmaan' (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issue 9 & 10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 12

[6] Ibid. Interview in 'Haft Aasmaan' (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issue 9 & 10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 24

[7] Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: *Majmua Maqaalaat*, Pg. 168

jurisprudence issues; then extended to arguments of belief taking support from principles of deriving conclusions in the domain of jurisprudence. It further gained ground that a jurisperdent has benefit of excuse and wages as well from God in his efforts to derive truth. In the meantime, real standards for reaching truth by means of jurisprudence fixed by Islam are ignored and conditions framed by faith for jurisprudence are yet to be distinguished.

It is pitiable that differences between Shia and Sunni are reflected as though they exist only in matters of belief and regulations having bearing on outcome of personal conclusions of jurisprudents. Further, the ways of jurisprudence in both sects are correct and are justified.

But in fact, it is not so as we shall point out in the course of discussion.

"There is a basic difference in Shia and Sunni jurisprudence."

Therefore it is wrong reasoning that a jurisperdent has benefit of excuse and wage from God in his intellectual efforts. A jurisperdent's effort must be based on a correct principle prescribed by faith, which is to follow School of Infallible Ahle Bayt of Prophet. It is mentioned in *Mutawatir* (widely narrated) traditions. True and correct jurisprudence can only be attained by following the way shown by Ahle Bayt of Prophet.

Therefore every mental assumption or following a conjecture cannot be called jurisprudence. Likewise, the terms 'excuse'

and 'wage' cannot be justified to give a religious covering to personal made-up conclusions for personal gains.

Before we could pass any judgment, let us first sketch a clear picture of principles and fundamentals of jurisprudence in Shia and Sunni schools.

Criticism and Analysis

The basis to remove differences between religious conducts and beliefs of followers of two schools is attributed to *Ijtihad*. We too commence our discussion from this very point:

Ustad Ja'far Subhani writes in this regard:

"Ijtihad in the sense of Shia scholars differs completely from *Ijtihad* that Sunni sect draws meaning from. *Ijtihad* to a Shia means that a researcher or a Mujtahid (i.e. jurispudent) exerts extensive efforts to draw a solution to an issue from Quran and traditions (*hadith*). *Ijtihad* in the said sense paves a way, through holy verses of Quran for a jurispudent to reach correct result by sifting decrees and discovering from commandments and rules. Whenever exists a decisive text or documentary proof in any matter, *Ijtihad* in such or similar matters supports establishing a decree in sense of a law. On the other hand in absence of a text or proof *Ijtihad* comes to aid. The jurispudent by his effort draws a solution from Quran or tradition, which establishes an authority to the issue in question.

However it is some other kind of *Ijtihad* that exists with the Sunni sect called 'Ijtihad of opinion.' This *Ijtihad* does not need any proof or document in Quran or tradition. **[1]** The jurispudent acts according to own conjecture and opinion in relation to circumstances. This is the standard with them. What he deems fit he issues a decree. Both the Caliph and Ibne Masood have said that in absence of text or proof, *Ijtihad* is necessary. *Ijtihad* meant here is one based on opinion or idea not that which needs background of Quran or traditions. **[2]**

Whenever a court became necessary and Abu Bakr was to pass the sentence and dispute was difficult to resolve he used to utilize similar precedent. If there did not exist any precedent he used to invite persons of experience for consultation. Then he used to pass sentence according to their opinion.

This clearly shows that the Caliph and his associates did not regard Quranic verses or Sunnah of the Prophet worthy enough to cater to the need of the situation. They did not refer the matter to Imam Ali (a.s.) – the rightful successor of Prophet. Therefore they considered themselves needless. Whatever their thought and mind suggested to them, they passed judgments without least care whether it was right or wrong.”[3]

Sunni clerics and scholars do not consider instances in their books sufficient to cater to all practical issues. On the other hand they do not accept the existence of an infallible Imam who is the final point of reference in such matters. So they go according to their conjecture, which is the most dangerous way.”[4]

When Umar appointed Shurai as a judge of Kufa he instructed him: When

[1] *The Sunni sect does not refer to the infallible Imams because they do not believe in Imamate. They do not consider them as religious source. After the Prophet they refer to Ayesha and Abu Huraira. Their Ijtihad does not depend on Quran and Sunnah.*

[2] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Peshwayi az Nazar-e-Islam (Leadership in the view of Islam), Pgs. 101-102*

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

[4] *Ibid. Pgs. 96*

you come across a case unprecedented in Quran and tradition of Prophet, you better chose one of the two sides. Or if you want to go through Ijtihad you can do that too.

Imam Ali (a.s.) too appointed Shurai as judge. But he did not leave his hands free. He set conditions that he should not pass and execute the sentence without first informing the Imam. Ibne Masood narrates: Ali told the judge designate that if he confronted a case unprecedented in Quran or traditions, he must try to follow his own intellect. In the event of his inability, he should refrain from giving the sentence and not feel ashamed.

From this instance and its like it can be seen how much the Ummah benefited from teachings of Prophet.

This shows that they were confronting cases for the first time. Similar cases never existed before. Or they did not find any precedent. Therefore they tried to pass judgment without a base in Quran or tradition.”**[1]**

“But those who believe in the Infallible Imam and his place after Prophet, reject this kind of reasoning. In issues of commandments and branches they refer to the Imam.”**[2]**

“Somehow or other it became clear to us that Caliphs had no way other than to manufacture opinions in cases new to them. They used to chain people by opinions of this rather than guiding them to commandments of God.”**[3]**

“The Second Caliph used to criticize people of opinion. The Caliph used lash of corruption against men of opinion. This shows what type of influence opinion had in those days. They depended on their own immature and erroneous opinions even when there were verses and traditions for their guidance. In most cases, they overlooked God’s commandments and pleasure because they preferred their own opinion, which is often imperfect.”

Unfortunately, the very Caliph was among those who did not benefit from advice. On many occasions, he has contradicted Quran and traditions of Prophet.**[4]**

[1] *Ibid. Pgs. 99-100*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 96*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 105*

[4] *[Refer: Allamah Sharafuddin: Ijtihad Dar Maqaabil-e-Nass (Ijtihad against Islamic*

The evidence for this type of Ijtihad in the early days of Islam is as quoted here:

When Ibne Abbas was asked any question and if that existed in Quran, he used to answer accordingly. Or if the Prophet told anything in that concern he answered too. If not, he gave his

own opinion. This served a ground for Sunni sect. Their jurisprudence books abound with such opinions, which have no worth in Shia view and all are taken from this source.”[1]

“They depend on these invalid and inauthentic bases. Therefore Islamic jurisprudence took to itself a shape of school and that too into several ones in past centuries. Then, schools were formed and Imams were erected so plenty that Sunni scholars saw rescue only in shutting down Ijtihad upon themselves. By so doing, they confined religion into four faiths.”[2]

“These events reflect that Islamic legislation did not attain its goal in Prophet’s time. Such a ground necessitates legislation to chase the errand by some other way and extend the office of prophethood. No one can occupy this office unless he is like the Prophet in all respects and possesses extensive knowledge; he must be Infallible and able to expound divine commandments to the masses. A man of such qualifications alone can attain such a great goal. Where is such a man? Who is such a man? The Ummah can neither spot nor find one for itself. God alone can introduce such a man to the people. God alone can appoint one because the office is divine and the choice too is His.”[3]

Now the question that arises is: In spite of introductions that took place from day one right up to Ghadeer Khumm, in between this span such an introduction has taken place several times, whether there remains any excuse? Does there exist any hurdle to justify their act in turning away from Amirul Momin-een Ali (a.s.)? Is their attitude justifiable in not believing in Imamate and *Wilayat* of Infallible Ahle Bayt?[4]

texts); Allamah Firozabadi: Shinasai Haft Tan Dar Sadr-e-Islam (Introduction of seven person in early Islam); Allamah Askari: Deedgaah-e-doo Maktab Dar Baare Madaarik-e-Islami (Outlooks of Two Schools about sources of Islamic legislation)]

[1] *Ustad Ja’far Subhani: Peshwayi az Nazar-e-Islam, Pg. 102-103*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 104*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 105*

[4] *If it be so we cannot justify later Ijtihad that is not dependent on the infallible Imam*

It is natural if we have an attitude other than what we have now towards followers of School of Caliphs; in fact it would have meant that we ignored the textual specification (*Nass*) about Imamate. We have turned our back on belief in Imamate. Our excuse is *Ijtihad*. A jurist's conclusion is justification for such an act. All this is not weighty enough to face the trend of truth and current of reality. So it is said:

“Shia and Sunni have differences in application of Caliphate. As such, their differences originate from comprehension of text, verses or intellectual arguments. Therefore Muslims in such branches must give justification to each other in having different conclusions.”!**[1]**

“Ijtihad and regulation in faith is acknowledged by all. It has no specialty particularly to legislation (religious) and commandments. If there is difference either. If we witness somewhere the outlook with its accessories is differing with principles, then should we justify that too? Shia perhaps may not tolerate if we say that Caliphate is also from this category. It means it was uncertain. Therefore the issue (of Caliphate) changed to an issue of a branch and that of Ijtihad.”!**[2]**

While the fact is that:

“Research for knowing the Imam is an obligatory duty due to reason that anyone at least might expect that God has appointed one to lead people after the Prophet.**[3]** And He has commanded us to follow and obey him.

So this expectation persuades reason to push towards research about finding the Imam and if found to know him. It is a duty upon us. If we are deficient in this regard and there be a person - Imam - and we failed to know him, then there will be no excuse for us...”**[4]**

Therefore to reflect the difference as that of jurists' kind between two schools in the field of belief particularly in Imamate and *Wilayat* of Infallible Imams is unjustifiable. It

means that text or verses in this regard are violated. The excuse for it is *Ijtihad*. This causes a great part of Prophet's instructions

or without having obtained knowledge from them.

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Interview in the periodical, 'Haft Aasmaan' Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 13*

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

[3] [That is Imamate]

[4] Reza Ustadi: *25 Dars Dar Bare Imamate (25 Lessons on Imamate), Pg. 11*

in this respect, which are commandments descended from God, to be forgotten and left unheeded.

So one can campaign or openly reject this basis against every obvious commandment of God and a clear text received from the holy legislator - all under pretext and excuse of *Ijtihad*. And no blame can be attributed to him. **[1]**

Ijtihad and difference in understanding serves as an excuse to Sunni school for turning away from religious teachings that entail beliefs and divine commandments. If we justify this today, it will push generation after generation backward. Can it be so? And thereby, each and every conduct and action of Caliphs and those who confiscated right of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) is considered as *Ijtihad* of jurists, i.e. the personal conclusion of opinion reached according to need or necessity. Can it be considered so?

Today, if we give covering of *Ijtihad* to differences in jurisprudence and beliefs, particularly rescinding and rejecting divine text (*Nass*) regarding Imamate, it can certainly justify formation of Saqifah Bani Saada and hijacking the rightful Caliphate - the succession of Ali to the Prophet. And the later actions of Caliphs that created innovations in religion.

It is said:

"Events in early Islamic days can be seen from a different angle too. Ibne Abbas was secretary to Second Caliph. Ibne

Abbas says: I told the Caliph that Prophet has said regarding Ali certain matters. The Caliph replied: Yes, but that is not final. People did not understand what the Prophet meant.”!**[2]**

“Difference among faiths of Islam is like difference among the Sunni sect and like difference among Shia clerics and jurists. Different views exist among Shia jurists.**[3]** The difference between Shia and Sunni

[1] Refer: Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Maalimul Madrasatain Vol. 2*, This book has been translated under the title of: *Deedgaah-e-doo Maktab Dar Baare Madaarik-e-Islami (Outlooks of Two Schools about sources of Islamic legislation)*.

[2] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 37

[3] Establishment of link between difference of Islamic faiths with difference of Shia clerics in arguments of knowledge has been sketched in the following way:

The differences among Muslims are in unnecessary matters and unimportant Issues. This does not harm unity of Islamic nation, even a bit. Even among scholars of every sect there exist differences in viewpoints of knowledge and jurisprudence. For instance,

too from my viewpoint is of the same kind. In fact, it was only a difference in conclusions among companions of Prophet after his demise. Imam Ali (a.s.) and his companions were of the belief according to proofs including occasion of Ghadeer that to succeed the Prophet was the right of Ali: on the other hand people of Saqifah, Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and their supporters formed the government. Ali too co-operated with them to the last**[1]** although he had difference with them.”!**[2]**

The reality, which we agree, is this: It was a real and grave difference that took place over Caliphate after the Prophet. So we believe in immediate succession (i.e. Caliphate) of Ali without any gap. Our brothers, Sunnis, believe what happened at Saqifah was right. This difference in views between Shia and Sunni is a difference between a Muslim warrior a jurist**[3]** and a brother.”!**[4]**

As a matter of fact:

- The obvious and clear divine text (*Nass*) of Ghadeer Khumm based on Guardianship of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) binding all Muslims to follow it. Is it *Ijtihad*?

- Or is it *Ijtihad* to go against Prophet's orders to provide him with pen and ink so that he could put into writing that which could save the Ummah from going astray?**[5]**

- How is it possible to claim that the Prophet was uttering nonsense while Quran testifies his word as well as himself to be infallible?

Indeed, by the courageous and brave *Ijtihad*!?!

- Opposition to Prophet's command to join Usamah's army, is that too *Ijtihad* while Quran enjoins absolute and unconditional obedience to Prophet?

in Shia faith amidst jurisprudents there is difference in unimportant and side matters. (Message of Unity, Pg. 242)

[1] *[We shall reply to this objection.]*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Interview quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue 4, Winter 79, Pgs. 61-62*

[3] *[His conjecture about Ijtihad and jurisprudence of companions is in accordance with outlook of School of Caliphs regarding sources of Islamic legislation.]*

[4] *Ibid. Interview quoted in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue 4, Winter 79, Pgs. 61-62*

[5] *Refer: Ghulam Husain Zain Ali: A Letter left Unwritten (Analysis regarding the case of pen and ink-pot)*

- Is it also *Ijtihad* to break sanctity and transgress the sacred offspring of Prophet and attack the house of his only daughter, Fatima? Is it not disobedience to the Quranic verse that makes it obligatory to love relatives of Prophet (Ahle Bayt)?

- Confiscation of Fadak which openly goes against Quranic order and Prophet's instructions; can it be named *Ijtihad*?**[1]**

Let us not forget that difference in belief among the sects of Islam about Imamate is fruit of same attitude undertaken by Caliphs. Today some claim Shiaism has named it *Ijtihad*. They call it a difference between brothers.

Possibly a question could arise here. There should not be any difference in order to obtain Islamic unity. On the other hand the last discussion relates to differences of jurists.

In other words, how can it be possible to set aside differences of jurists and obtain unity?

The answer that group of unity-seekers gives is:

“Ali’s action was to preserve the school and unity. He was so great that he could not entertain any rancor against any for trifle worldly positions. For this reason he paid allegiance to Caliphs and at the same time reserved his own viewpoint. But as for Muawiyah, Ali took him to account because his rebellion had gone beyond difference. For Ali life was a symbol of forgiveness and he was too pacifying at the clash of views.”!**[2]**

We discussed about wrong method of arguments of difference under umbrella of *Ijtihad* between Shia and Sunni. That *Ijtihad* too is free from any conditions fixed by faith. As a result, in early days of Islam difference between leaders of two sides is to be acknowledged as that of jurists. Now we would like to discuss conduct of forgiveness in dealing with differences of views which end to benefit of Sunnis from Shia side. This is for sake of protecting unity.

Imam is infallible. He is absolutely obedient to commands of God. He believes that Imamate and *Wilayat* (of Imam) are decrees of God. The result of Saqifah

[1] Refer: Reza Ustadi: Article: ‘Fadak’ quoted in *Danish Nama Imam Ali*, Vol. 8, Pgs. 345-402

[2] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Mashal-e-Ittehad (Torch of Unity)*, Pg. 22, 30 & 31

is clear and obvious contradiction with divine instructions and trampling upon divine texts (*Nass*), which descended in Quran’s verse on Ghadeer Day. How can it be accepted that Imam with such qualities could agree with result of Saqifah under excuse of *Ijtihad* and difference in views and personal opinions? There cannot be any forgiveness in God’s decrees. With regard to Imamate and Guardianship, God’s decrees cannot be ignored. The right of succession (Caliphate) cannot be overlooked under pretext of misunderstanding. The right of

succession is already stolen and hijacked. So how can Imam come to terms with them in this regard?

However perhaps such expressions can reflect good ability towards attracting followers of all sects. But they are bereft of sincerity and honesty. These thoughts do not have any originality and religious source. Besides, they are factors of deviation in Shiaism. Furthermore, they hinder movements of knowledge towards inviting people to School of Ahle Bayt and towards correcting belief of all Muslims. Otherwise it paves way to followers of all sects to give up their efforts to research or undertake intellectual endeavors to know Imamate under pretext of *Ijtihad*. As such, they will see themselves under no obligation in this respect at all.

This trend in the end shall push coming generations to this wrong belief which is:

“Perhaps this could serve a point here. Right from the start of Islam various tendencies of jurisprudence and scholastic theology were named religion. It is a fact that all of them are headed to one destination.”! **[1]**

“Each of those ways is a faith and path to Islam. The Sunni’s path is tradition. Through path of tradition, they reach to truth. Shia’s path is that of Family and Infallible Ahle Bayt of Prophet. They receive light of Islamic truth through them.”! **[2]**

“The real religion is Islam. All believe in it. Madhab (i.e. religion) in Ma’rif means ‘Way, ‘Path’ (and the place of going) towards religion. Thus Islamic faiths are paths to Islam. Their origin is mostly Ijtihad. Difference in outlook with regard to Quran and tradition originates from understanding of persons and the Ijtihad of persons.”! **[3]**

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Article: ‘Elements of Islamic Unity and its Hindrances’ quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 227

[2] *Ibid.* *Nida-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 177

[3] *Ibid.* *Nida-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 53-54

“We understand like this. They understand like that. We should look upon each other by tolerance or giving the margin of excuse.”!**[1]**

“Islamic society must pace in track of real unity that could patch hearts. First of all we should overrun the thought that Sunni thinks Shia and Shia thinks Sunni is a hell dweller. Then alone can we attain the goal.”!**[2]**

Another Criticism and Analysis

“Companions and cronies of each Caliph used to say, whenever he committed a mistake, that it was his Ijtihaad...”[3]

Allamah Sayyid Ja’far Murtuza Amili writes in this regard:

“The first who gave wind to the term of Ijtihaad[4] in order to cover and justify religious errors of others was the First Caliph. Then the Second Caliph took benefit of this term. During his Caliphate Khalid bin Waleed killed Malik bin Nuwairah - a reputed companion of the Prophet. The Caliph came under pressure to bring Khalid to justice for his crime. It should be remarked here that Malik was a staunch follower of Ali; and he refused to acknowledge the new authority that had captured power.

After killing Malik, Khalid slept with his widow the very same night. On this occasion, Abu Bakr said: He contemplated and erred.[5]

Then afterwards they narrated that if anyone reached correct result through *Ijtihaad* he has double wages from God. If he commits a mistake

[1] *Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 14*

[2] *Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: Majmua Maqaalaat (Collected Essays), Pg. 167*

[3] *Allamah Askari: Saqifah, Pg. 67*

[4] *The term of Mujtahid used in Sunni School denotes those who made themselves free to create laws and rules against rules of God and the Prophet.*

But in the school of Shiaism this term is applied to one who draws rules from sources of Infallible Imams.

In the due course Shia school applied this term to an expert in jurisprudence therefore the meaning of this term differs with what the Sunnis jurisprudence denotes.

[5] *[The terms of ‘Ijtihaad’ and ‘Mujtahid’ became common after the era of Caliphs and their followers. So Caliphs*

translate divine decrees and any other puzzling issue themselves according to their own taste or necessity. They did not want any authentic or authoritative source.

(Allamah Askari: Deedgaah-e-doo Maktab Dar Baare Madaarik-e-Islami (Outlooks of Two Schools about sources of Islamic legislation), Pg. 89)]

he will have single. The narrators are Amr bin Aas, Abu Huraira and Umar bin Khattab.

This saying is like a philosopher's stone, even more valuable than that, which turns dust into gold.

