

# Burning the house of Fatima binte Mohammad[saww]

**Work file:** burning\_the\_house.pdf  
**Project:** Answering-Ansar.org Articles

## Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
0.0.1	06.01.2003	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

## Contents

<b><u>1. INTRODUCTION</u></b>	<b>4</b>
<b><u>2. THE STATUS AFFORDED TO SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) BY RASULULLAH (S)</u></b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 THE VIRTUES OF SAYYIDA FATIMA ZAHRA (AS)	6
2.2 THE ANGER OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)	6
<b><u>3. ANALYSING THE EVENT FROM CLASSICAL SUNNI SOURCES</u></b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 FIRST REFERENCE - AL IMAMA WA AL SIYASA	9
3.2 SECOND REFERENCE - TAREEKH ABUL FIDA	12
3.3 THIRD REFERENCE - IQD AL FAREED	12
3.4 FOURTH REFERENCE - TAREEKH TABARI	12
3.5 SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) SUFFERED A MISCARRIAGE ON ACCOUNT OF UMAR'S ACTIONS	16
THE ISLAMIC PENALTY FOR ONE GUILTY OF CAUSING SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) TO HAVE A MISCARRIAGE	17
<b><u>4. THE RESPECT AFFORDED TO HOUSE OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS) BY RASULULLAH (S)</u></b>	<b>20</b>
4.1 THE EXALTED RANK AND RESPECT AFFORDED TO THE HOUSE OF FATIMA (AS)	20
4.2 RASULULLAH (S) WOULD STAND UP WHEN HE SAW SAYYIDA FATIMAH (AS)	20
<b><u>5. THE REACTION OF SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)</u></b>	<b>23</b>
5.1 SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)'S ANGER	23
5.2 SAYYIDA FATIMA (AS)'S EULOGY OF HER SUFFERING	24
5.3 A SUNNI SCHOLAR'S FATWA THAT THE SUFFERING OF AHL'UL BAYT SHOULD NOT BE DISCUSSED	25
<b><u>6. ANALYSING THE EVENT</u></b>	<b>28</b>
6.1 WAS A CONSPIRACY BEING HATCHED AGAINST ABU BAKR?	29
6.2 WAS IT LAWFUL FOR ABU BAKR TO ACT IN THE MANNER THAT HE DID?	29
6.3 THE CONSEQUENCES OF UMAR'S ACTIONS	30
<b><u>7. DEFENCES OF SHAH ABDUL AZIZ FOR UMAR'S AGGRESSION AND OUR REPLIES</u></b>	<b>31</b>
7.1 DEFENCE ONE	31
7.2 REPLY	31
7.3 DEFENCE TWO	31
7.4 REPLY ONE	31

7.5	REPLY TWO	31
7.6	DEFENCE THREE	32
7.7	REPLY ONE	32
7.8	REPLY TWO	32
7.9	REPLY THREE	32
7.10	REPLY FOUR	33
7.11	REPLY FIVE	33
7.12	REPLY SIX - RASULULLAH HAD IDENTIFIED PLACES OF FITNAH	33
7.13	DEFENCE FOUR	34
7.14	REPLY	34
7.15	DEFENCE FIVE	34
7.16	REPLY	34
7.17	DEFENCE SIX	34
7.18	REPLY ONE	34
7.19	REPLY TWO	35
7.20	DEFENCE SEVEN	35
7.21	REPLY ONE	35
7.22	REPLY TWO	35
7.23	REPLY THREE	36
7.24	REPLY FOUR	36
7.25	DEFENCE EIGHT	37
7.26	REPLY ONE	37
7.27	REPLY TWO	37
7.28	REPLY THREE	38
7.29	REPLY FOUR	38
7.30	DEFENCE NINE	38
7.31	REPLY ONE	38
7.32	REPLY TWO	38
7.33	REPLY THREE	39
7.34	REPLY FOUR	39
7.35	REPLY FIVE	39
7.36	DEFENCE TEN	39
7.37	REPLY ONE	39
7.38	REPLY TWO	40
7.39	REPLY THREE	40
7.40	REPLY FOUR	41
7.41	DEFENCE ELEVEN	41
7.42	REPLY ONE	41
7.43	REPLY TWO	42
7.44	REPLY THREE	42
7.45	REPLY FOUR	42
7.46	DEFENCE TWELVE	42
7.47	REPLY ONE	42
7.48	REPLY TWO	43
7.49	REPLY THREE	43
7.50	DEFENCE THIRTEEN	43
7.51	REPLY	43
<b>8.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>COPYRIGHT</b>	<b>47</b>

## 1. Introduction

This topic has been the subject of intense debate in the world of Sunni / Shi'a polemics since the death of Rasulallah (s). Discussions in connection with the attack on the house of Sayyida Fatima always generate huge emotions, so intense that they in effect force people to think about which side of the Sunni / Shi'a divide they choose to remain on. This tragic episode in effect explains why it is that Shi'a Muslims bear enmity to some of those individuals that Sunni Muslims deem to be their heroes.

Whilst traditional Sunni scholars have sought to acknowledge / defend and indeed praise the actions of Hadhrath Umar in this episode, the modern day self declared champions of the Sahaba the Salafi and Deobandi have scrapped this traditional approach and adopted a new approach to tackling this issue. Their approach is a nice simple one that can be easily digested by the ignorant masses:

1. The event never occurred (as was the approach of Ansar.org)
2. Scholars that narrated this event are unreliable, unknown authorities
3. Scholars that narrated this event were actually Shi'a posing as Sunni (practising taqiyya).

This three pronged approach is what I would deem *the Pinocchio factor of Neo Nasibi ideology*, denial. After all it is far easier to dismiss / deny event than to acknowledge it and provide defences for it.

The reason for such an approach is of course two folds:

1. We are living in a time where people want to learn and they can get answers at the touch of a button via the World Wide Web – hence focussing on this event in effect raises many questions that these Nasibi Ulema will find difficult to explain to the enquiring mind.
2. These Nasibi know only too well that if reverts [who are not ingrained with a love