This has served a ground for their committing most terrific and ugly crimes. For instance, how many innocent people were murdered? The battles of Jamal, Siffeen, assassination of Imam Ali (a.s.), Ammar bin Yasir, abusing Imam Ali (a.s.) from over thousands of pulpits for a thousand months and massacre of Imam Husain, his children and associates and taking into captivity of his family from town to town.

All this and more than this was done under covering and justification of Ijtihaad. To make benefit common throughout a complete generation this medal of Ijtihaad was given to justify all their mistakes and errors. Among them, there were rogues, rascals, ruffians, usurpers, murderers, fornicators and drunkards. No saying goes for those who rose against the Infallible Imam of their time. Their scholar and their ignorant both did not know how to perform prayers or how to divorce a wife.

They have even gone so far as to say that whatever is done is Ijtihaad. To act on Ijtihaad is a compulsory obligation. It is not allowed to treat one as profligate while he is performing Ijtihaad. Some have said that for companions it is allowed to act on personal opinion against text because it is their distinction. Others do not enjoy such a right."**[1]**

Therefore on this basis:

"Years later we see Ibne Hazm (d. 456 A.H.) introducing Abul Ghadia, killer of Ammar Yasir to be a contemplator a Mujtahid and one deserving of exceptional reward from Allah!

And Ibne Turkamani Hanafi (d. 750 A.H.) that extolled Ibne Muljim Muradi for assassinating Imam Ali (a.s.). Further, he is regarded as a scholar and jurispudent! Another associate of his, named Ibne Hajar (d. 852 A.H.) says for companions of Ali who fought on his side in battles during his rule that the jurispudent who made mistake has one wage and one reward with God.” [2]

[1] Allamah Ja’far Murtuza Amili: *Ranj Haai-e-Hazrat-e-Zahra (Agonies of Zahra)*, Pgs. 127-128

[2] Allamah Askari: *Deedgaah-e-doo Maktab Dar Baare Madaarik-e-Islami (Outlooks of Two Schools about sources of Islamic legislation)*, Pg. 92

“In this way, followers of School of Caliphs have reached unanimity since Second Century Hijri until today that all companions were Mujtahids. God will ignore all their wrongs; that is the blood they have shed and the enmity they harbored. God will ignore their wrongs and will even reward them. This thought applies upto Muawiyah’s time. Some believe that Ijtihaad is effective until the time of Yazid...” [1]

[1] *Ibid.* Pg. 109

Chapter 12

Alterations in Beliefs of Shia Ja'fari Twelve Imamite Faith

This chapter contains three subjects:

- First Deviation: With regard to relation between Imamate and rulership.
- Second Deviation: Deletion of Imamate from principles of religion.
- Third Deviation: To seek distance from enemies of Prophet's Ahle Bayt.

This item is avoided from Shia teachings.

Part 8

Imamate and Rulership

Chapter 13

Introduction

As has become evident the ground of Imamate, *Wilayat* and Caliphate of Prophet's Ahle Bayt forms and frames differences between beliefs of followers of Ahle Bayt and Caliphs in addition to right of succession of Infallible Ahle Bayt, which was hijacked at Saqifah Bani Saada. This Saqifah is the spot wherefrom start all troubles, agonies, tyranny, terror and so forth against the Imams, the offspring of Prophet. For instance, one is attack on the house of the only daughter of Prophet. This attack gave strength to pillars of later tyranny that was in store for Prophet's family. As such, the differences too attain depth between two schools, Shia and Sunni, which cannot be denied.

Existence of such a wide crevice could appear to those who invite towards Islamic unity, as a setback. To remove this setback, in their mind, no stone should be left unturned.

We witness a unique thought and an odd idea towards separating the position of Imamate of Ahle Bayt from office of rulership. They claim that worldly position or any office is worthless and too little for dignity of an Imam.

As a result of these misunderstandings they think that Imam Ali (a.s.) was on good terms with Caliphs. We shall deal with this conjecture in a systematic manner in this chapter.

With regard to deviation of relation of Imamate and rulership our discussion is as follows:

First batch: There are three kinds of separations between Imamate and rulership.

Type A)

Separation of Imamate from rulership, in the sense of setting aside Caliphate and considering it out of argument.

Type B)

Separation of Imamate from rulership, in the sense of Caliphate being independent of Imamate.

Type C)

Separation of Imamate from rulership, in the frame of 'Great Imamate' and 'Great Caliphate'.

Second batch: to show rulership in little value or worth before Imamate.

Part 9
Three types of Separations
between Imamate and Rulership

Chapter 14

Introductory Conjecture

“Difference between issue of Caliphate and that of Imamate is one of strong pillars. Of course each one justifies it in one way or another.”!**[1]**

This conjecture is expressed in the following thought:

Type A)

Separation of Imamate from Rulership in the sense of setting aside Caliphate and considering it out of discussion:

“Muslims today are in no need to discuss about past Caliphate. The thing that we must stress thereon and prove is this: The Prophet had set Members of his Household at the level of Quran and oracles for Muslims. Therefore Muslims even today stand in need of them. The issue of Caliphate or rulership does not matter here...”!**[2]**

“We already differ with Sunni sect in issue of Caliphate. Now presently Caliphate does not exist. Therefore there should not be any ground to quarrel. But the thing that is useful to us is aspect of Wilayat. In other words, the authority of learning or knowledge and their being final oracle or source of religious issues to refer. The position of Prophet’s Ahle Bayt still exists. Their fountain still gushes.”!**[3]**

“The Prophet in his time held the office of the oracle of Muslims. Then he (the Prophet) appointed Imam Ali (a.s.) as the final authority of knowledge and his inheritor after his death. The Prophet acquainted people with the names of all twelve Imams as his heirs.”!**[4]**

“It is very much interesting that people feel pity at the issue of Caliphate and its getting shifted. But nobody laments nor does he feel sorry for our

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Nida-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 218

[2] Ibid. Article: ‘Elements of Islamic Unity and its Hindrances’ quoted in *Kitab-e-Wahdat*, Pg. 256

[3] Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 18

[4] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 14

having been deprived of benefits of knowledge of Ali and his sons – heirs of the Prophet. The shifting of Caliphate severed for us the link of Guardianship.”!**[1]**

“Commonly all people in their various categories and capacities – speakers of congregations, speak on subject of Caliphate snatched away at Saqifah.”!**[2]**

“When Shaykh Attar refers to Lord Ali, he mentions him from the angle of Guardianship.**[3]** Likewise, Maulana too mentions him in the same angle and adds: This Caliphate, a matter of dispute for you, is not important. The status and position that Imam Ali (a.s.) held in the scope of knowledge is far greater one. The link of soul that he enjoyed is more important. Ali himself did not pay any importance to Caliphate.”!**[4]**

Type B)

Separation of Imamate from Rulership in the sense of Caliphate being independent of Imamate:

“Imamate and Caliphate are two separate entities quite different from each other but coherent. The best way of peace is: to recognize or acknowledge the Caliph as a trustee and a guard over treasures of earth and Imam over treasures of divine knowledge through the Prophet.”!**[5]**

In this outlook deviation with regard to link between Imamate and Caliphate starts thus:

“As a matter of fact, there is no difference between the two. These two offices since the beginning until the end are at congruity with each other. Therefore in Shia dictionary, Imamate has never been against Caliphate.

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 19*

[2] *Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 19*

[3] *[Inner guardianship.]*

[4] *Ibid. Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 20*

[5] *Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani: Article quoted in Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pg. 217; Narrators of his outlook: Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 5, Pg. 23; Dr. Ali Shariati: Tashayyo-e-Alawi o Tashayyo-e-Safavi [Alawite Shiaism and Safavid Shiaism] (Collected Writings 9) Pg. 76, quoted from statement about belief of Alawite Shias.*

As such, an understanding or co-ordination is possible between the two to the extent to acknowledge one (Caliphate) as a trustee of earthly treasures and the other (Imam) as a trustee of divine and Prophet’s knowledge.”**[1]**

Because: “Caliphate of righteous Caliphs is a position other than Imamate.”**[2]**

As a result:

“The issue of Caliphate and Imamate are two issues separate from each other but with a caliber of co-ordination with each other.”**[3]**

In fact it could be summed up as:

The outcome of this claim to separate Imamate and Caliphate from each other. Imamate is considered at a station other than Caliphate and Caliphate occupies a place other than Imamate.

Thus it is said:

“The subject of Imamate from the outlook of the strong verses of Quran is separate from rulership.”**[4]**

“The late Allamah Simnani[5] writes in Islam magazine: ‘Imamate and Caliphate are actually two issues. Caliphs had accepted and acknowledged Imamate of Imam Ali (a.s.). Ali too had accepted their Caliphate. He used to say: You rule but I will solve the difficulties. They had agreed to this. Particularly the Second Caliph had sincerely accepted this proposal of Ali.[6] These are the ways we can follow.”![7]

[1] *Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani: Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pgs. 218-223*

[2] *Ibid. Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pg. 219*

[3] *Dr. Ali Shariati: Tashayyo-e-Alawi o Tashayyo-e-Safavi [Alawite Shiaism and Safavid Shiaism] (Collected Writings 9) Pg. 75, quoted from statement about belief of Alawite Shias.*

[4] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Raahi Bi Soo-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Way to Islamic Unity), Pg. 158*

[5] *[Shaykh Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani]*

[6] *[The above analysis is also explained as follows: The authority in learning and knowledge of Imam Ali was already known and recognized by Caliphs and they had accepted it. (Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Kayhan Farhangi, Issue 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 16)]*

[7] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring and Summer 80, Pg. 20*

At this wrong belief it is said:

“Imam Ali (a.s.), with the high spirit he had, went far and far, beyond and beyond Caliphate.”!**[1]**

“Imam Ali (a.s.), in fact, was far beyond above elected Caliphate.”!**[2]**

“Imam Ali (a.s.) has openly and frankly stated: I have no rivalry with you in an elected Caliphate. He enjoyed a far more important spiritual position and distinction; that is Guardianship of Muslims. Besides, he was an Imam and father of Imams. Imamate was his lot. Besides, the most close and intimate relation and link he enjoyed with the Prophet.”!**[3]**

“There is another duty among duties of Imamate and Guardianship which is far important than Caliphate. That duty is to preserve and safeguard treasures of knowledge of the Prophet and to transfer it honestly and correctly to scholars, people and clerics.”!**[4]**

“Another example of the activity of the office of Wilayat and Imamate of Ali in the era of Caliphs, we clearly see how high and important it is than the elected office.”!**[5]**

“The Guardianship and heritage of divine information vested with him by God goes far beyond elected Caliphate.”!**[6]**

[1] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Preface to the 2nd Edition), Pg. 10*

[2] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 5, Pg. 20*

[3] *Ibid. Vol. 5, Pg. 22*

[4] *Ibid. Vol. 6, Pg. 16*

[5] *Ibid. Vol. 7, Pg. 14*

[6] *Ibid. Vol. 7, Pg. 18*

Chapter 15

Deviated Repercussions of this Conjecture

First Wrong Result

According to this outlook, we cannot find any other justification for avoidance and unwillingness of Imam Ali (a.s.) to give allegiance to Abu Bakr. **[1]** There are actions of oppression and tyranny. House of only daughter of Prophet, Fatima was attacked and set afire and the flames consumed the door. All this was done directly by Caliphs themselves. The only conclusion that can be drawn is this: The base is wrong. In such circumstances, acknowledgment of Ali to Abu Bakr's authority is a thing caused by conditions prevalent at that time. Therefore it is a natural outcome. Hence it is written as follows:

“Imam Ali (a.s.) refused to give allegiance for a short period. But his high conduct and demeanor and forgiving nature made him pay allegiance.”! **[2]**

“Imam Ali's (a.s.) only aim was to safeguard Islam, protect its entity and preserving unity. **[3]** Therefore he paid allegiance to Caliphs.”! **[4]**

Or they write:

“The conduct and behavior of Ali and his sons with Caliphs was such that it took to itself to reflect as if acknowledgement and acceptance is mingled, mixed, molded.”! **[5]**

“Ali for the sake of interests accepted rulership of two Caliphs.”! **[6]**

[1] *[The correct Bayyat is one that is given with willingness and desire of the person. Else, it is only a handshake. Or it can be named as an outer show. The acknowledgement of Ali took six months to take place. And it took place under hatred and*

application of force. It was actually a handshake. (Allamah As-kari: Saqifah Pg. 116)

For better and wider comprehension of Bayyat and conditions that surrounded it, refer to Chap. 1 of Vol. 4 of this book.

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

[3] *[On the basis of Shia Belief the foundation of Islam is Imamate and Wilayat]*

[4] *Ibid. Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Preface to the 3rd Edition, Pg. 11*

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

[6] *Ibid. 5 Raahi Bi Soo-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Way to Islamic Unity), Pg. 167*

“Ali refrained for a period after passing away of Prophet, afterwards he did Bay’at to Abu Bakr.”!**[1]**

How can it be accepted at all that Ali should accept and acknowledge Abu Bakr’s Caliphate? A Caliphate that was framed against divine consent? A Caliphate that was usurped and taken by force, trick and tyranny? A Caliphate, which has trespassed on Quranic verses and trampled the command of God? A Caliphate, which came into being by overrunning clear instructions of the Prophet himself. So how can Ali accept such a Caliphate? An acceptance that originates from the heart! Yet, Ali did. This shows his foresight and how dear the interests of Islam were at his heart.

In this respect, it is written thus:

“Abu Bakr takes oath to the effect that loves the Prophet’s Ahle Bayt more than his own relatives. Further, he commits himself to follow the Prophet’s policy and his works. Then Ali tells him: The place to give allegiance is the Mosque tomorrow.”!**[2]**

“He sees that one who has occupied the chair of power will exert efforts to make it stronger and extensive. Therefore he will try to extend the geography of Islam. So he paid the allegiance.”!**[3]**

In other words to believe in this type of *Bay'at* is in contradiction to principles of Shia faith due to the following reason:

Imamate, Wilayat and Caliphate are divine offices bestowed by God. They are inseparable from each other. Likewise, they cannot be transferred or delegated to others.

Whatever Imam Ali (a.s.) did in every befitting opportunity was to establish truth and prove the injustice done to him. By his campaign, he declared to people the illegitimacy, unlawfulness and invalidity of their Caliphate, which was his right and snatched away from him. Likewise, the unique and unparalleled campaign of Zahra, the only daughter of the Prophet, demonstrates that they usurped the right of Ali to succeed the Prophet and Caliphate which was a legitimate right of Ali. On the other hand the tyrants did know that rulership and Caliphate is an absolute right of Ali vested to him by the Prophet

[1] *Ibid. 5 Raahi Bi Soo-e-Wahdat-e-Islami (Way to Islamic Unity), Pg. 163*

[2] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 5, Pg. 22*

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

at the commandment of God. So if Ali (a.s.) did not pay allegiance, their Caliphate would not attain legitimacy and will forever remain usurped.

Therefore they persisted with all force, tricks and tyranny they could. What history openly shows is this:

When Ali did not answer positively to their call to pay allegiance to their authority they set fire to the door of Zahra's house and threatened to burn alive the dwellers - the progeny, the kith and kin of Prophet. Then an attack on the house was launched. At this stage they had to face Zahra's defense. She took the lead to save *Wilayat* and Imamate of Ali. By all their brazen-facedness they pushed her aside. Then they took hold of Ali and dragged him to the Mosque. All the while a naked sword was drawn over his head - a constant threat

accompanied him which could come true any moment. They tried to draw from him what was their desire (allegiance to Abu Bakr). Their design did not succeed because of presence of Fatima, the Prophet's daughter.

If the Imam had least desire to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr or had he a least agreement with that group or for sake of any other reason had he any interest to benefit of the Ummah or Islam there was no sense in obstinacy he showed. The force and tyranny applied to him is enough to prove his unwillingness to accept Abu Bakr's Caliphate. How could he agree for his right to be usurped and give acceptance to this?

All this goes to prove that:

Rulership is a right bestowed by God. As a result, it cannot be exchanged or given to others. It is irrevocable.

Such a thing would be to ignore divine decree and commit terrific atrocities; and yet they say:

"For the sake of interests of Muslims he transferred the right of leadership to others."!**[1]**

Second Wrong Result

After Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani**[2]** for the first time dwelled on such a

[1] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Paara-e-Payambar (Portion of the Prophet), Vol. 6, Pg. 15*

[2] *It is interesting that in the explanation of his outlook it is said: "He claims that there are religious proofs to support this separation!" (Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Nida-e-Wahdat, Pg. 216)*

type of thought in his article in a magazine of Egypt, Message of Islam, published by Darul Taqreeb**[1]** Muhammad Madani, principal of Islamic law college of Azhar and director of the said magazine, depending on contents of the article wrote an essay titled: 'A great change in Al-Azhar University.' He writes:

“This discourse clearly conveys that accusation of usurpation of Caliphate and that those who took the reins of power were usurpers, is baseless. It is far from Shia principles of faith. They too, like all Muslims, consider the basis rests at the satisfaction of masses.”!**[2]**

The wrong result is not drawn directly from conjecture of separation between Imamate and rulership. But it is drawn on the basis of first result of this category of conjectures.

It is thus said:

“Satisfaction and Bay’at of Ali with Caliphs established that Ali did not regard their government illegitimate.”!**[3]**

Creation of such a picture of Shia belief in the minds of followers of Caliph’s school could possibly be an effective step towards unity. But it must not be ignored that a right will have to be sacrificed for sake of unity. Unity cannot be turned into a slaughterhouse of reality. Negligence in facts and figures can only result in imaginative unity. Our next generation shall take this wrong belief:

“It is quite possible for Shias as they follow Ali and his sons to admit authenticity of Caliphate with a simultaneous belief in the position of Imamate.”!**[4]**

On the basis of this separation comfort can be drawn that Ali occupied a befitting position. Although the office of Caliphate is separate from that of their Imamate but there is no reason for any anxiety because:

[1] *This article by Muhammad Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi has been translated and the contents are approved by him. In this writing we shall deal with the translator’s extensive thought by way of completion of the above outlook.*

[2] *Muhammad Madani: Article quoted in book Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pg. 90*

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

[4] *Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani: Article quoted in book Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pg. 222*

“Imam Ali (a.s.) practically enjoyed the office of Guardianship and Imamate among masses. The people brought to him their complaints against Caliphs. Caliphs too often used to consult him in matters which were difficult for them to solve. Ali was a supervisor over their actions and at the same time a guide to them...[1]”[2]

So we must be happy that his Imamate is not denied to him or any tyranny done against him and no right of his is usurped.

Similarly we should accept that Caliphs were never deviated because their government was run under his supervision. Fatima’s house was attacked and set on fire. Consequently, Fatima met her martyrdom and Mohsin was miscarried. All this happened in order to make Ali accept this high position to supervise duties of Caliphs and to guide them. Caliphs wanted to protect Islam!

Thus it is said:

“If people at consultation of Imam make a man of their choice manage their affairs and administer Islamic government their guardian choose Islamic government, the things will go better under his watch and control at his divine authority.”[3]

Third Wrong Result

Does there remain any room for difference, dispute or a distance between Imam and Caliphs on the ground of what passed? So, is there any reason for quarrel between their followers?

The cardinal result that these unity-seekers are after is to show otherwise the relations between Imam and usurpers of his right of Caliphate. On a false basis, they try to establish that there lasted peace and understanding between them.

The thought of unity is turned into a real belief. The standard of real foundation and unity is ignored. According to this sort of thought, difference between Ali and Caliphs, in addition

to contrast between beliefs of Shia and Sunni about Imamate and Caliphate is commented and changed 'as if there existed understanding between the two.' [4] The readers will conclude the mistaken result.

[1] [We shall answer this objection separately.]

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

[3] *Ibid. Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious)*, Vol. 7, Pg. 18

[4] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects)*, Translation of article, 'Imamate and Caliphate' by Shaykh Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani: Pg. 218

For instance:

"What crime is greater than one that creates difference among Muslim Ummah while the Imam and Caliphs were on good terms."! [1]

Type C)

Separation of Imamate from rulership in a frame of Great Imamate and Great Caliphate: [2]

As it must have been observed so far, separation of Imamate from rulership (Caliphate) means complete independence from *Wilayat* (of infallible Imam). This is a wrong dimension, an erroneous angle, a mistaken outlook of some unity-seekers under a pretext of a suitable way to resolve. [3]

About these two offices, the vested or bestowed Guardianship and elected or selected Caliphate, much is said from this mistaken conjecture. Relations between these two offices and its heads is illustrated like this:

1 - These two offices: affairs and duties they have are totally different from each other. Therefore they are separate. There are not many common elements between them. They are independent of each other.

2 - There is a parallel link between these two positions independent of each other regardless of duties and obligations of each. As such, an understanding and comprehension exists

between the two. The office holders (of these two positions) have no differences beyond mutual complaints.

Thus it is said:

“If opinions are exchanged in this regard it was baseless and not in a position of these two offices. In my opinion it is better not to call it a difference. It was only a complaint.”!**[4]**

3 - The position of *Wilayat* with regard to status, dignity, responsibility, duties and obligations make the holder of this office very much important and far higher and more sacred than office of Caliphate. This theory is applied to

[1] *Ibid. Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), Pg. 219*

[2] *Refer: Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 63-78*

[3] *Ibid. Article quoted in Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), (3rd Edition 1377) Pg. 255 onwards.*

[4] *Ibid. Article quoted in Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), (3rd Edition 1377) Pg. 257-258*

position of Caliphate. So consequently, coming down to position of an elected Caliphate one who holds the status of Guardianship it is too low and too little for him and his dignity. Considering the higher status of Guardianship than Caliphate and taking in view Imam's carelessness and paying no importance to government's position it can be said that nothing was taken away from him by Caliphs!

4 - The position of Imam's Guardianship was active throughout the period of three Caliphs. The responsibility that entailed this office for Ali was acceptable to Caliphs, so none of his rights was usurped. Caliphs' government was also not a government formed by force. Caliphs had acknowledged and even depended on authority of Ali, of his knowledge in which he was the final point of reference.

If one looks at these criticisms made by deviated outlook this much will be concluded that the difficulties of such outlooks

are the wrong and perverted conclusions about Imamate and Caliphate.

In short, Caliphate, which is a reality by divine decree, has been deleted from Shia belief and an elected Caliphate is inserted instead.

The corrupted ones' claim is that the Imam was not the head of Caliphate. They tried their best to show Caliphate (i.e. rulership) of less value and importance. However this outlook is never accepted by Shia.

These unity-seekers have their own opinion about Caliphate of Infallible Imams. They have tried here to lift the handicaps towards acceptance. They want to consummate their earlier theory.

If it is revised, the office of Caliphate, which was completely a separate entity from office of Guardianship, now is divided into two branches:

Part A) The great Caliphate: They have brought it to the level or grade of great Guardianship of Ali.

Part B) The open Caliphate: (Caliphate in public view): This is the same elected Caliphate. As said earlier, in this conjecture this is the only branch of Caliphate separated from Imamate.

To describe these two branches, it is said:

“Depending on this theory, it can be said that Imam Ali (a.s.) like Joseph, the Prophet, during the period of thirty years after passing away of Prophet in affairs of politics, law and economics had great Caliphate

in addition to great Imamate. But someone else was clad in the cloak of Caliphate.”![1]

Particulars of this Oblique new thought about the Great Caliphate

First Particularity: The great Caliphate is higher than Caliphate, which is open to people. The reason: it is like a stationary millstone and a base. So it is a pivot of government. Therefore Ali had no desire for this open Caliphate.

Thus it is said:

“Ali was aware of this fact that if he accepts Caliphate there is none to undertake the ministry which is a harder and more difficult job. There was none to become the stationary stone of a hand mill; that is to become a pivot thereon to rotate affairs of government.”!**[2]**

Second Particularity: The great Caliphate is more influential and efficacious than the apparent Caliphate. The reason: the Imam can interfere or issue orders in Caliphate wherever and whenever he deemed fit.

Third Particularity: The great Caliphate is active behind the curtain. Its dignity is beyond ordinary affairs. It has no direct link to government business.

In explanation of these particularities, such is expressed:

“Ali was like a pivot of Islamic government although apparently he was in the background. The cloak of Caliphate had covered some other body just like Prophet Joseph who commanded wherever he wanted.”!**[3]**

“The great Imamate and great Caliphate of Ali demanded him to guide and give opinion in affairs of Caliphate, in administrative matters and in military advances. He left army movements to care of others.”!**[4]**

One who designed this wrong conjecture after sketching such a picture of this great Caliphate claims that this position of Ali was active in the time of

[1] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam*

Ali, (1st Edition 1380) Vol. 1, Pg. 63

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 72*

[3] *Ibid. Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 74*

[4] *Ibid. Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 67*

Caliphs. But the great Caliphate of his had begun immediately after passing away of Prophet.

It is again said that:

“Amirul Momineen (a.s.) immediately after passing away of Prophet took office of great Imamate and great Caliphate in background of apparent Caliphate. Some think that he was aloof and took shelter in the corner of his house. But it was not so.”!**[1]**

“During the period of thirty years after passing away of Prophet, he held great Caliphate in fields of politics, economics and law though someone else wore the gown of apparent Caliphate.”!**[2]**

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 64*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 63*

Chapter 16

Deviated Repercussions of this Conjecture

First Wrong Result

Since the great Caliphate of Ali was active immediately after passing away of Prophet throughout the period of Caliphate, which was in appearance, so no right of his was usurped or confiscated.

Thus it is said:

“Imam Ali (a.s.) besides the five years he was physically in the scene he had great Imamate and great Caliphate all over the period of thirty years since passing away of Prophet.”! [1]

Second Wrong Result

Considering differences between great Caliphate and Caliphate, visible to the people, it is not usurpation - that is the actions committed by those (other than Ali) who took over Caliphate. So their government was not illegitimate.

Third Wrong Result

That the holder of great Caliphate acknowledged Caliphate held by other, which was visible to people, is a natural and normal thing.

In this respect, they say:

“After a short period he did Bay’at for the sake of unity, peace, calm and safety of Islam.”! [2]

Consequently the invalid and illegitimate Caliphate of Abu Bakr and Umar is being shown as lawful, valid and under supervision of Ali. A Caliphate (as though) approved and accepted by Ali!

Reminder

Whatever you read up to here was a report of claim coined in a new thought of unity-seekers. This new thought was erroneous and wrong in addition to dimension which too was wrong and deviated.

The writer of the article has tried to reason and give evidence in order to establish the validity of his theory that the great Caliphate was active

[1] *Ibid. Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 78*

[2] *Ibid. Article quoted in Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 70*

throughout the period in which others had worn the gown of Caliphate. They are as follows:

“The great Caliphate of Imam Ali (a.s.) during a period of thirty years after passing away of Prophet – we shall revise...

Guiding Caliphs in political, economical, legal and judicial affairs and keeping them from going astray.

Appointing his own persons in key posts.”**[1]**

Then the writer explains ways and proceeds of his great Caliphate giving details about consultations of Caliphs with him. He further adds and explains the part he and his companions had in government and military advances.

We would like to remark here that we shall deal with all these points in the second and third chapters of second volume in detail.

The claim that his great Caliphate was active during the period of twenty-five years of Caliphs is nothing but an exaggeration far from reality and remote from facts. It is against history.

Here we draw your attention to a short criticism of the conjecture of Caliphate being separate from Imamate and *Wilayat*.

[1] *Ibid.* Article quoted in *Collected Papers of International Conference on Imam Ali, Vol. 1, Pg. 64*

Chapter 17

Criticism and Opinion Guardianship and Imamate is inseparable from apparent Caliphate

Ustad Ja'far Subhani writes in this respect:

“There is another theory against all we have said so far. Shia scholars agree unanimously on it. The theory goes to say: Imamate is a guardianship bestowed by God to Imam. To make it more clear: Imamate is a position similar to prophethood. It is neither selected nor elected. It is chosen or appointed by God Himself. The holder of this position, the Imam, is chosen and appointed by God.

Therefore Imamate is extension of Message brought down to people by Prophet. A Prophet is a founder of divine legislation over the earth. Imam is a guard of this legislation and guard of Message. Imam goes parallel with the Prophet except in getting revelation, which is the only distinction of Prophet. The Imam too is distinguished with qualifications and qualities necessary to a Prophet. He must be unique in knowledge and well conversed with principles, fundamentals, branches, decrees, rules, etc. An Imam too must be protected from committing any mistakes, big or small. **[1]** The office of Imamate in Shia school is extension of duties, which are Prophet's responsibility. Imam performs all duties of a Prophet. The obligations that bind a Prophet are transferred to the Imam.” **[2]**

As such if rulership is within the ambit of prophethood of a prophet and this office is established in the entity of prophet, then it cannot be separated from the entity of an Infallible

Imam also. Therefore it cannot belong to other than the person of Imam. Since Imamate is the extension of prophethood, rulership too comes within the range of Imam's responsibilities as it was the case with the Prophet. Therefore it is unreasonable to think of separation between office of Imamate and rulership.

We follow this discussion from the angle of knowing minutely the duties of a Prophet:

Ustad Ja'far Subhani writes under the heading: Whether government is possible without an Infallible Imam – if it is a divine right:

[1] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Rahbari-e-Ummat (Leadership of the nation), Pg. 20*

[2] *Ibid. Peshwayi az Nazar-e-Islam (Leadership in the view of Islam), Pg. 3*

“There is no doubt that one of the duties of prophets and one of the branches of their Guardianship is their government and their command over people. The government which in reality and originally belongs to God and delegated to Prophet and then to men of God, is a government framed and formed by justice, divine regulations and virtue of God's commands.

In Bani Israel Prophets Dawood and Sulaiman had such a divine rightful government by God's decree. The right and just government is that which is established by God's orders; not on conjectures, fancies or guess, which is always accompanied with surmise and suspicion. So it is often associated with lust, desire, aspiration and greed. It is absolutely impossible to administer such a government unless the administrator has extensive knowledge in all sciences and fields relative and necessary, such as punishments and particularities of a ruling. He should be cold and calm, able to overcome his own anguish and anger. He must be able to control his personal greed, selfishness, lust and pleasure. In short, only a man with such qualities can be an infallible Imam. The Prophet according to Quranic verse was a ruler, commander and governor of Muslims. He was their politician, judge and arbitrator. If all verses descended in this regard are scrutinized, it will come to light that the Prophet was an absolute undisputed ruler, an arbitrator and a

judge of Muslim Ummah. He was a rightful politician too. When we pay visit in a form of pilgrimage to Imam in his shrine we read in the text of pilgrim devotions (Ziarat Jame Kabeera) - "...politicians of the people." The Imam performs the duties of the Prophet. The Imam performs the job of government and judiciary. He stands parallel to the Prophet. As we pointed above, he must be having the same qualities, the Prophet had. All rules, commandments and details of religion must be known to him. Similarly, he must be infallible like the Prophet, far from faults, remote from wrongs, pure and purged of sins. If Imam wants to administer his government in a different way, there will be no issue of Caliphate or succeeding the Prophet. It will be a government like other governments. It is obvious that the Imam whom God appoints is to fill the gap created by the death of Prophet. The Prophet ruled on the basis of divine laws. He did not commit mistake or go astray in applying laws of God whatever subject or case might have been. Therefore his government was in fact the mirror of this Quranic verse: "And rule among the people with truth and do not obey the (personal) lust." Now passing away of Prophet has created a vacuum that cannot be filled by anyone who has no knowledge of all the rules. Their ignorance in the events of any problem pushed them here and there to beg for a solution. What an agony it is when no goal obtained, he takes shelter in his own conjecture. Therefore the file of their life is full of mistakes, errors, wrongs and faults; all dangerous and harmful. How to fill such a deep crack and crevice; and who is to fill it? He must be of highest spirit in position; a copy of the Prophet - having knowledge of each branch and side of Islam, He must be able to solve difficulties and problems without making mistakes. It is quite apparent that ordinary persons cannot fill the gap nor can they continue the Message brought down by the Prophet. Therefore it is here the presence of an Infallible Imam becomes necessary and a need to tread the path of the Prophet. Imam is a need to be in place of the Prophet to carry out his duties and make restrictions and prohibitions prescribed by God and conveyed by Prophet." **[1]**

Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari in this respect writes:

“Prophethood itself is a reality containing thousands of issues. The presence of Prophet suffices people from having anyone else to govern them. Imamate in Shia school entails prophethood. However it is higher than prophethood. It is such a fact we have accepted. As long as the Prophet exists, there is no saying as to who should be the ruler. The reason is the Prophet enjoys a status beyond people. Likewise, as long as Imam exists, there is no question of who must be the ruler. In Shia school, Imamate is a phenomenon and stretched entity of prophethood at its highest grades.” **[2]**

“From Shia outlook, the issue of rulership in the period of Imam is like rulership in the time of the Prophet. In other words, it is an exception. With the supposition of existence or presence of Imam in consideration of the extent of Shia belief; the issue of rulership also becomes a branch issue - depending on other issues.” **[3]**

Reminder

There is another criticism with regard to inadvertency towards standard, sincerity and originality of this thought. Distance has been taken from spirit of Islam and its social teaching; because:

“Separation between these two positions actually is a sort of Christianity on tongues of those who share this theory. This is a deviated constitution

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 142- 146*

[2] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imamat-o-Rahbari (Imamate and Leadership), Pg. 162-163*

[3] *Ibid. Pg. 147*

of Christianity of today, which says: I hand over affairs of Caesar to Caesar himself. This is not an Islamic constitution. All its regulations and laws reflect one system overall compressing all material and moral aspects sufficient to cater to needs of human beings in social, conduct and character, political and economical fields.

The constitution of Islam and its root frames the regulations of human policy, which is to administer Islamic social affairs. The station of moral leadership cannot be separated from government and political rule. Some among open-minded ones in the past and present consider it as a necessity to divide or separate the two, i.e. Caliphs and Infallible Ahle Bayt of Prophet as it is the only way of unity between Shia and Sunni. The government must be the lot of Caliphs and moral leadership on the part of Infallible Ahle Bayt. By this way alone, dispute lasting a thousand and four hundred years can be brought to an end. By so doing Muslims can stand against the imperialism of East and West with strength and unity.

But this very thought is a mistake. The sum of this unity is constituted by a wrong consideration, which rather reflects a kind of Christianity or secularism. Why at all should we separate these two offices, which is against Quranic verse? Why at all, should it be divided like sacrificed meat?"[1]

"The Holy Quran clearly says about Prophet Lut and Prophet Joseph: We gave to them rulership and command. About Prophet Dawood, Quran says: We gave him judgment and power of arbitration. About Prophet Sulaiman the Holy Quran narrates his government. Likewise, about Talut too talks of his government and that he had other distinctions. Therefore it shows that divine prophets are founders of divine governments on the earth and executors of divine authority."[2]

"There is no denying the fact that the Prophet, besides being a ruler of masses was ruler of people also. He was a spiritual leader as well as a moral guide. There are verses of Quran, texts of Islam and historical evidences that narrate that the Prophet laid the foundation of Islamic government. He took the responsibility of all affairs as a real ruler does. Islam obtained expansion at...teaching of constitution of monotheism and legislating laws at the invitation for holy war and extensive military training among masses in addition to teachings laws particular to Jihad.

[1] *Ustad Ja'far Subhani: Rahbari-e-Ummat (Leadership of the nation), Pgs. 102-103*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 96*

The training of defense was made common among the people. Besides, personal physical participation of the Prophet in twenty-seven battles and appointment of captains and brigadiers for fifty-five brigades showed the government's face. In addition to this, it went as far as to establish that the Prophet's call was not only spiritual. Likewise, his leadership was not only confined to convey divine decrees or religious messages through advices, admonishments or preaching. His orders were obeyed because of his capacity of a ruler and commander-in-chief of the army. In doing thus he safeguarded his Ummah from harm of enemies and protected the Message and Book of God from all perversions and deviations. He stood security to execute divine laws in a human society.**[1]** The financial system of Islam is the most obvious evidence to prove that Islam is a complete and consummate model to run a society. The system was complete and nothing was short in it. Every core and corner of human field in a society has not escaped the care and attention of the system. It attended and answered all human needs that a society could possibly have. The way this system has chosen to attain this goal is to enjoin people to do what is good, i.e. to bind themselves to good. Similarly to avoid doing bad, being hurtful to self and others is prohibited. All laws and regulations the Prophet established show a thorough and a deep study of society. Then the Prophet laid its foundation which swiftly took root in society.**[2]** Apart from being political head of government, the Prophet was a spokesman of divine or heavenly laws and a commentator expounding and explaining contents of Quranic verses. In short, he was a coach for God's words and a teacher to teach the Book of God.**[3]**

The Prophet in his life held these two positions (i.e. head of the government and conveyor of Divine Message.) After passing away of Prophet, a vacancy arose for position of the Prophet. As such, the Islamic society needed one to fill the position of Prophet to carry out duties related with this position.

Now the question is to see who is qualified to take over the charge. Who has those qualities to occupy the two vacant offices?

[1] *[In other words, the prophethood of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and the Imamate of His Eminence Ali (a.s.) have been always together as power of executive and the position of their Wilayat cannot be separated from the power of executive.]*

[2] *Ibid. Pgs. 94-97*

[3] *Ibid. Pgs. 94-97*

It is quite clear and hence conceivable that the job of preaching to the people and guidance of masses to acquaint them with Divine laws; as to what is allowed and what prohibited and to encourage the society to high morals and demeanor befitting human beings can only be undertaken by those who are safeguarded from sins, protected from faults and are themselves infallible. They can control their own self. Besides, knowledge of everything rests with them. An absolute leader of the people cannot be otherwise. His conduct and character, his words and deeds become a model for masses to follow. Such a one must be pious without a margin of sin, forgetfulness, fault or error. We call this quality Ismat; that is infallibility. At the same time, he must have knowledge of every science. This is impossible unless God has vested his bosom with His knowledge.**[1]**

In brief, leader of Islamic society should be well versed with fundamentals, principles, branches and side rules and constitution of Faith. Otherwise he cannot be a divine spokesman over the earth and leader from God to His creatures. He cannot be, likewise, an absolute guide without being infallible.”**[2]**

Another Criticism

There is another point, which should not be far from sight. These conjectures are harmful to the extent of irretrievability to framework of Shia belief. However they put the next generation into doubt with regard to separation of right from wrong.

From another aspect, it encourages propaganda of a thought, which can be named 'separation of faith from politics'.

“Islam is a compendious and complete constitution consisting of all aspects of human life – the open and hidden ones. Islam has brought a new system with a new thought. As it is a school of moral and civilization at the same time, it is a social and political system. Islam gives meaning to matter, makes the hidden apparent and obvious, frames the next world in this world, houses the essence in a shell and preserves seed in a pod. Deviation of Caliphate and rulership from its original track is tantamount to make Caliphate a pod without a seed or a shell without kernel...

So it was at this point that politics were separated from piety or being bound to a religion. As a result, those who were heirs of Islam and

[1] *Ibid. Pgs. 94-97*

[2] *Ibid. Pg. 98*

guards of moral heritage were sidelined.**[1]** They had no say in affairs. Those at the helm of affairs were strangers to spirit of Islam.**[2]** They could only run the legislature apparent to the eyes. From this one can understand the fatal hit that hurt the body of Islam. It started the day politics were separated from faith.**[3]**

This was the greatest danger to Islamic world and to those who aspire expansion and advancement of Islam should rely on unification of politics and faith. These two are like spirit and body. The spirit and body, this pulp and shell should get together with each other. Islam has paid much care with regard to politics, rulership, holy war, political laws and preserving the heritage of Islam. If this is separated from this pulp, the pulp will rot while the shell will dry up...”**[4]**

The Result

“The issue of Imamate from the aspect of leadership and rulership is such: Now presently there exists an infallible exactly like the person of the Prophet. The Prophet, at the behest by God, has introduced and identified to us his successor. His successor is above the level of ordinary people. As far as qualities and qualifications are concerned he is exceptional like the Prophet. Therefore in this case there is no question of consultation, election or committee.

In the days of the Prophet, there was nothing of these words such as: the Prophet is only a Messenger. Divine revelation descends on him. Responsibility of government rests with a consulting committee. People should vote whether the Prophet must be the ruler or someone else. In fact, the people had some other trend in their thought. In spite of being a Prophet and being above level of a human and having a link with unseen world of revelation nobody raised this question of an executive of the government. Now too (after his death) there is no necessity for such words. The Prophet had twelve successors. In their existence, there remains no ground for election, consultation and selection.

Having had an infallible one, with knowledge of everything, who does not mistake; rather no possibility of error can be attributed to him, should we go after an ordinary man?

[1] *[Imams (a.s.)]*

[2] *[Usurpers of caliphate]*

[3] *[Since Saqifah]*

[4] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imamato-o-Rahbari (Imamate and Leadership), Pg. 31-32*

The position of Ali’s Imamate was in the sense we said above that Ali was already an Imam in the sense of the word. So naturally all by itself leadership or administration of the government too will have to be his lot. The Prophet had issued statements in this regard. The Prophet described Ali’s position because the other position (Imamate) was his...”**[1]**

Because:

“Imamate is a pillar of Shia belief. A branch of Imamate is rulership. When an Imam is present, i.e. in existence of an infallible Imam the right of rulership goes to no one as it was with the Prophet. In the time of his existence, no one had the right to run the government. The Prophet, at the command of God, had appointed Ali for Imamate. Rulership is joined to Imamate. The necessity of Imamate is administration also.**[2]** In some instances, the Prophet appointed Ali to administration on the basis and standard of Imamate. The base he held was Imamate but he said: He (Ali) is the Imam after me.”**[3]**

Therefore:

“Imamate among Shia is regarded above rulership. Rulership becomes one of the affairs of Imamate. The explanation of Islam, the decrees and its rulings occupy a level, which must be Infallible. It cannot be otherwise.

We say one of the functions of the Prophet was rulership. Rulership not from the side of people nor was it a people’s right to give him rulership. This rulership was one, which God had bestowed on him. The reason was that the Prophet was above human beings. In other words, he was a teacher of divine laws and rules besides his link with the unseen world. He had rulership over the people. Among Shias, there is another issue. If that issue is established, rulership itself will be established. We believe a position entailing that of prophethood. In existence and presence of that position, rulership is itself contained therein.

Likewise, when the Prophet was present, question of rulership was contained within. As such when an Imam exists, of course at the level Shias stress on, the question of rulership is clear and a settled one.”**[4]**

[1] Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: *Imamat-o-Rahbari* (Imamate and Leadership), Pgs. 80-81

[2] [That is rulership is included among the duties of the Imams.]

[3] Ibid. Pg. 81

[4] Ibid. Pgs. 112-113

Part 10
To show Rulership of less value
than Imamate

Chapter 18

Introduction

Now it is the turn to answer the second category of conjectures having had replied the conjecture of separation of Imamate from rulership. This conjecture too is in the same dimension with the same aim; that is to prove existence of good terms between the Imam and Caliphs.

This conjecture can be framed in the mold of following expressions:

“The office of Guardianship vested to Ali by God and Prophet according to texts and verses is so high that worldly offices and elected Caliphates before it are like polluted water with a putrid stench or a morsel that suffocates the throat or a worn out shoe or nasal liquid. It is so worthless and of such low value.”!**[1]**

“He was in background the Prophet’s successor Waliullah (i.e. God’s friend) and Caliph of God. His dignity and status was so high as not to let him compete for worldly Caliphate.”!**[2]**

“Ali was the successor of the Prophet according to Quranic verses and Prophet’s confirmations on several occasions. But his spirit was so high that he saw the office of Caliphate too little that he himself says: “Rulership over people to me is like polluted water with a putrid stench or like a morsel that suffocates the throat. Ali refrained from paying allegiance to Abu Bakr for a period. But his generous forgiving nature made him to pay allegiance.”!**[3]**

In the last narration, it appears that the author of the article is prone to believe that Caliphate is separate from rulership. In accordance with this belief, he argues the worthlessness of Caliphate. He then stresses on this point that both (Caliphate and rulership) are undisputed rights of Ali. As he proceeds, he shows the worthlessness of this position before the high spirit of Ali. However in any

[1] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 6, Pg. 8*

[2] *Ibid. Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 6, Pg. 12*

[3] *Ibid. Mashal-e-Ittehaad (Torch of Unity), Pg. 20*

case, it does not mean that Ali overlooked the crime of usurpation of his right or forgave the usurper, finally, there did not last peace between him and transgressors of his right.**[1]** It is an obvious fact that such a type of outlook towards rulership will result once more in wrong conclusions. Such as, he willingly paid allegiance to Caliphs!

A) Caliphs are shown as if they were not transgressors of Ali's right, or they did not usurp Ali's right to Caliphate.

B) Ali too did not carry any rancor against them.

C) He further says that peace and good terms lasted between the Imam and Caliphs.

"He wanted rulership to serve religion and establish justice. Otherwise he regarded rulership far lesser than the worth of his old worn-out shoes."**[2]**

Criticism and Analysis

As could be noted:

“He has brought down Imamate to rulership and administration either deliberately or unintentionally. It should not be forgotten that such a discussion results in scientific negligence, which cannot be accepted besides its entailing corruption in drawing conclusions. The outcome can be only an imaginative unity. The statement says that Imamate and Wilayat are two aspects - one moral and the other rulership. Then assertions are made that the first one cannot be usurped[3] while the second is not so important. In the narration of the word of Ali, a word is changed; that is Guardianship instead of rulership. Intentionally it is changed to create a short cut towards unity.”[4]

Another point that should be made here is:

Caliphate and rulership are positions given by God. This furnishes a suitable ground for guidance and perfection and prosperity of this world and the next. It

[1] *[He who entertains this outlook has termed the bitterness as a enmity Ali had against the Caliph. This term is not suitable concerning the personality of Ali. Bitterness is possible to have, but he could not be implacable because it is not a good quality. (We shall dwell on this subject in more detail)]*

[2] *Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Ittelaat Daily, Issue no. 26 Khordad 1379*

[3] *[It should not be forgotten that this is occasion for denial]*

[4] *Dr. Jawad Muhaddaseen: Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue 8, Bahman 1379*

drives the society towards resurrection. Such a type of rulership cannot be worthless for Ali. If it be so, it means: Ali paid little or no attention to his duties because it is coherent with the position God has installed Ali in.

The office of Guardianship does not necessarily depend on rulership, which too must be in possession. The Imam under

responsibility of Guardianship discharges his duty of guidance to people. But the fact should be noted that rulership provides an easier ground to achieve the goal of Guardianship to the extent of perfection that is expected by the appearance of the present Imam.

Rulership, which they usurped from Ali, was on the ground of their denial of Imamate and *Wilayat* of Ali. This denial gives birth to a denial that stretches in the whole Ummah and totally forgets its turning away from the Imam who is a door of guidance and resurrection in the next world.

The world from the viewpoint of Ali is worthless. Likewise is rulership that aims world. Sunnis have said thus about Caliphate. Rulership gives meaning to Ali when he can serve the truth and justice and enable him to eradicate wrong.

In other words, Caliphate and rulership lose their attraction to Ali when they serve selfish motives or go astray from God's will. Throughout the period of three Caliphs, this type of rulership had imprinted a sketch in the minds of people.

In fact they took rulership for granted to hoard worldly and material gain.

It was exactly on this wrong outlook that the Ummah got tired of injustice and partialities of Uthman. They saw no way but to turn to Ali. So they returned to Ali.

They returned not because Ali was the person whom the Prophet had introduced as one appointed by God to the leadership of Islamic society. They returned because Ali was selected by companions who wanted to establish justice. This clearly shows that they had already forgotten the divine verse for Ali's leadership.

The government, which Ali was called upon to form was a display of Ali's wisdom in executing divine orders. At the same time, the previous three regimes also were a demonstration of their denial of Ali's right of Guardianship and Imamate and usurpation of his rights.

Therefore it is clear that rulership founded on such base has no value to Ali. However Ali exerted his efforts and tried repeatedly to take back his usurped right. This was silenced by an attack on Fatima's house, the only daughter of the Prophet.

Part 11
**Removing Imamate from Principles of Faith and making it a
Fundamental of School**

Chapter 19

Introduction

Pay attention to this objection:

“...Difference in Imamate is not a difference in principle of faith. Since our childhood, we are taught that principles of faith are three and fundamentals of school are two. Principles of faith are separate from fundamentals of school.”! [1]

One of the mode of dividing which has no root in Islamic teachings but today it is commonly used - separation of arguments of belief in principles of faith and fundamentals of school or in terms of unity-seekers - separation in real issues (common ones) and the side ones (i.e. those of *Ijtihad*).

It so seems that this way of dividing might have originated in thought of Islamic unity. Or it should have much utility and usefulness in this path. Depending on this order discussion of Imamate has been discarded from comprising main and basic issues of Islam while, on the other hand the subject of Imamate constitutes the ground for difference between two schools - that of the Prophet's House and that of Caliphs. It is brought down to a side matter. Therefore the different views in this regard become *Ijtihads*, i.e. personal opinions based on personal conclusions. As such, it is by itself in the margin - not in the contents, beyond frontiers of principle which are common among Islamic sects.

So it is said:

“Islamic Caliphate comes among common principles because it carries rulership. Therefore politics is among pillars of Islam.

As a result there needs to be an executive or administrator. But the discussion takes a detailed length to the effect to make it a branch subject not to be treated as incoherent with the principle...

For instance, Shia and Sunni differ from each other on application of the term. They had disputes on this issue as to whom should be applied the

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Payaam-e-Wahdat (Message of Unity), Pg. 258*

term of Caliph. This shows real Caliphate and politics as an entity that stands by itself. It is an outstanding issue; an element of its own independent base. Strange it is that who should take charge of Caliphate must be a side discussion, a branch argument!"**[1]**

"Some narrations about Guardianship are in the same trend and sense which are particular to Shia. Yet, Guardianship in that sense becomes a side matter pertaining to belief."**[2]**

"In my view those who today say that there is no politics or rulership are more astrayed than those who deny immediate succession of Ali to Caliphate."**[3]**

Unity-seekers by posing such divisions can very easily set aside a far margin to this discussion of Imamate, which is the main and most important difference of belief among sects of Islam. Their pretext is - a principle of faith, of *Ijtihad* or a branch issue and so forth.

So it is said:

"The other issues wherein runs difference among religions are among principles. Every school has a fundamental for itself."**[4]**

However in each sect such side belief, not the basic ones, that have no relation with fundamental issues of Islam, can be found.

Thus it is said:

“The subject of supreme leadership of Muslims was the element that gave blow in the beginning to body of Islam. It hurt the united rows of Islam. Since this was among the second grade of issues, it did not create controversy with unity of principle and purpose. The difference existed therein was hurtful to unity of Muslims.” **[5]**

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring & Summer 80, Pgs. 12, 13, 18*

[2] *Ibid.* Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 18

[3] Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9-10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 15

[4] *Ibid.* Nida-e-Wahdat (Call for Unity), Pg. 27

[5] Muhammad Moheet Tabatabai: *Sayyid Jamaluddin Asadabadi wa Beedaari-e-Mashriq-e-Zameen (Awakening of Eastern land), Pg. 169*

In other words, Imamate against the principle of faith is only a branch of belief. Therefore it is on this ground that Islam does not acknowledge it as a valid principle!

On the other side, this type of division (or dividing) displays all Islamic sects in basic issues and joint principles of faith of Islam; and makes all to benefit by the link with the root of Islam!**[1]**

In this way another step is taken towards unity.

So it is said:

“What Islam regards valid among principle and branches**[2]** one should believe therein. He is a Muslim. Those principles are three: Monotheism, Prophethood and Day of Resurrection...

So Imamate is not from principles of Islam. It is from principles of Shia faith, He who denies this, if he believes in three said principles, (Monotheism, Prophethood and Resurrection) is a Muslim but not Shia.**[3]**”!**[4]**

“Imamate is from fundamentals of school, not from principles of faith. Denial of this principle does not become a reason for the denier to be treated out of Islam...”!**[5]**

[1] *To get acquainted with other Islamic faiths refer to the book The lost Truth by Shaykh Mostasim Sayyid Ahmad. He has written this (above named) book after having been guided to the right faith of Shia 12 Imami.*

[2] *The essential branches of faith are - on which all Islamic faiths agree - obligation for performing prayers, fasting, Hajj and illegality of marriage with mother, sister and so on.*

(Muhammad Jawad Mughnia: Article: ‘Zaroorihai Deen-o-Mazhab’ quoted in the book Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects).)

[3] *[With reference to discussion about principles of faith and Islam it cannot be used to justify marginalization of Imamate]*

[4] *Muhammad Jawad Mughnia: Article: ‘Zaroorihai Deen-o-Mazhab’ (Essentialities of faith and religion) quoted in the book Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects). This translation is quoted from the article: ‘Elements of Islamic Unity and its Obstacles’ quoted in Kitab-e-Wahdat (Pgs. 224-225)*

[5] *Dr. Ali Shariati: Tashayyo-e-Alawi o Tashayyo-e-Safavi [Alawite Shiaism and Safavid Shiaism] (Collected Writings 9) Pg. 75, quoted from statement about belief of Alawite Shias by Shaykh Muhammad Jawad Mughnia: Article: ‘Zaroorihai Deen-o-Mazhab’ (Essentialities of faith and religion) quoted in the book Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects).*

In one comprehensive glance it can be said:

After the last commentary on separation of Imamate and Caliphate:

“Commentary of second kind towards co-ordination and nearness in the most important matter of difference Imamate; Muhammad Jawad Mughnia has written an essay on it. He says Imamate is not from principles of Islam. It is the base of Shia faith and its essentiality, which returns to principles.”!**[1]**

Criticism and Analysis

The body and structure of Islam is in discussion. Its teachings can be divided into two entities - the lower structure and the above structure. In this division, some teachings of faith including obligations or duties and those of beliefs in relation to all teachings of conduct or of belief housed in the lower structure. These are called basics of Islam or basis of faith in narrations of infallible Ahle Bayt. The sense of this is totally other than the common description as principles of faith.

On this basis, that batch of teachings of faith is called base or principle of faith. The root or construction of Islam rests on that. Not because outer belief - even its contents - is common with Islamic sects, are called principles of faith.

On the basis of what we said, Shia believes that Imamate is part of principles and pillars of faith. In faith of Islam the element of Imamate is the fundamental of the foundation.

Here we quote some writings of Shia scholars:

“The reality of a thing is its own base and root. Its structure is built on it - i.e. on its base and on its own root. Therefore principle of faith is that on which faith is built or stands thereon. Such it is to believe in Imamate; Quran and traditions support this.”**[2]**

“Imamate and leadership of religion in Shia school is a part of principle from view of essentiality of belief. It stands in the row of Monotheism, Prophethood and Day of Judgment.”**[3]**

[1] Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: *Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity)*, Vol. 2, Pg. 204

[2] Allamah Shaykh Muhammad Hasan Muzaffar: *Dalailus Sidq (Proofs of Truth)*, Vol. 2, Pg. 29

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

“When we Shias want to describe principles of faith on the basis of religion we count it as a part of principle.”**[1]**

“We believe that Imamate is one of the principles. Faith without belief in it is incomplete.”**[2]**

“No doubt that the only way to reach true elements of knowledge (science of knowledge) is to dive into contents of religion to obtain pearls of knowledge the Prophet has pointed to us.

It is only when we understand the directions of the Prophet regarding adherence to Imamate, which is viewed by the Prophet as an important pillar of the very structure itself. The Prophet goes even further. He says one must know his Imam in his lifetime. If one died without recognizing the Imam during his lifetime, it is as if he died in ignorance (pagan’s death).

That is, such a person has not understood the reality of monotheism, revelation and prophethood of the prophets and is not blessed by heavenly guidance of Quran and his life had not been Islamic and Quranic even though he might have believed in all true beliefs and had been imbued with all distinctive qualities and no matter how punctual he might have been in his life in discharging religious obligations such as prayers, fasting, Hajj, Zakat, fighting Jihad, has always attended mosque etc.”**[3]**

“The outcome is that: Belief in Guardianship and Imamate of Ali and other infallible Imams (his sons) is a backbone and worth bestowing element to all other principles of faith as well as character, conduct and deeds. Without that, faith with all its heads and titles has no divine validity nor is it of any value before God. It is like a zero which gets no value although several thousands zeros might stand in a row. A number must accompany a zero to get the value. Else, nobody will count zeros. Unless belief and deeds follow the fundamental of Imamate in the track of the Guardianship of Infallible Ahle Bayt, God does not pay any heed nor do they get a place with him. Everything is gone without any return.”**[4]**

[1] *Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: Imamate-o-Rahbari (Imamate and Leadership), Pg. 45*

[2] *Allamah Shaykh Muhammad Reza Muzaffar: Aqaid al-Imamiyah (Faith of Shia Islam), Pg. 93*

[3] *Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi: Dar Justujoo-e-Ilm-e-*

Deen (In search of religious knowledge), Pgs. 131-132

[4] *Ibid. Pgs. 146-147*

“This dividing line, which is a standard one, keeps belief in Guardianship and Imamate in a row with principles of faith. Some have erroneously concluded that: Belief in Imamate and Wilayat of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) is not among necessities of Islam. The belief in Islam is possible without that. On the other hand the holy verses prove other than this.

Therefore the subject of Guardianship is more obligatory and necessary than other obligations. It is more important before God than all duties. There is a point worth considering here. Among the five pillars: prayers, fasting, Zakat, Hajj and Guardianship only in four, excuse is justifiable. In four pillars excuse is accepted by God. The Prophet (the lawmaker) has given margin. For instance, in journeys prayers become short; likewise, fasting is avoided in sickness too. Zakat is not obligatory if one is financially not well off. Hajj is not binding if one is financially unable to do. But Guardianship of infallible Ahle Bayt (a.s.) is in no way exempted. It is a duty whatever conditions or circumstances be there one is bound to obey Imam and recognize him and be in his service. In their times, we shall be resurrected.”**[1]**

[1] *Dr. Hadi Ghandhari: Aathar-e-Itiqaad Ba Imam-e-Zamaan (Signs of Belief in the present Imam) Pgs. 11-13*

Part 12
Aim of Eschewing Shia teachings[1]

Chapter 20

Introduction

In Islamic literature, *Baraat* (i.e. seeking distance from the enemies of Infallible Ahle Bayt) is side by side with *Tawalla* (i.e. being friends with friends of Ahle Bayt). It is in the row of Imamate and *Wilayat* of Ahle Bayt (a.s.).

Baraat from enemies of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) stands side by side with Guardianship. These two depend on each other. It is a need and necessity. *Tawalla* is in meaning of belief in Imamate and Guardianship of Ahle Bayt (a.s.). It is a basic pillar of piety. It contains very important and great substance in it. In the issue of *Baraat*, to be religious or faithful cannot be possible without this.

The foundation and root of *Tabarra* is: To entertain no good terms at heart although at tongue you may agree with them. Who are they? They are deviated, perverted and astray in relation to Ahle Bayt of Prophet - adversaries of them. In conversation to show you are displeased with them. In deed and action to be distant with them or to seek distance from their customs, meetings, taste and religion.

By existing or in presence of such a fundamental in faith how can it be said with regard to Godly figures or those who are so close to God and loved by God that they had friendly differences or had intimate conduct. How can they be friendly though in differences or intimate with enemies of religion of God?[2] On the ground that a ranking implacability the Godly men do not have we cannot set aside or repudiate

totally *Baraat* which is one of the pillars and fundamentals. It is not a personal matter or on personal interest. It is a God's command, which should be obeyed as His other obligations. In *Baraat*, there is no selfish motive nor are there any personal tendencies. This obligation is based on divine decree. Its pivot is enmity and love with religion of God. We cannot

[1] *Note: The contents in the above introduction are taken from two valuable books: 1. Dar Justujoo-e-Ilm-e-Deen (In search of religious knowledge) by Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi and 2. Marefat-e-Imam-e-Asr (a.t.f.s.), (Knowing the Imam of the Age) by Dr. Sayyid Muhammad Bani Hashimi.*

[2] *Hatred and enmity is not a good quality for believers but it is not so towards enemies of faith.*

be friendly with enemies of God. Likewise, we cannot be enemies with friends of God.

Baraat in no way is like worldly love and hatred. It is neither material nor personal. It cannot be compared with human psychological conditions, which occur daily in life of individuals.

It is only an effort to invalidate this fundamental of *Baraat* by using unsuitable words. As it is said, the word of truth is established by what is not true. Anyway, this fundamental is based on God's order. From the other side, being a religious one is possible by knowing the guidance. To attain guidance compulsorily one should know the astray too. One should know those who created innovations in religion.

It is also necessary to know what those innovations in religion are. Then only can we separate faith from that which is not faith.

If we want to attain correct faith, to get a correct way of worship to God, we should know enemies of faith. We must know their role in deviating people from religion. And we should convey our knowledge in this regard to others too.

In fact it is necessary to know the astray-going and perversions from real faith. To know leaders of misguidance is necessary. Then we must introduce them to Islamic society. By so

doing we can rescue ourselves from going wrong. We can be aloof from them, which is necessary.

Designing such discussions is a need towards researching knowledge of religion and understanding Islamic truths. It cannot be called as an insult, an abuse or foul language. This has been made an excuse so that an advantage could be drawn therefrom and which is to close such discussions once and for all. The results of such discussion are beneficial. They want to deprive others of it.

A question that arises in the mind is that:

Unity-seekers have stepped far beyond frontiers of political unity. Practically they have plunged into Sunni beliefs. They have done this for sake of Islamic Unity; and they are moving fast in that direction. Now what are those conjectures left for them to convey or propagate that they try to delete and rescind this fundamental of *Baraat* from Shia teachings?

In reply it can be said:

So far whatever is said toward trend of knowledge and civilization for creating Islamic unity and put before criticism and analysis and evaluation, five main

pivots can be found in the thought and view of extremists among unity-seekers. And these five pivots in the end either directly or indirectly contradict fundamentals of *Baraat*. These five pivots are:

A - Taking benefit of a deviated thought, silence, an excuse to maintain Islamic demeanor?

It is thus said that:

“Is it possible to insult sanctities of one milliard Muslims and at the same time claim unity of Islam?”! **[1]**

“No logic gives way nor allows reason in our being free to insult heads of Sunni sect using our public media and taking into service writers and speakers.

If we aim for oneness and unity of hearts we must abolish our practice from radio, television, meetings and gatherings and pulpits; whatever from these platforms is said and which wounds and injures feelings of Sunnis. Such a thing should be prohibited.”! **[2]**

“To make insults, to be brazen faced and to fabricate statements or traditions which later can be attributed to the Prophet in vilification of leaders of Islam and breach sanctities of

Islamic personalities respected by a milliard Muslims – is it a principle of Shia faith?”! [3]

“Scolding, abusing and using foul language against those who have a position of respect and reverence among Muslims is against decorum and demeanor. It is an undesired, impolite and an indecent act and Imams of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) have prohibited it.”! [4]

B - To show differences between Ali and Caliphs as friendly

They say:

“Whatever passed in the early of days of Islam and whatever passed after passing away of Prophet between Ali and reputed companions (of the Prophet) it was certainly kind of friendly differences...” [5]

“What I oppose is ...changing in a statement, friendly differences that existed between Hazrat Ali (a.s.) and companions of Prophet into

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

[2] *Ibid.* Interview published in *Nida-e-Islam Magazine*, Issue 4, Winter 79, Pgs. 62-64

[3] *Ibid.* *Jam-e-Jam Daily*, Issue No. 8, Bahman 1379

[4] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Payaam-e-Wahdat (Message of Unity)*, Pg. 274

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

inimical differences.”! [1]

C - Denial of Enmity in a sense of blame, to show relations were intimate between Ali and Caliph

Thus it is said:

“If be it compelling that our outer and inner phases should be different and our account in relation to early days of Islam is not clear before ourselves and God and we wish to stress on unity for the sake of interests and we think as if there existed enmity between Ali and Caliphs, we achieve nothing...”! [2]

“As far as it concerns Ali and the three Caliphs particularly to Ali, he never behaved with his competitors inimically.”!**[3]**

“Our elders and leaders, Ali, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were not enemies of each other.”!**[4]**

D - To Show Rulership Worthless from Ali’s Viewpoint

They say:

“Ali regarded power (executive) far below a worn-out shoe; on this score he cannot harbor avarice against Muslims.”!**[5]**

“Ali was so high that he could not entertain hatred against any on account of an unworthy matter.”!**[6]**

“The spirit of Ali was so high that he could not yield to hate a Muslim on ground of a worldly position.”!**[7]**

E - Mending the Method of Shia Propaganda

They say:

“Our difficulty is in the method of our propaganda. The method that we have to describe Shiaism is in the first place a curse to Caliphs and

[1] *Ibid. Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379*

[2] *Ibid. Interview published in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue 4, Winter 79, Pg. 62*

[3] *Ibid. Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 10, Bahman 1379*

[4] *Ibid. Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379*

[5] *Ibid. Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379*

[6] *Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Mashal-e-Ittehaad (Torch of Unity), Pg. 22*

[7] *Ibid. Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami (Unity of Islamic Sects), (Preface to the 3rd Edition) Pg. 11*

companions. Therefore we can never make any progress”!**[1]**

Closing Reminder

Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi writes:

“We know since the Ummah attributed by Islam and Quran, faces a joint enemy who wants to destroy the very foundation of religion reason dictates that the whole Ummah together with Shia and Sunni should campaign united in one row to defend existence of religion and themselves.

However this does not necessitate Shias to withdraw issue of Tawalla and Baraat. These two fundamentals are like life and death of Islam with Shias. It does not mean showing leniency to adversaries. At the stage of argument and research, or at the stage of preaching and propaganda in public meetings and common medias, or in position of teaching in educational centre and training of children and youths it must be maintained that belief of the other side should be respected. Unity must be preserved from getting injured. True belief could be kept untold. These are the stations where frankness and openness in speech could prove hurtful. Hence could be refrained. The next generation regarding the belief will remain in suspect and surmise.”**[2]**

“Very seriously, we must be mindful and closely advertent of Satan to not mislead us. There might appear many titles such as unity, co-ordination, respect to Islamic brotherhood and so forth. To take up common issues and leave singular elements, which are attractive of appearance but should not spoil the glitter of the pearl of our faith. Special care should be taken to see that pillars of faith among young generation might not be shaken or even destroyed. The matter of political unity may not be turned into a unity of beliefs. And by sorting, they could easily project the real, original and correct Islam in two wings - Shia and Sunni - in the minds of plain-hearted people who have no real information in the field. And both those wings are not real and although they would introduce to them as correct and original Islam of true and right path. Ultimately and consequently, the two main pillars of *Baraat* and *Tawalla* will fade

out and decay totally. As such, the real Islam of Prophet Muhammad will vanish from the minds of Shias. Islam will fall down when these basic

[1] *Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in 'Haft Aasmaan' (Seven Skies) Magazine, Issues 9 & 10, Spring & Summer 80, Pg. 26*

[2] *Ustad Sayyid Muhammad Dhiyabaadi: Dar Justujoo-e-Ilme-Deen (In search of religious knowledge), Pgs. 154-158*

pillars have fallen. The eternal life of man will be exchanged at a very low cost that is the expansion of Islam and a long stretch of its government and political advances. All this is only fancy and imagination.”**[1]**

[1] *Ibid. Pg. 157*

Part 13
Deviation in the Meaning of
Divinely-Granted Caliphate of Ali

Chapter 21

Introduction

It is a sad and painful incident of deviation in Shia belief. The purpose was Islamic unity. Political and social movement of Sayyid Jamaluddin Asadabadi was the impetus and it was his idea that gave beginning to utterances like:

“The difference of the names of Ali and Umar should be set aside and attention must be directed to Caliphate.”**[1]**

Vast endeavors and extensive efforts of pupils and followers of School of Sayyid Jamal for putting into practice his aspirations have been silenced. It was a desire for an extensive Islamic Caliphate. Today there is no word of it except that:

“...The system of Caliphate with Sunni sect can be a ground for oneness of Muslims and all Muslim countries...”**[2]**

From one side followers of this thought and belief for attaining Islamic unity under a title of only way for pacifying and appeasing Shia-Sunni differences met with a hot welcome. This has been continuing since the time of Mashrota until today.

With attention to Sunni School in subject of Imamate and Caliphate in its prime stage, elements present in this school had to undergo a total purge. The very same thoughts of Sunni School in this ground among Shias were not common and were under a heavy criticism.

The purging elements related to this system of thought provide room for pro-Sunni elements to creep in the folds of

Shia beliefs. The sensitiveness of Shias with regard to argument of Imamate and Caliphate gave a hand too.

However this erroneous thought with a productive faculty of errors had one fruit. And that was an influence of deviation in belief of Imamate.

[1] *Nazim-ul-Islam Kermani: Tarikh-e-Bedaari-e-Iraniaan (History of Iranian Awakening), Vol. 1, Pgs. 114-115*

[2] *Sayyid Ahmad Mawassaqi: Istiratazi-e-Wahdat (Strategy of Unity), Vol. 2, Pg. 106*

This deviation gradually progressed to the extent of overturning the meaning and sense of Imamate during the presence of infallible Imams. Its black, dark shadow was cast on the Sun of Ghadeer and Caliphate of Ali. It took to itself various tendencies to an extent that even today we witness its deviation and wrong thinking in new molds and new models.

Criticism and Analysis

A walk into the park of thought of this group of continuing 'Imamate and Caliphate' and then a comparison of it with institute of Sunni thought[1] in this subject takes us to elements common in the outlooks of unity-seekers and Sunni beliefs[2] which are as follows:

First Conjecture: Imamate and Guardianship in Islam are only for the sake of Rulership!

In this respect, they say:

"In the pure and noble faith of Islam the subject of Imamate is not regarded as a part of the business to impart duties of administration, government, political and social affairs in the administration."![3]

"Imamate is the same authority and the run of political affairs of Islamic Ummah."![4]

"In Islam Imam means head of the government. His duties are repeatedly mentioned."![5]

"The dispute between Shia and Sunni which has been continuing since centuries is on the issue of rulership."![6]

"The holder of order (or the head) and the Islamic ruler means the executors of these two verses of Quran which is the duty on the part of Islamic governor..."

[1] *In order to learn about Sunni outlook especially regarding Imamate and Caliphate, refer to the books Peshwai az Nazar-e-Islamand Rahbari-e-Ummat by Ustad Ja'far Subhani.*

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

[3] *Haider Ali Qalamdaran: Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 52*

[4] *Ibid. Hukoomat Dar Islam (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 51*

[5] *Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Hukumat-e-Deeni O Hukumat-e-Mardumi (Government of religion and Government of people), Pg. 2*

[6] *Ibid. Hukumat-e-Deeni O Hukumat-e-Mardumi (Government of religion and Government of people), Pg. 2*

If the Islamic Governor executes an Islamic order, the title 'the head of affairs' (Wali-e-Amr) can be applied to him."! [1]

"The executor of Islamic rules is called 'head of affairs (Wali-e-Amr)."! [2]

Second Conjecture: Rulership in Islam is an Elected post!

They say:

"The choice of appointing the ruler after passing away of Prophet is in the hands of people. It is not even in the hand of the Prophet."! [3]

"The choice of the ruler is an acknowledged right of the Ummah."! [4]

"To select an Imam is a special right of the people."! [5]

"The chief executive of Muslims is electoral. The qualities of this post are specified in Quran. Muslim in each term should select one according to these specifications."! [6]

"To select 'the head of affairs' (Wali-e-Amr) is a fixed right of the people. According to specifications, his duties are subsidiary. It remains as long as Quran exists."! [7]

"To maintain a Quranic government is a responsibility on all Muslims. The ruler of Muslims is selected among them with opinion of masses."! [8]

"The issue of Caliphate is a national issue. To fix a ruler is in the hands of the people."! [9]

[1] Sayyid Asadullah Meer Islami Kharqani: *Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Quدرات-e-Islami* (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam) (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 101

[2] Ibid. *Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Quدرات-e-Islami* (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam) (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 38

[3] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam* (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 129

[4] Ibid. *Hukoomat Dar Islam* (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 77

[5] Ibid. *Hukoomat Dar Islam* (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 128

[6] Sayyid Asadullah Meer Islami Kharqani: *Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Qudrat-e-Islami* (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam) (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 38

[7] Ibid. *Raah-e-Tajdeed-e-Azmat O Qudrat-e-Islami* (Way to renovate the glory and power of Islam) (Preface by Sayyid Mahmood Taliqani), Pg. 290

[8] Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Article quoted in the book *Deen-O-Hukumat* (Religion and Rulership), Pg. 547

[9] Husain Ali Montazeri: *Mubaani-e-Fiqhi Hukumat-e-Islami* (Translated by Mahmood

“The public opinion in an Islamic government is a basic element for appointing the ruler.”! [1]

“People have a right to appoint a person who possesses conditions befitting a ruler to the post of a guardian and vest him with rulership.”! [2]

How to utilize these Conjectures to Create Deviation in the Meaning of Divinely-given Caliphate of Ali

So far we came to know how unity-seekers borrowed the thought from Sunni school and how they exerted efforts toward dissipating Sunni outlook about Imamate, Guardianship and Caliphate. We also came to know their basic idea, which runs as follows:

“To bring down the high station of Imamate to the level of social status of rulership and to believe it to be electoral.”!

It is obvious that this outlook is useful for creating Islamic unity and to create a sort of coherence between the two. This idea avoids the contrast as it overruns the right of Ali to Caliphate.

From one side we witness deviation in the sense of Caliphate, which by the Quranic text is attributed to Ali; a deviation, which has found a place among Shias besides giving a covering to wrong and impure idea.

This deviation has started from two conjectures, which are:

Conjecture A: Deviation in the Sense of Guardianship by Separating Imamate and Rulership

They say:

“We in very foundation consider infallible Imams as authority of God. We believe them as a guide to the people. We believe them as true narrators of God’s commandments and orders.

We have faith in them as protectors of religion from any deviation or perversion. Besides, we trust them as true and correct interpreters of divine decrees and Quranic text and traditions of Prophet. As such, this position is far higher than Imamate in the sense of rulership. Of course in their presence it becomes obligatory on the Ummah to regard them as Caliphs and rulers and to

Salawati) (Sources of Islamic jurisprudence in Islamic Government), Vol. 2, Section 4. Proof of occurrence of Caliphate by selection by people, Pg. 299

[1] Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: *Hukumat-e-Salihaan* (Government of the Righteous), Pg. 77

[2] Ibid. *Hukumat-e-Salihaan* (Government of the Righteous), Pg. 201

Part 14
Deviated Repercussion of these
Conjectures[1]

Caliphate is not a Monopoly of Amirul Momineen (a.s.)![2]

So they have said:

“Conditions laid down in Islam for head of affairs (Wali-e-Amr) are briefed in this sentence. The most suitable and befitting person for the post of a ruler must be selected.”!**[3]**

“The infallible Imams have two positions. Most important of all is they are guides, leaders and authorities from God. They are chosen ones to interpret and explain God’s rulings, decrees and what descended on the Prophet.

The other one is rulership and Guardianship. It is compulsory upon the Ummah to pay allegiance to and obey them. Since they are superior in knowledge than all others, people must choose and obey them.”!**[4]**

“In this fact there is no doubt that Ali was the most deserving person to succeed the Prophet. Neither Shia nor Sunni have any doubt in this regard.”!**[5]**

“The person of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) was more deserving than others for rulership. It is not in the sense that Caliphate is his belonging nor in the sense that Caliphate is prohibited for others. But the sense here is eligibility and the qualities – in which he stands first and above all.”!**[6]**

Caliph cannot be Exclusively Ali after the Prophet

[1] Attention in this regard shows why unity-seekers place their real idea in the argument of Imamate and Caliphate (elected government).

[2] Roots of this perverted outlook can be found in the conjecture of 'Obtained Imamate' in writings of people like Dr. Ali Shariati.

[3] Nimatullah Salihi Najafabadi: *Hukumat-e-Salihaan* (Government of the Righteous), Pg. 97

[4] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam* (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 124

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

[6] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam* (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 146

They say:

"Rulership and Caliphate in the sense of administration, as it is said, is his (Ali's) right. In spite of his acceptance it is prohibited to others. However it is not such an important post.

Rather Caliphate and rulership is among his (Ali's) positions. When he is not present or he did not become Caliph another one can be made a candidate or can be appointed."!**[1]**

"In such a case the second obligation becomes mandatory. The formation of Caliphate at consensus of Muhajireen and Ansaar becomes final and legitimate."!**[2]**

Usurpation of Ali's Caliphate is no more in Question!

It is said:

“Although he (Ali) rightfully considered himself more suitable and deserving, he did not consider others' Caliphate infidelity or usurpation.”!**[3]**

Caliphate of Caliphs is not illegitimate!

Such is said:

“In selecting the Caliph through consultation, companions of Prophet maintained rules of God and carried out Islamic regulations.”!**[4]**

“After passing away of Prophet immediately, companions of Prophet thought about Caliphate and formed a government of religion. Thus Caliphate of Caliphs came into being.”!**[5]**

[1] Ibid. *Hukoomat Dar Islam* (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 125

[2] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: *Nahjul Balagha* Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 176

[3] Sayyid Abul Fazl Barqayi: Preface to the book *Sharaha-e-It-tehaad* (Roads to Unity), Pg. D

[4] Haider Ali Qalamdaran: *Hukoomat Dar Islam* (Government in Islam), Vol. 1, Pg. 112

[5] Mustafa Husaini Tabatabai: Article quoted in the book *Deen-O-Hukumat* (Religion and Rulership), Pg. 545

Propagation of these Conjectures in the Name of Open-mindedness

The attraction of the name of election of the people and its resemblance to Western democracy – the foregone conjectures have found a place in attention of open-minded persons of the society.

Such is said:

“In accordance with sense and contents of Quranic verses and traditions and according to words of Ali himself (which are in plenty) the owner of rulership and the executors are people themselves. Islamic government is a democratic or public government.”!**[1]**

“The appointment or dismissal of an Imam or head of government must take place with choice and consultation of people...!”

According to clear texts, repeated statements and practice of Prophet and other four personages of the cloak, government of Muslims is government of people themselves. It is formed by their consultation. So the Sunni brothers will have no objection.”!**[2]**

Relation of Imamate and Caliphate from Shia Viewpoint

Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari writes in this respect:

“...an issue in the chapter of Imamate is government. In other words, what is the status of government after the Prophet?

Is it on shoulders of people; and is it for people themselves to appoint a government for themselves or is it on the Prophet? Whether he appointed a ruler when he is no more?

Since recently, they design the issue in a way that it strikes to mind the idea of Sunni sect to the effect that it appears normal and naturally common.

The wrong framing of the issue:

They frame the subject in a way as if we have a problem by name of government. We want to see in the name of government as to what is the government in the view of Islam?... **[3]**

[1] Engineer Mahdi Bazargan: *Besat-O-Idiolozy* (Proclamation and Ideology), Pg. 115

[2] Ibid. *Besat-O-Idiolozy* (Proclamation and Ideology), Pg. 148

[3] Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: *Imamat-o-Rahbari* (Imamate and Leadership), Pg. 67

If we pose Imamate in a plain way at the level of a government and say, it means government, we shall see the attraction exceeds what Sunni say and goes beyond what Shias say...**[1]**

We should not commit such a mistake to imagine a government at the very name of Imamate. As a result the issue, let it be however plain, this branch that has come into being should not lace it. This might occur to us as to who should take over the charge of government. He who wants to be a governor should he be superior to all others? Probably he who becomes a governor could be relatively superior and not absolutely. This is because we have treated this issue as of little importance. This is a mistake.

Today this mistake is often repeated.

As Imamate is mentioned, our mind goes to the meaning of government. Government is a branch - a very little side of Imamate.**[2]**

We say there is some other issue among Shias. If we fix that issue, the question of government too is settled. We believe in a position or office, which is immediately after prophethood or its subordination. In the presence or existence of that office, the issue of government comes into its fold. In other words issue of government is encompassed in existence of Prophet. Similarly in the presence of Imam - in the sense, which Shia says - the issue of government is itself in existence.**[3]**

The subject of Imamate itself entails prophethood. But it does not mean that its position is far below something close to prophethood - in its similarity. The great prophets in addition to their prophethood they had this office of Imamate too.**[4]**

Imamate is a phenomenon of prophethood exactly to the level of prophethood at its highest grades. It is such among Shias.**[5]**

Prophethood itself is an entity wherein exist thousands of things. The Prophet's existence makes Muslims needless of a ruler because he is the ruler. Government was one of the affairs of prophethood...**[6]**

[1] Ibid. Pg. 69

[2] Ibid. Pgs. 70-71

[3] Ibid. Pg. 113

[4] Ibid. Pg. 186

[5] Ibid. Pg. 163

[6] Ibid. Pg. 162

But it was not bestowed upon him by the people. This was a right given him by God, because he was a superior human being.

Since he was the interpreter of God's commandments and a moral link with the unseen world he had rulership too over the people...[1]

When we accept such a fact there arises no question of a ruler as long as the Prophet exists. He has a dimension beyond a human being. Likewise, as long as exists the Imam there arises no question as to who is to rule...[2]

From Shia viewpoint, question of government is same as it was in lifetime of Prophet. He has an exceptional government.

As the question of government does not rise in lifetime of Prophet, so it is in lifetime of Imam. The meaning of Imam as it is in belief of Shia, rescinds the issue of government. The issue of government is a branch issue and a dependent one...[3]

Therefore we must not regard issue of Imamate simple. We should not treat it as a worldly position.

Among Shias, Imamate is a living issue. In presence of Imam, there is no room for other as in the case of lifetime of Prophet.

And the Prophet had appointed Ali for Imamate. He who is Imam necessarily governs too. The Prophet has mentioned 'rulership' in addition to 'he is the Imam after me.' [4]

He writes under the heading: 'In presence of infallible there is no room for selection' thus:

"The subject of Imamate with regard to leadership and government is: Now like the days of Prophet there exists an infallible. The Prophet had appointed his successor who was not to the level of other persons because his level was too high. And with regard to his capabilities and standards he was exceptional like the Prophet himself. Therefore there arises no question of consultation and selection.

In the days of the Prophet, no one said that the Prophet was a Messenger and a recipient of divine revelation. So the government must be framed by consultation. People should come and cast their opinion whether to

[1] Ibid. Pg. 112

[2] Ibid. Pg. 163

[3] Ibid. Pg. 147

[4] Ibid. Pg. 81

select someone else or the Prophet himself for the post of ruler. But people thought that the Prophet is above ordinary persons and that he has links with the world of revelation. Now after the Prophet there is no place for these sayings. But one thing is undeniable. Having had an infallible person purged from mistakes and perfect in earthly and heavenly knowledge, should we go to another one instead?

Besides, Ali was an Imam. So the worldly post of leadership too will be his lot all by itself. The Prophet has explained this aspect too. The Prophet referred this position to Ali because Ali had the other position also.” **[1]**

[1] Ibid. Pg. 80

Part 15
Discourse Seven Denial of Differences between Ali and Caliphs

Chapter 22

Introduction

It seems necessary to take into consideration events that took place in early days of Islam with their details and fundamentals of Shia belief and teachings of Shia school for analysis. Otherwise events will be interpreted according to desire by overlooking some occurrences or avoiding a part of them, deleting the beginning and end or ignoring principles of Shia belief, or by linking separate events to each other and a reason will be found for it.

This is the method and way of deviation not only in historical events but also in some researches of belief.

Such a trend in the event means to set aside fundamentals of belief and to take up similarities of history. By this way one's view or opinion in Islamic history, traditions and on Islamic texts can be inserted or applied. Even opinion of other researchers can be shown in a wrong light.

They separate an event from the whole history. This is one of the wrong thoughts being propagated for creating Islamic unity. They make Shia belief remote from event. This they do to prove that there did not exist any difference between Ali and Caliphs.

No tyranny took place anywhere, neither a right was snatched away from Ali.

It seems that the great obstacles in way of inserting this matter are events in history which started from Saqifah Bani Saada.

In any case every reader has a little study and some information about history of early Islam. So he knows the events immediately after passing away of Prophet. No matter this information could be on basis of Sunni sources. He cannot believe so simply that there was no difference between Ali and Caliphs. It could be possible that narration might have taken a different trend. The word difference might have been used in a sense of friendly not inimical difference, or the enmity of one side might be denied which followed the Saqifah and resulted in martyrdom of Mohsin and then martyrdom of Zahra herself. In the end relations might be shown as friendly.

Such they have written:

“Difference in a society – like that of Islamic – after passing away of Prophet could be of two dimensions. One: a brotherly difference; the other: an inimical one...

My conclusion is whatever happened in the early days of Islam among Muslims particularly after passing away of Prophet between Ali and companions of Prophet was certainly a friendly difference.”!**[1]**

Those who infuse such doubts have forgotten that one of parties to these differences, named friendly, was an infallible Imam. God vested him with mandate to repudiate differences in the Islamic Ummah.

One of the reasons of Shia for continuity of Imamate after prophethood is existence of differences among Muslims and necessity of their removal by an infallible source. God appointed the Prophet to remove differences between Muslims. In the same way, God appointed infallible Imam as only source to repudiate differences. God bestowed on him a faculty that safeguards him from mistakes or ignorance. He is the only source after the Prophet. Differences are nullified by referring to him. His word and practice are final authorities and distinguisher of right from wrong and virtue from vice. To deny his ruling is not acceptable and an absolute wrong.

Therefore to put in a word in the trend or attitude the Imam adopts is an open treachery from command of God. Treachery against God's orders and standing face to face in open disobedience to authority of God, that is the infallible Imam, is in itself a source of difference. There is no justification, whatsoever, even though the difference be a friendly one.

Even if we ignore this mistake of belief there still remains an important point to be heeded. Supposing the difference was a friendly one, the first question that arises is what was the reason for this difference?

History gives us answer to this question: The difference starts from Saqifah where the God-given right of Ali, which the Prophet had already made known to masses in Ghadeer, was usurped. Then atrocities were openly unleashed on him (Ali) and his wife Zahra. Ali himself had said: "...in these circumstances I am not alone on whom tyranny is being done."**[2]**

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

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

Here one should ask whether tyranny and atrocity could have a brotherly or friendly nature and characteristic? Can we say such a difference was a family issue or a brotherly one? Zahra, the only daughter of the Prophet has had been complaining too often. Were her complaints brotherly? Did she complain of friendly atrocities? Can a tyranny be friendly? If it was friendly, why Zahra kept complaining to God about the tyranny?**[1]**

Another point is:

If Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) after these oppressions, tyrannies and usurpation of Caliphate from the aspect of protecting Islam and responsibilities the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) had given him from Allah, does this reflect that Ali was happy or indifferent in his heart about tyrannies and atrocities done to him and his wife, Zahra? Does this mean that Ali treated the tyrannies committed to him as brotherly and friendly? Ali was under a mandate from the Prophet to tolerate tyranny for the sake of preserving Islam**[2]** although his Caliphate was taken away from him. He refrained from taking back his right by an armed

uprising because his motive and aim was greater and nobler. He had to remain honest to Prophet's recommendations to him.

Can Ali be sympathetic and have normal behavior and ordinary conduct against a tyrant, usurper and murderer? He himself has referred to this. **[3]**

If he remained silent to avoid war and bloodshed to protect Quran from being destroyed totally and likewise the family of the Prophet; does this mean that it was a brotherly difference?

On many occasions Ali interfered in the dealings of Caliphs. This shows his sympathy towards Islamic Ummah and its interests. It was his intention to protect religion from being destroyed. Such is the conduct of men of God against biggest enemies of faith, or God or themselves. Men of God have always behaved as such. They show endurance and tolerance in most pressing conditions. They have always invited to good and a straight way. However this cannot mean that they were looking eye to eye with the tyrants. It does not reflect that they did not have differences or that they were friendly with them.

[1] Refer: Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379

[2] That is protection of Quran and Ahle Bayt (a.s.) and absence of apostasy and return of the Ummah to the conditions of idol-worship and ignorance.

[3] "Be enemy to a tyrant and helper to a victim" Ali's will to his sons, Hasan and Husain, *Nahjul Balagha*, Muhammad Abduh, Letter No. 47.

This particularity also displays their (the enemies') conduct towards the Imam. It has been said:

"Our elders and leaders, Ali, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were not enemies with each other though they had differences with each other - very serious differences. But they were not one another's enemy." **[1]**

The calamity that happened after Saqifah; what was it, if not sign of enmity?

Certainly, they will say:

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

It is pitiable that designers of this outlook have forgotten important principles of belief and authenticity of word and deed of Infallible. Instead of going after origin of this difference, which is to turn away from God’s authority, they should have paid attention to the fact that it is all to give shape to their design. It is an effort to justify differences.

Shia logic is that an infallible Imam is a pivot of truth. Whoever is not in its circle or in its rotation has strayed and lost in darkness of vice and wrong.

The Quran says:

“So what is after the truth but going astray?”**[3]**

Well, has not the Prophet said this about Ali?

“Ali is with truth and the truth with Ali.”**[4]**

Still can we consider the difference a justified one? Can we classify it?

The base on which the difference rests is wrong. Disobedience and going treacherous in orders and instructions give rise to differences. Whether differences are friendly or do not make any difference.

To be at a difference with an infallible Imam is itself going astray. It is by root wrong and a sin though it may be named friendly.

[1] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Jam-e-Jam Daily, Issue No. 12, Bahman 1379

[2] Ibid. Interview published in Nida-e-Islam Magazine, Issue 4, Winter 79, Pg. 61

[3] Surah Yunus 10:32

[4] To know the sources of this tradition refer to *Ahqaaqul Haqq*, Vol. 5, Pg. 28, 43, 623, 638 and Vol. 16, Pgs. 384-397

The base of differences is tyranny, atrocity and usurping God-bestowed right of Ahle Bayt of Prophet. To deny their authority to lift the differences is to deny God’s decree. These differences are on the ruins of religion. Calling them friendly cannot change the reality.

Whatever the trend and attitude, contact and conduct of a party to differences was towards safeguarding God's religion, Quran and family of the Prophet. However vast the differences it cannot be a proof for existence of friendship or facing of the Imam in friendly terms against those who had usurped his right of Caliphate. It cannot be a proof for non-existence of implacabilities and rancor on the other side of dispute.

In fact, if they had not turned their backs upon the pivot of truth no difference would have come into being.

Because Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) had divine mandate for his responsibility and a mission from God, he adopted a special attitude in his relations with Caliphs. He avoided armed uprising. On no occasion did he give up his right to demand what was taken away from him. He kept his demand alive. **[1]**

Caliphs also had to cover their scandal and ignorance of Islam and administration; so occasionally they were in consultation with Ali. **[2]** In itself, it

[1] Ali did not refrain throughout the periods of Caliphs from stating that the caliphate was this right. Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: *Seeri Dar Seerah Aimmah-e-Athaar* (A Glance at the Life of Purified Imams), Pg. 22

[2] In cases of consultations if attention were paid it is seen on many occasions Caliphs and even companions have given their opinion. The Imam too has given his opinion. On the occasions when Caliphs were interrogated by non-Muslims in religious and scientific matters, Caliphs did not refer to the Imam. Even in some cases, it has been seen that Caliphs did not accept Imam's view or opinion. Sometime the Caliph used to ignore the presence of Imam. The Caliph, whether right or wrong, had issued his judgment without referring to Imam.

In order to be acquainted with the limited number of cases wherein the caliph consulted the Imam, refer to the list in the Second Volume of this book.

The important point, which must not be ignored, is:

Claim A: The Second Caliph gave priority to opinion of Ali over opinions of all companions. He had gone so far as to give

orders to the effect that no one had a right to give his judgment or opinion as long as Ali was in the mosque. Sometimes in the consulting committee, Umar treated Ali's opinion as final. On many occasions, he had acknowledged that Ali was superior to all in knowledge. (Abdul Kareem Biazar Shirazi, Keyhan Farhangi, No 184, Bahman 8, Pg. 16)

is a proof of their ignorance and not knowing the job. They had occupied the Prophet's position they did not deserve.

There was no sign to show either side was on good terms with the other. Although there was no open dispute or a row between them, yet the terms took most awkward trend.

In the early days of usurpation of Caliphate there occurred a harsh entanglement and ended by attack on Zahra's house.

Claim B: Umar has too often and too repeatedly said: "This judgment of Ali is better than all our judgments."

When he reached to the Caliphate, he took refuge in God from the situation when he is entangled in a difficult issue and Ali too is not present. Before him Abu Bakr and after him Uthman also sought his help in their difficulties. (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious, Vol. 2, Pg. 7)

The root goes back to the acknowledgement of Caliphs. They have tried to cover their usurping the government which was a God-bestowed right of Ali.

Umar during his Caliphate told Ibne Abbas: "Ali was more suitable and befitting to the post of ruler than me and Abu Bakr. Ibne Abbas said then why he was sidelined? Umar immediately replied: "We do not take decisions without consulting Ali."

(Ali Muhammad Mir Khalili: Imam Ali and the Rulers, Pg. 167) Caliphs' attitude towards attaining consultation of companions can be regarded as their diplomacy to make them feel they also have a share in affairs of government. Besides, it minimized their objections to a certain extent.

This method seemed necessary throughout the long period. The causes of Uthman's assassination can be found in this very ground because he had abolished to take advice, which was in contrast to his two predecessors. One of the complaints of those who had surrounded his house was that he did not take

their advice. Those who surrounded his house complained addressing Uthman. There are points worth noting:

“During your caliphate you have thrashed the companions of Prophet for guiding the people and inviting you back to the right path and be just in your doings. So now it is your turn to pay the cost of your wrong doings.”

(Allamah Askari: Role of Ayesha in Islamic History, Vol. 1, Pg. 251)

Caliphs were always anxious to give legitimacy to their rule. They tried to gain the attention of Ali in whatever way it was possible. They tried to show to the people that Ali was pleased with them. Therefore they were very much serious in their endeavors.

In spite of all this we still see them claiming:

“As soon as Ali paid allegiance to Caliph he became intimate with him.”!**[1]**

“Ali paid allegiance to Caliphs. Since he had a high spirit, he did not take anybody’s rancor to heart. But he behaved sincerely with them.”!**[2]**

“Although Ali was aware that he was more suitable and deserving to be Caliph, yet he behaved gently with Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. He extended help to them without any hesitation.”!**[3]**

“There is no crime more serious than that even though there was peace between the Imam and Caliphs people fell into differences among themselves.”!**[4]**

Such comments and statements, injecting ideas that the Imam and Caliphs were on good terms entail wrong consequences. For instance:

The rule of Abu Bakr and Umar has come out of the circle of usurpation. The logic of people of Saqifah has taken legitimacy.

More pitiable is that they frame various arguments to prove that Ali had confirmed legitimacy of their government while it was his right. How can this be possible?

Furthermore, they say:

“Acceptance and acknowledgement of Ali shows from his own (Ali’s) outlook that their government was a legal and legitimate one.”!**[5]**

Regretfully, such types of statements and comments go a long way to justify Caliphs’ government. The deviations, perversions, crimes and innovations in religion are thus either forgotten or hidden in an umbrella of such false claims. Their atrocities and enmity with infallible Ahle Bayt of Prophet are ignored. It is claimed:

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Mashal-e-Ittehaad* (Torch of Unity), Pg. 22

[2] Ibid. *Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami* (Unity of Islamic Sects), (Preface to the 3rd Edition), Pg. 11

[3] Ibid. *Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami* (Unity of Islamic Sects), (Preface to the 3rd Edition) Pg. 207

[4] Ibid. *Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami* (Unity of Islamic Sects), (Preface to the 3rd Edition) Pg. 217

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

“Seeking distance from enemies of Ahle Bayt of Prophet (i.e. Baraat) is applied on only three Caliphs.”!**[1]**

“Rude historical portrayal of the three Caliphs must be looked at anew.”!**[2]**

Ali did not campaign. It is true. But it does not mean he was a friend of them. He had a greater aim. He avoided people going back to their recent position; that is idol worship, to the days prior to Islam.**[3]** He wanted to protect the land of revelation from foreign enemies. He had to save the life of the Prophet’s family from hypocrites.

This attitude is attributed to silence and silence construed as acceptance and co-operation with Caliphs.**[4]** Likewise, they try to establish friendship between Imam and Caliphs. The long rankling enmity of Caliphs with Ahle Bayt (a.s.) is over-ridden. Consequently it will entail legitimacy to Caliphs’ government.

Such a movement goes beyond necessary limits for protecting political unity and laying a lid over dispute and differences.

Criticism and Analysis

“Ali did not give up his right because he kept complaining and demanding his right from those who had usurped it. He frankly and openly made his right known to all. He did not see this as a hindrance or setback to Islamic unity. There are several speeches in *Nahjul Balagha* to establish this fact.**[5]** In spite of all this, he did not withdraw himself from

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

[2] Ibid. Aftaab-e-Yazd Daily, Issue No. 9, Tir 1381

[3] Silence for the sake of unity does not mean approval to usurpation of his divine right of Caliphate and an effort of protecting this usurped rulership!

[4] Many such statements are present in the Section One of the book, *Strategy of Unity* (Section of the biographies of Imams)!

[5] This rests on the same wrong analysis that for the sake of national unity he maintained friendly relations with Saqifah’s caliphate. Ali overlooked his and his wife’s right for the sake of unity of Muslims. He endured all sorts of tyranny. He gave priority to Muslim unity over himself and his wife and his sons. (Sayyid Jawad Mustafawi: Article: ‘Unity in Nahjul Balagha’ in *The Book of Unity*, Pg. 131)

The behavior of Ali was regarded a distinction to national unity. For this reason whatever action he took with regards to his rights he was careful that unity which was a principle to him should not be harmed. Whenever he thought that his principle was getting hurt he used to ignore his own right. (Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview in ‘Haft Aasmaan’ (Seven Skies) Magazine, Nos.9-10 spring, Summer 80, Pg. 11)

the rows of Muslims before the strangers. Ali kept the same attitude in practice too. Besides, personally he did not accept any post in government of any Caliph. He did not accept any. He neither accepted any military post nor a civil one neither in any district nor province or responsibility of pilgrims. When he

did not accept any post, it does not denote his acceptance of their government or his overlooking of their tyranny in depriving him of his right.**[1]** He himself did not accept any office but he did not prevent his family members, friends or companions to accept any post. To accept a job in administration could be co-operation with them. But it was by no means sanction to their right to rule.”**[2]**

Therefore it is better to expound here the historical bitter and painful truth.**[3]** We should not distort facts or show partiality. Else the coming generation will take for granted these things as a matter of belief not on the basis of happenings.

“We should not consider Caliphs restricted from Caliphate particularly when the Imam had been on good terms with them. He was co-operative and even intimate to them. Further the Imam was their guide openly and secretly.”!**[4]**

Such a reflection of events; does it not make stronger pillars of rulership which had come into being through intrigue and treachery at Saqifah? And this very

[1] In this duration Ali was outside the political as well as military arena. During Abu Bakr’s Caliphate he did not accept any responsibility. He did the same in the time of Umar. He did not accept the post of the commander at the time of Iran invasion. At the time of journey of Umar to Palestine, Umar took all companions of Prophet along with him. Ali took the responsibility of administration of Medina. This was the only exceptional case. It is remarkable here that Umar was strongly against Bani Hashim going out of Medina. He feared their influence in districts outside Medina or their military action which he had anticipated.

(Jalal Darikhsha: *Mawaaze Siyasi Hazrat Ali Dar Qibal Mukhalifeen* (Political stands of Ali against opponents), Pg. 54

[2] Ustad Murtuza Mutahhari: *Imamat-o-Rahbari* (Imamate and Leadership), Pg. 20-21

[3] When the curtain is lifted from Saqifah the events come to light. The assault on Fatima’s house, usurping the caliphate and confiscation of Fadak in all these bad and criminal

intentions of Caliphs are obvious. It bars the way for dividing God-bestowed positions and makes clear that Members of Prophet's House took no step of friendship towards them.

[4] Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani: Article in *Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami* (Unity of Islamic Sects), translation Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Pg. 222

Saqifah is an open disobedience to Quranic text and God's ruling. The political game of Saqifah was a deviation among Muslims and formation of a government in contradiction to the government of God. A false justification of peace and friendship between the Imam and Caliphs cannot give legitimacy to their tyrannical treachery.

The false peace and friendship on the part of the Imam who was a true one and God's Caliph over the earth in favor of Abu Bakr's false Caliphate will give it legitimacy.

What History says?

“If this statement be true that in the lifetime of Prophet of God two different political movements existed among Muhajireen. There were those who were trying to obtain Caliphate. It should be confessed that from those days the Imam and Shaykhain (Abu Bakr and Umar) should have not been on good terms. In the information about conduct, nothing exists to prove this. Likewise, there does not exist anything to show friendship between them. The enmity of Ayesha with Ali existed from the very days of the Prophet. She herself has admitted this fact. This shows the differences between the progeny of Abu Bakr and the progeny of Ali. When Fatima died, all the Prophet’s widows took part in mourning ceremonies. But Ayesha did not participate under excuse of sickness. Anyway, something was narrated to Ali. It was that Ayesha had expressed her happiness. Immediately after Abu Bakr’s Caliphate, she started proving the legitimacy of Caliphate and created troubles for Ali and his relatives.

Zahra’s house was attacked. She was angry with the two (Abu Bakr and Umar). Zahra in her will banned them from attending her burial. This deepened the differences. Since then Imam isolated himself in his house and got busy with affairs of his private life. The government had expected him in view of his paying allegiance, **[1]** to not claim his right. They even

[1] By the martyrdom of Zahra, Ali lost a supporter. Thus Ali became obliged to yield to Abu Bakr’s Caliphate. This he had to do to protect Islam and to avoid the hypocrites and pagans from availing an excuse. For instance, a few persons had claimed prophethood outside Medina. For example, Musailaima who claimed prophethood in the days of Prophet himself. When the Prophet died his family members and his tribe surrounded him in a display of physical support to him. He too had prepared rhetoric verses. His claim was: one prophet for his tribe and one for Quraish. He had prepared forty thousand warriors to attack Medina and to reduce it to dust. Had he reached Medina the first ones he would have killed was Ali and his sons, Hasan and Husain. Then he would have destroyed the grave of Prophet and erased all remaining signs

expected him to take up his sword in way of strengthening their rulership and to fight with their adversaries. But Imam rejected this request from them. So it was quite normal that they belittle him against such an attitude of his.**[1]** This policy pushed the Imam into further isolation.”**[2]**

“Relations of the Imam with Abu Bakr were too cold as though there were no good memories at all. But in his relations with Umar, there are many memories most of them are Imam’s assistance to him in judicial matters. Besides, his help in answering the questions is another factor.**[3]** Umar used to apparently behave gently with the Imam. He tried not to be obviously harsh towards him. Likewise, Imam too maintained same reciprocation. But Uthman was not like this. He did not tolerate Imam’s opinions...”**[4]**

from the face of the earth. Next to him there was a woman from the tribe of Bani Tameem named Sajjah. She had succeeded in gathering a gang around her. She too claimed that she was a prophetess. A number of people had returned to their initial status of idol worship. The following claimed to be kings: Noman Bin Munzir Saavi Tameem. He had his coronation in Bahrain. Another one was Laqeet Bin Malik from Bani Najiah tribe. In Omman he was called ‘Zultaaj’ (crowned). In such circumstances Uthman approached Ali and said: “O, Cousin! You are witnessing this situation. If you do not yield, Islam is facing danger.” So, Ali yielded for the sake of safeguarding Islam. Ali himself says: “I had given up. But I saw people had turned their backs at Islam. And the faith which the Prophet had brought was fast vanishing from the people as they were inviting among themselves to this end. Hence I feared if I do not help and support Muslims and Islam a great defeat will happen to Islam. In that case the havoc will too greater for me than to lose the government of a few days over you.”

It was after Ali’s *Bayyat* that Abu Bakr was able to send troops outside Medina. However for the sake of centralizing Islam *Bayyat* of Ali was quite necessary. So it is an established fact that had not Ali given *Bayyat* Islam would have never survived. So we are rather under an obligation to Ali because of his *Bayyat* Islam existed and we are Muslims accordingly.

(Allamah Askari: *Role of Imams in revival of faith*, Vol. 14, Pg. 35-36) For more details of the above case refer to Section One of 4th Volume of this book.

[1] Umar respected Ibn Abbas more and gave priority to belittle Ali. This was a policy so that Ibn Abbas narrate traditions. Allamah Askari: *Saqifah*, Pg. 73

[2] Rasool Ja'faryan: *Hayat-e-Fikri O Siyasi-e-Imamaan-e-Shia* (Intellectual and Political Life of Shia Imams), Pg. 53

[3] In matters of utmost importance when Umar was not able to take a decision he used to consult Ali.

[4] Rasool Ja'faryan: *Hayat-e-Fikri O Siyasi-e-Imamaan-e-Shia* (Intellectual and Political Life of Shia Imams), Pg. 57

“To oppose the government was very difficult for the Imam. In the early days the Imam tried to avoid facing the government by isolating himself. Saad bin Ubadah was rather a good experience.**[1]** He did not pay allegiance to Abu Bakr. All of a sudden news reached that Jinns had murdered him.”**[2]**

“Of course whenever an opportunity arose he did claim his right. In the early days of Abu Bakr's Caliphate, he did not pay allegiance for a few months. It was still initial stage of Abu Bakr's Caliphate that Ali used to take his wife and sons and go from door to door of the Ansaar to remind them about Prophet's words and demand the right snatched from him by intrigue.

His insistence was to the extent that he was accused of greed for Caliphate.”**[3]**

“Regarding evaluation of Imam about the three Caliphs this much can be said: In each of the periods, Imam was not free to express his evaluation about the two Caliphs. But during the period of Uthman, whenever an occasion or an opportunity arose he expressed his conclusions and opinions.

The reason was that his soldiers in Kufa were such that except for a few all had accepted two Caliphs (Abu Bakr and Umar). So the Imam could not speak his mind in their presence or in their gathering. Once he availed an opportunity, he

started exposing his agonies caused by them. Then all of a sudden he turned the trend of his speech and did not continue the subject.”**[4]**

“Inspite of his alertness and care he did not accept the condition of Abdur Rahman bin Auf in the days of Shura committee. The condition was that the Imam should follow Abu Bakr and Umar’s practice in his Caliphate. Imam refused and said he will act according to his own Ijtihad.

This refusal clearly shows Imam’s attitude to the two Caliphs. This shows that their conduct in most cases was against Prophet’s conduct and God’s pleasure.

[1] Refer: Allamah Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Af-saane* (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pgs. 143-147

[2] Rasool Ja’faryan: *Hayat-e-Fikri O Siyasi-e-Imamaan-e-Shia* (Intellectual and Political Life of Shia Imams), Pg. 57

[3] Ibid. Pg. 58

[4] Ibid. Pg. 59

Imam’s speeches and proceeds during his government reflect his displeasure about dealings of the past two Caliphs.”**[1]**

The Result

“Each side of the Imam’s isolated life in that society is an indicator that he himself and Caliphs were aware of this fact that they cannot behave or deal with each other as to show his approval to them and to their Caliphate.”**[2]**

Likewise:

“There is not a least doubt that the Imam had no part in the run of affairs during three Caliphates. He only gave his opinion where judicial cases were concerned. And still more limited he gave opinion only in political concern. Therefore he had no serious or sincere presence in political scene of past three Caliphs. In short, Ali had no membership or chair in the framework of government of three Caliphs. So it can be said that he had leadership of the opposition party from a distance.”**[3]**

Reminder

The point in explanation of Ali's activities of belief and knowledge should be paid attention to is:

The real identity of Imam's activities lies in his endeavors towards wiping out dust of deviation and wreckage from original face of Islamic teachings and propaganda of Islamic fundamentals. There is no doubt how he tried to renew the real entity of faith. This becomes clearer when anti-Islamic movements of Caliphs are sketched in detail.

If we magnify the limited activities of Imam, it will result rather in giving a misleading picture to the people. Whatever he did must be kept against whatever Caliphs did. Then only can be understood Imam's services to Islam. Caliphs damaged Islam and its teachings. Imam Ali (a.s.) mended the damage. The scope is wider. It embraces military, economical, cultural, social and political spheres. The work of Ali cannot be conceived without a comparison with the work of previous three Caliphs. We add here what is said:

“Since the revolution which Islam brought was a revolution of faith and culture, it did not depend on aimed campaign. After demise of Prophet,

[1] Ibid. Pg. 59

[2] Ibid. Pg. 60

[3] Ibid. Pg. 61

Imam (Ali) occupied himself in this said activity, which was of utmost importance and priority. This he did to provide a thorough and consummate answer to objections and attacks (in sphere of belief) of the scholars of newly conquered countries. Further, to be able to cater to the queries of lawyers and jurists. Far beyond this, to provide a stock of teachings that could be embraced without hesitation in countries that had accepted Islam as their faith. So in the fronts of law, belief, principles, Islamic cultural issues, jurisprudence and other issues he was well equipped with the needed sources.”**[1]**

“After Prophet’s passing away Imam Ali (a.s.) throughout the span of three Caliphs because of his God-bestowed sagacity, intelligence and ministry he had been a pivot of Islamic revolution. He engaged himself in giving guidance to people and Caliphs at the same time.”**[2]**

He [Imam Ali (a.s.)] fulfilled the task of highest degree of honest consultant of Caliphs in all grounds, political and military. He had physical presence in the arena. As far as he could he held the people and Caliphs from going astray, becoming disobedient to divine rulings, deviating from standards established by Prophet, going corrupted, treacherous and sinful by advising and enjoining good and restraining from evil.”**[3]**

A Note

We have specified all aspects and dimensions of this discussion regarding extremist unity-seekers in second volume of this book. We suffice with this much in this volume. We invite your attention to the analysis of Ustad Ja’far Murtuza Amili in his book *Analysis of the political life of Imam Hasan Mujtaba*(2nd Edition, Pgs. 88-125):

He commences his analysis under the heading: ‘A Surprising Role’ and writes:

“Events took place which are known and recorded in history. Ali was sidelined from Islamic Caliphate and isolated in his house.

Politics of the system that ruled and those who came to power treated Imamate with two aims.

1 - They started injecting spirit of disappointment and hopelessness into

[1] Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Kayhan Farhangi, Issue No. 184, Bahman 80, Pg. 15

[2] Ibid. *Seemai Imam-e-Muttaqeen*, (Portrait of the Imam of the Pious), Vol. 7, Pg. 18

[3] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: Ittelaat Daily, Issue No. 26, Khordad 1379

adversaries; even to Ali himself. They regarded Ali as most powerful and stronger of all besides seeing him as a strong rival and competitor.

They started erasing out all signs of aspirations and intentions to reach to Caliphate....”

Ustad Ja’far Murtuza in continuation of his analysis derives the following results through documents and proofs, which he produces in this respect:

“Government authorities were trying that Ali might forget the issue of Caliphate and Imamate and lose heart in reaching it.”

Then the Ustad writes in his analysis about the second aim of Caliphs:

2 - They prepared ground to confirm and establish Caliphate in favor of those whom they held in their view and choice. They tried to create such conditions and circumstances, which could keep out Ali and any member of Ahle Bayt (a.s.) of the Prophet from getting Caliphate.

The Ustad dwells on political calculations of Caliphs towards attaining these aims. He produces historical documents. He counts ten attitudes in this respect and deals each of them individually.

Part 16
Deviation in Criticism of Ali
about Caliphs

Chapter 23

Introduction

Some supporters of Islamic unity have produced a feeble analysis. They claim thereupon that no political difference existed between Ali and Caliphs. However in this respect they face a difficulty. This difficulty is the strong and harsh criticism of Caliphs from Ali.[1] The criticism is so strong that it rescinds all possibilities of naming it peace or good terms or friendship.

Therefore unity-seekers attribute this attitude and criticism of Ali to his higher morals and decorum in comparison to ability of Caliphs in administration of government. By this analysis and their own, they have gone so far as to forget the holy text in this respect. All these endeavors at whatever cost, are to give credit to the plot of Saqifah. They think that the only shortcoming of Saqifah was absence of Ali.[2] To propagate this conjecture they do not refrain from laying hands on whatever comes handy to them. Here is one:

“Is it right to say that there existed interest and opinion in the mind of Ali which concerned him? But the fact is that he saw himself stronger to Caliphate because he held himself and members of his family stronger than others in running affairs of government.”![3]

In fact, such an outlook acknowledges independence of one from the other between Imamate and rulership. The outlook confirms each a separate entity from the other.

Then on the basis of this separation, he dwells on the error of Saqifah to select an Islamic ruler with the required qualities. In

the end he sees Ali as the deserving person for the post. Then from here Ali is ignored and forgotten.

Therefore criticism of Ali becomes too light. It takes up a level of complaint to the effect that one says: How this one was selected when there was a more

[1] For more information about these matters refer to book *Sahaba Az Deedgaah-e-Nahjul Balagha* (Companions in the view of *Nahjul Balagha*) By Dawood Ilhaami.

[2] After the death of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) Saqifah was arranged without consulting Ali and Abu Bakr was made the caliph. (Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: *Mashal-e-Ittehaad* (Torch of Unity), Pg. 20

[3] Ibid. *Mashal-e-Ittehaad* (Torch of Unity), Pg. 22

deserving one?

So in this regard it is said:

“If words or opinions were exchanged in this regard it was baseless and outside the fundamentals of these two positions. In my opinion, it is better not to call them difference. It was only a complaint as to why the Caliph was selected without taking his opinion or consulting him.”!**[1]**

Criticism and Scrutiny

Ustad Ja'far Subhani writes in this regard:

“Sunni scholars and researchers have written explanations of Nahjul Balagha. They have scrutinized the statements of Imam Ali (a.s.) about Caliphate one after another. They have derived this conclusion from the whole data: The aim of Imam from his statements is to show his eligibility, ability, quality and qualification for Caliphate without any gap from the Prophet. With regard to relationship: the Imam enjoyed very close ties with Prophet. With regard to learning and knowledge, the Imam was superior to all. With regard to principles of justice, information and principles of policies and politics: the Imam had no peer. Likewise in matters of running a country also he was above all companions of Prophet. For this reason, he was the befitting candidate for Caliphate. Because elders of the Ummah had decided to choose good instead of best. So they selected other than him; an inferior. Therefore Imam pointed out the tyranny that took place in this respect. He had a right to say that he was more suitable and befitting for the job.

The right which the Imam refers to goes thus: Since the day the Prophet passed away my right was taken away from me. And I was deprived of my own right. This is not a religious right that should have been given to him by head of religion. But it is meant to be a natural right, which binds each one to not give priority to an inferior when there is a superior. In other words, in the presence of a better choice it must not go to an inferior. The affairs or a task should rest on shoulders of one who is more able and befitting one. Whenever if the opposite happens, that is inspite of presence of one with more qualifications, abilities and knowledge he is ignored and another one with less abilities and more ignorance is chosen, it will be a natural right of his to complain about

[1] Muhammad Salih Haeri Mazandarani: Article quoted in *Hambastigi-e-Mazaahib-e-Islami* (Unity of Islamic Sects), Translation: Abdul Kareem Bi-Aazaar Shirazi: Pg. 220

the tyranny done to him...”**[1]**

This matter is regarded as a research but it is not more than a thought. We cannot translate all words of the Imam into his personal ability. And such a personal decorum of Imam cannot be a pivot of harsh attacks on Caliphs. Whenever the problem of leadership in Islam should be solved by means of referendum, consultation or negotiation, one who surpasses in all qualities the others and yet is ignored and not elected he cannot regard himself as a rightful one or the post is his right. To withdraw to him is a tyranny. He cannot attack bitterly those who have taken his place. But such is not the case. We do not see such a tone in Imam's speeches. He considers himself the true rightful one to belong to the post. He regards it a tyranny in him if he were to withdraw from the arena. He considers Quraish tyrants to him and trespassers and transgressors on his rights, can such harsh words be justified because of his self-decorum? It is never correct to represent the criticism of Caliphate of Caliphs as his personal demeanor. These words of the Imam go a great deal to prove that Caliphate was his established right. The Imam regarded deviation in behavior towards him as deviation in truth. Such a firmness in his belief towards Caliphate cannot be but by the text of Quran or a divine decree. Else, there is no other reason, which could make one sure and certain to such an extent.

Such interpretations cannot be translated into a priority. Those who interpret statements of Imam in this way are judging in advance. Their belief rests in elected Caliphate, which is a setback to them to evaluate words of Imam.”[2]

Taking into consideration such harsh criticism of Imam to Caliphs, which was right of Imam and rightful to him - a right vested to him directly from God, can we accept that:

“The Imam had not abused Caliphs in a fashion common among masses, but on the contrary, he had on many occasions even praised them.”[3]

Such vague and hallow claims cannot be encouraging factors to eradicate the principle of *Baraat* and put into practice praising Caliphs?

[1] Ustad Ja'far Subhani: *Peshwayi az Nazar-e-Islam* (Leadership in the view of Islam), Pgs. 264-265

[2] Ibid. Pgs. 265-268

[3] Muhammad Jawad Hujjati Kermani: *Ittelaat Daily*, Issue No. 29, Khordad 1379

“It will certainly be so because it crawls and creeps on a belief that by doing so we are following Ali’s practice.”!**[1]**

Is it reasonable that the conduct of Imam which must be a model, will praise, that too on several occasions, those who enacted Saqifah to deprive him of God-bestowed right of Caliphate? Besides, they attacked Zahra’s house. Beyond this they set fire to its door. As a result, his wife miscarried and she herself later died – a death of martyrdom.

[1] Ibid. *Ittelaat Daily*, Issue No. 29, Khordad 1379

Part 17
Discourse Eight To Acknowledge
the Legitimacy of Caliphs'
Government

Chapter 24

Introduction

Ultimately, an outlook comes into being which is much pitiable. Abu Bakr's Caliphate is freed from the circle of usurpation of Ali that has surrounded it for so long. Further, we give to it a total legitimacy. Therefore we draw in red the mark of cancellation over differences sprung from argument of Imamate and Caliphate and dispatched wholesomely to be forgotten! Why all this? Because we do not care nor do we see ourselves bound to maintain standard of originality and sincerity of the idea for sake of Islamic unity.

They say:

"The issue of being a Caliph has two stages and priorities:

First priority: Adherence to holy text that embraces Caliphate and Imamate of Ali and his family...

Second Priority: In exceptional cases or conditions such as absence of social ground to get first priority or insurgency of masses or majority of the people due to any reason. This gains legitimacy and comes into effect."**[1]**

In other words, this wrong thinking acknowledges that:

They discarded and sidelined Caliphate, which was based on foundation of holy texts and appointment from the side of God. Leaving this authentic Caliphate, they go after a fake one and immediately a Caliph is chosen by people and consultants of Emigrants and Helpers.

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issue No. 4-5 Pg. 176

(It is surprising the men in charge of Nahjul Balagha have

given room to perverted outlook of Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani in their Issues No 4 & 5 of *Nahjul Balagha* Magazine. We read in the beginning of essay on Pg. 7: “We shall dwell on the outlook of *Nahjul Balagha* about rulership and leadership. We shall avoid indulging in verbal arguments and only depend on analysis, personal conclusions and real picture.”

Therefore appointment of Caliph by Ummah takes legitimacy to itself and becomes Islamic and gains religious dimension. As such, the elected Caliphate becomes legitimate.

It is said:

“Certainly this very priority became effective after passing away of Prophet...”!**[1]**

This perverted outlook tries to create Islamic unity under its attractive heading: The Second Priority and it takes to defend Abu Bakr’s Caliphate. They say:

“In this long argument, acceptance of two priorities in the issue of Caliphate brings forth two outlooks. The first outlook suffices on first priority and repudiates the second. This en-folds and enwraps repudiation of legitimacy of Caliphate of Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. We must admit here that Shia mentality too is the same.

But the second outlook obliges to acknowledge legitimacy of Caliphate of Caliphs. I insist that we in our time itself must scrutinize the matter from this outlook.”!**[2]**

Designers of this perverted outlook are followers of the route of Islamic unity. They invite to follow this outlook. It means acceptance of getting effective Caliphate of consultation and its legitimacy immediately after passing away of Prophet. They invite to this thought and say:

“Those who are supporters of Islamic unity, closeness of sects and inviters of nearness should know that in these days it is a necessity. In such a circumstance as this we should follow the width and length of this very same outlook...”

If this group wants to reach by means of persistence over the first outlook to unity, it appears impossible...”!**[3]**

Scrutiny and Criticism

Such an attitude tries to give to the plot of hypocrite emigrants[4] in Saqifah Bani

[1] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 178

[2] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 181

[3] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 181

[4] Refer: Sayyid Hasan Fatemi: *Danish Nama Imam Ali* (Scholarship of Imam Ali), Vol. 8, Article: Saqifah, Mustafa Dilshaad Tehrani. *Miraas Raboodah*, Sayyid Murtuza Askari: *Saqifah*, Yusuf Gholami: *Pas az Ghuroob*.

Saada a reactionary feature committed in relation to second priority about Islamic Caliphate. By so doing they could provide and furnish to Abu Bakr a religious ground to the rulership he captured.

It was on the basis of this theory all these things took place after disobedience of society from Caliphate of Ali, in addition to absence of social grounds for establishment of Alawi government. In other words, it took place after effectiveness and getting legitimacy of the second.

To justify this perverted idea we must first acknowledge the gathering of Ansaar in Saqifah as a most distinguished factor[1] that wipes out and eliminates conditions necessary to establishment of Alawi government.

They say thus:

“The initiators in this matter are Ansaar. They (Helpers) without pre-knowledge or any consultation gathered in Saqifah Saad Bani Saada. In that gathering no one mentioned the name of Ali or Bani Hashim.”! [2]

“In the meeting name of Ali or Bani Hashim was not mentioned. The matter of Quranic verse or text that confirms

Caliphate of Ali was overlooked and ignored which was first priority and even ground for second priority was prepared.”!**[3]**

Then to pretend that Emigrants present in Saqifah did not have any plan to lay hand upon Caliphate. They witnessed the ground that was made to usurp the right of Ali – that is Caliphate. They witnessed that Helpers and Emigrants extended validity and legality to election of Caliph. Here the second priority got accomplished. They took step for a legitimate endeavor to push Abu Bakr to the seat of Caliphate.

[1] By the same argument can be rejected the analysis of gathering of Ansaar in Saqifah that:

“Ansaar were supporters of Ali (a.s.) and their aim in conglomerating in Saqifah was to take Caliphate from Muhajireen through Saad bin Ubadah and then transfer it to Ali (a.s.). This is not at all acceptable”!

[2] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 183

[3] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 183

They say thus:

“Paying allegiance to Abu Bakr was not a pre-prepared plot as they say or claim.”!**[1]**

Yes, in this oblique thinking the Caliph and his supporters were introduced as believers and committed to religious rulings and regulations and to Islamic teachings. They were obedient to first priority – that is they were believers in Holy Text and divine decree about appointment of Caliph prior to the meeting.

They got the news of meeting in Saqifah Bani Saada. There the gathering became opposed to Caliphate of Ali. Besides, there was no pre-prepared ground necessary to get hold of Caliphate of category of the first priority.

He participated because of his corruption to religion and his obligation to faith. It was a gathering of mischief and corruption. He acted upon God’s rulings and Islamic teachings and on

the second priority. As such, Abu Bakr was chosen to Caliphate.

They say:

“Abu Bakr with his past had a position among companions of Prophet that people went to him when they turned away from Ali.”!**[2]**

Therefore the designer of this wrong thinking believes:

“Ali was deprived of grounds available to Abu Bakr.”!**[3]**

On this perverted outlook, it must be said:

Proceedings of Abu Bakr and his supporters were not a tyranny to Ali. Abu Bakr’s Caliphate too was not illegitimate nor was it usurpation. It took place after second priority become effective!

Thus it is said:

“In spite of the conditions Ali has accepted its validity.”!**[4]**

“Certainly this priority was in effect after passing away of Prophet. Ali finally agreed and paid allegiance to Caliphs. He sincerely co-operated with them.”!**[5]**

[1] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 183

[2] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 187

[3] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 183

[4] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 176

[5] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 178

“Ali paid allegiance to Abu Bakr by his will. There was no compulsion upon him. He co-operated with him in all events. Later he continued the same with Umar. He had also praised the two.”!**[1]**

Unanswered Questions

Designers of this theory (believers of second priority in Caliphate) invite all unity-seekers to:

“Follow the same broad outlook; and for its evidences search in Quran or tradition, or within lines of history.”!**[2]**

Therefore at the end of this analysis all scholars and researchers are invited to find out scientific and committed answers to the queries as hereunder. The answers are applied to outcome of above theory.

In fact, if the second priority in Caliphate be a religious factor or that of faith or Islamic one; and Caliphate takes shape in event of that getting activated, Caliphate becomes legitimate. From the other side, we believe that both Ali and Zahra were infallible and sincerely obedient to God. So:

Question 1: What was the reason in attacking Zahra’s house by the gang of Abu Bakr? Why the sanctity of Zahra’s privacy was trespassed and transgressed?

Question 2: What was the reason in the attack on the person of Zahra and hitting and beating her physically which resulted in her miscarriage ending in the martyrdom of Mohsin?

Question 3: What was the reason in tying rope around the neck of Ali and dragging him by force to the mosque?

Question 4: What was the reason in Ali’s firm and strong refusal to pay allegiance to Abu Bakr?

Question 5: What was the reason in Ali’s invitation to Muhajireen and Ansaar for an armed uprising against Abu Bakr?

Question 6: What was the reason of bloody defense of Zahra in the matter of extracting Ali’s allegiance for Abu Bakr?

Question 7: What was the reason for such heavy wrath and anguish of Zahra against the Caliph and his associates?

[1] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 181

[2] Ibid. Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Issues 4-5, Pg. 181

Question 8: What was the reason in the early and untimely death of Zahra in the early days of Abu Bakr's Caliphate?

Question 9: What was the reason in Zahra being buried at night? What was the reason for Caliph and his colleagues not participating in burial ceremonies?

We leave the judgment to you; and find the conclusions yourself with the help of impartiality, sagacity and true information and justice.

We want all interested readers to answer these questions based on historical documents from Shia and Sunni sources. We invite them to refer to the following sources:

Calamities of Zahra (Vol. 2) by Allamah Ja'far Murtuza Amili.

The Agonies of Zahra translation of the above book by Muhammad Sepehri

Attack on Fatima's house by Shaykh Abdul Zahra Mahdi

The Manifest proof of Zahra's martyrdom by Ustad Ja'far Subhani

Disappointment in Fire translation of the above book by Sayyid Abdul Hasan Imrani

Darkness of Fatima Zahra by Shaykh Abdul Kareem Aqeeli

Mohsin bin Fatima Zahra by Shaykh Abdul Mohsin Qataifi

Where is Justice? Mohsin son of the Chief of Believers by Wafiq Saad Amali

Pains of Fatima by Shaykh Abdullah Nasir

Burning of Fatima's house by Shaykh Husain Ghaib Gholami

Fire on the House of Revelation by Sayyid Muhammad Husain Sajjad

House on fire by Masoodpur Aghayee

What happened to Fatima's house? by Sayyid Abdul Hasan Husaini

Martyrdom of my Mother Zahra by Ghulam Reza Ali Khan

Chapter 25

Addendum Solution of Shia to Create Islamic unity

One of the questions that arises after criticism and analysis of theories of Islamic unity is the query about a sincere solution and action towards unity between Muslims of the world.

Particularly what is claimed by the movement in way of Islamic unity together with belief in refusing legitimacy of Caliphs' government and showing it as usurpation. This generally seems impossible.

They say:

“This group if it wants insistence on first priority to attain unity, generally it seems impossible.”! **[1]**

Therefore this addendum is written in such a circumstance taking into consideration necessity of preserving every faith's position and refraining from disturbance to fundamentals of each faith of Islam. It has always had been ground of confirmation on part of those who wear the glitter of Islamic unity:

The aim by writing this short addendum is to remind about two points: It seems that attention to these points was a key to arguments relating to closeness. It has made the theory designers of unity needless from coining so many other issues to maintain original discipline and sincerity in this intellectual awakening.

So we are hopeful that these two reminders will come under the care of those who exert efforts for Islamic unity

particularly those who to achieve this aim see themselves lenient towards beliefs and fundamentals of Shiaism.

First Point

Whenever there arises a word about unity and its factors or setback, it entails different views of Infallible Ahle Bayt (a.s.) of the Prophet and those of Sunni schools in field of Imamate and Caliphate. Both appear concomitant:

Perhaps one of the main reasons for this association could be existence of deep distance between issues of fundamentals of thought of these two schools. Besides, the social clash that is anticipated to come into being by these discussions. It has drawn the attention of revivalists of unity to subside the differences.

[1] Muhammad Waizzaada Khorasani: Interview with Nahjul Balagha Magazine, Nos. 4-5, Pg. 181

Of course to decrease differences entails showing fundamentals of Shia belief upside down in argument of Imamate and Caliphate! It creates a question mark over ideas of closeness while maintaining original standards of reality.

As is seen the worry and anxiety of this group of unity-seekers is to raise full set of fundamentals of jurisprudence of Shia school in this fundamental discussion so that analysis of Sunni outlook will subside totally. There will remain no room for any anxiety or setback in the way of unity.

We draw the attention of revivalists who sacrifice standards of sincerity and originality for finding a way of attaining Islamic unity to this point. Difference between fundamentals of principles of School of Infallible Ahle Bayt and School of Caliphs in the field of Imamate and Caliphate is basic from Shia viewpoint. It constitutes the basic pillar of Islamic faith. But this difference according to Sunni belief is only a side and partial difference. It comes beneath the structure to a level of branch in practical chapter of enjoining good. They do not regard it so important. For them it does not demand tolerating the view of

other party. Because of their belief, Shias may not become object of attack.

This kind of Sunni outlook in relation to this issue in Islamic teachings brings satisfaction to unity-seekers. Due to reason of a special conception of this type of discussions, that Sunnis have there is no ground to worry about matters that Shias produce will not disturb unity and will not create a dispute between faiths of Islam.

Had Sunnis been adherent to their own school's theoretical fundamentals in this discussion, they would not have a negative outlook towards Shias because of these differences. On the other hand some activities of unity-seekers have become lenient to Shia fundamentals.

Therefore it can be proposed that Shias may invite to Islamic unity but at the same time the subject of Imamate and Caliphate too should be on agenda along with Sunni belief and thought. At the same time, they should be committed to not show any undesired reaction or unwanted sensitivity at any difference of beliefs. They should practically show constraint.

In other words, one of the active and energetic ways of revival of unity among Muslims Ummah is to make Sunnis committed to calm at argument of Imamate and Caliphate.

As you know, there are some evidences, which we shall refer to later. Difference in the issue of Imamate and Caliphate from Sunni viewpoint is like difference in jurisprudence among four faiths. They consider it at the level of jurisprudents in comparing authority in grasping the religious rulings or like jurisprudents of Hanafi and Shafei faiths on authoritative grounds.

Therefore existence of such type of differences in jurisprudence among jurisprudents of Sunni sect (all of them are in branches of faith outside principles of their religion) gulf in unity would not occur. The subject of Imamate and Caliphate should not meet negative reaction. According to Sunni belief in practice too, the same attitude should be maintained. Imamate

and Caliphate too is like other subjects as one of the side rulings and a jurisprudence branch. The differences therein however deep should not be a pretext to create disturbance in unity. In such a case, Sunnis from a practical commitment to their fundamentals of thought should be open to objections in belief and behavior.

In the end, to prove that Imamate and Caliphate is a branch and side issue from Sunni outlook we refer hereunder to few documents from Sunni sources.

Ghazzali in his book, *Iqtisaad fil Itiqaad* (Pg. 234) says:

“Beware that viewpoint in Imamate is not among important matters and it is not a part of sciences of reason. But it is one of the jurisprudential issues.”

Amadi in his book, *Ghayatul Maram Fi Ilmul Kalam* (Pg. 363) says:

“Beware! To talk about Imamate is not of religious faith and not from necessary matters unless it is an exceptional matter. Ignorance about it is not any religious shortcoming.”

Eji in the book *Al-Mawaafiq* (Pg. 395) says:

“We regard Imamate as a branch issue. If we mention it in our book of belief we do it by way of following our predecessors.”

Taftazani in his book, *Sharh Maqasid* (Vol. 2, Pg. 271) says:

“There is no doubt that Imamate is more suitable to be a branch of faith because appointment of an Imam with specified qualities is *Wajib Kifai* (an obligation sufficient if one performs it - others are exempted).” **[1]**

[1] All these narrations are taken from the book, *Dar Sar Zameen-e-Khatiraha*, (Which is text of the lecture of Ustad Ja’far Subhani in Yarmok college).

Second Point

Another argument launched by some unity-seekers, which they consider as a block on way of Islamic unity is the Shia outlook regarding practical application and type of executing the

main element of *Baraat* in life of faith and belief of a Shia regarding the “lack of justice of some Prophetic companions” under the title of effects and fruits of discussion about “Imamate and Caliphate” in Islam.

On the other hand it was supposed that such type of views would bring forth negative reactions of Sunni sect. Therefore we witness reverse efforts of Shia in this chapter of Shia belief.

Whatever negative stand towards Islamic unity comes into being in this field from side of Sunni sect is against their fundamental belief in the issue of ‘excused and paid’ of the status of a jurispudent that is a matter of acceptance and attention of unity-seekers.**[1]**

According to this outlook, Shia belief in argument of justice of Prophet’s companions and *Baraat* has Quranic backing. It follows a particular line of thought in this subject. In fact it is regarded as a salient application of jurisprudence. Suppose if Shia might have gone astray in this jurisprudence it should, from the Sunni viewpoint, embrace the formula of a jurispudent being excused.

By this way, one obstacle in way of Islamic unity is simply removed. Therefore there is no need to reverse Shia fundamentals of neither belief nor necessity to make Shia refrain to act on his own jurisprudence.

In other words, one of the practical solutions for Islamic unity is to make Sunni sect committed to honor their own belief regarding error in jurisprudence in the face of Shia outlooks opposing their thoughts.

This solution is several times more transparent and effective than efforts for creating a change in Shia fundamentals in these subjects.

However Imamiyah belief in these subjects is very much alive on pillars of logic and proof of their own jurisprudence taking in view the Sunni idea that results of jurisprudence must be

respected in way of Islamic unity. So the discussion of error in jurisprudence and a mistaken jurisprudence is excused and is from settled principles agreeable to School of Caliphate.

[1] Refer: Waizzaada Khorasani: *Nida-e-Wahdat* (Call for Unity), Pgs. 178- 180 & Pgs. 3, 27, 28, 101

Historical evidences indicate that the very first person who founded this formula is Abu Bakr bin Abi Qahafa.

About the criminal conduct of Khalid towards Malik bin Nuwairah and his family members he said: **'He did Ijtihaad and made a mistake'** or **'He concluded and erred.'**[1]

This belief took hold among Sunni scholars and entailed the following:

Ibne Hazm (456 year) introduced Abul Ghadia who had killed Ammar Yasir as a jurisprudent and one deserving reward from God.

Ibne Turkamani Hanafi (750 Year) became a follower of Ibne Hazm. Both of them (Ibne Hazm and Ibne Turkamani) extolled Ibne Muljim Muradi for Imam Ali's (a.s.) assassination and introduced him as a jurisprudent.

Ibne Hajar (852 year) considers all opponents, adversaries and enemies of Amirul Momineen Ali (a.s.) in battles of Siffeen, Jamal and Nahrawan as men of jurisprudence and described them as jurisprudents who erred and ones who have one reward from God.[2]

Similarly, Ibne Hajar believes with regard to Muawiyah and Amr Aas about the bloodshed that they were jurisprudents.

As *Muftis* reach their personal conclusion (i.e. *Ijtihaad*) and sometimes two *Muftis* differ in their judgments - one says a magician must be killed while the other does not accept it. The deeds of Muawiyah and Amr Aas were also like this.[3]

If it is so the Sunni sect must look upon Shia in their judgment and belief regarding justice of some companions and *Baraat* under formula of *Ijtihaad*; at least they maybe

regarded as erring jurists that are excused and rewarded.

Anyway, an advantage must be drawn to the benefit of avoiding reaction and creating calm. This formula must be used towards creating nearness. There remains no need to create a change in principles of Shia belief and in fundamentals of Shia thought.

[1] Refer: Allamah Askari: *Abdullah Ibne Saba Wa Deegar Afsaane* (Abdullah Bin Saba and other legends), Vol. 1, Pg. 199 onwards

[2] Refer: Ibid. *Doo Maktab Dar Islam* (Two Schools of Islam) Vol. 2 (Outlooks of two schools about sources of Islamic legislation) Pg. 92

[3] Refer: Ibid. Pg. 105

As long as Sunnis are committed to their belief about excuse of a jurist they should not act otherwise. This will not create any distance in Islamic unity.

Therefore as long as the Sunni sect, as a party in the differences, believes discussions about Imamate and Caliphate as branch matters and their belief in a jurist being excused one, they accept the mistake in jurisprudence. We must not witness their impoliteness about treating Shia beliefs.

On the other hand Ja'fari jurisprudence is acted upon only by Shias and it respects the sanctity of life and property of everyone who acknowledges the oneness of God and Muhammad's Prophethood. He is supposed to enjoy all rights by Islam. It honors even an outward appearance of Islam. So this peace cannot be shattered.

In Ja'fari jurisprudence, the outward appearance of Islam has validity. It embraces all faiths of Islam under its own ruling:

Respect to life, property and conjugal ties of every Muslim though he may be only so outwardly, are guaranteed. The meat he has slaughtered is allowed to be eaten. Marriage with him or her is permitted. Transactions are permitted with him. All civil rights are reserved to him such as applying to court of law

or carrying out sentence for or against him. Details of all such ruling are present in books of religious laws. Shias regard his judgments with respect for safety of unity.

Chapter 26

End Reflection on Shia Ideal of Islamic Unity in the Zahra's speech (s.a.)

In the end we refer to some extracts of Zahra's speech, which is famous by the name of Fadak speech, and close our criticism and analysis:

As we all know this great lady of Islam went to the mosque to demand the usurped rights of Ali. In the presence of Helpers and Emigrants the lady addressed Abu Bakr and made him the target of her complaints and anguish. She demanded Fadak from him to make his usurpation public.

Therefore she delivered a long sermon in which she sketched the only way of avoiding differences; such as:

“Almighty God had made following us system for community[1] (cause of co-operation) and our leadership a barrier to disunity.” [2]

Disturbance in outlooks of seekers of Islamic unity and their daily increased insistence in belittling the position of Shia arguments about Imamate and Caliphate do not carry any fruitful result to them. But it results in forgetting the Holy text and God's decree and deviation in rightful Shia beliefs. To them it will give no benefit except suspicion among Shias and a distinction to Sunnis. It is a self-indication that the only way left open to real Islamic unity and waiving off separation is to return to original principle and to place trust in it. Turning back on it has brought forth disunity.

Indeed this real principle is the same Imamate and *Wilayat* of Infallible Ahle Bayt (a.s.) of the Prophet. Ghadeer is forgotten amidst the din of devils and the Ummah has plunged into disunity.

Therefore Imamate of the Infallible Proof is the only pivot of unity.

[1] Community is in the meaning of custom or system.

[2] Mahdi Ja'fari: *Mastoorā Aaftaab-e-Sarmad*, Pgs. 158-159 quoting from Ibne Teefoor, *Balaghatun Nisa* (Eloquence of Women), Pg. 12; Jauhari: *Saqifah wa Fadak*, Pg. 98; Ibn Abi Hadeed: *Sharh Nahjul Balagha*, Vol. 16, Pg. 211

For the text of this sermon refer to the book of *Sadaai Fatimi Fadak*, written by Muhammad Baqir Ansaari and Sayyid Husain Rajai

ISLAMICMOBILITY.COM
IN THE AGE OF INFORMATION
IGNORANCE IS A CHOICE

*"Wisdom is the lost property of the Believer,
let him claim it wherever he finds it"*

Imam Ali (as)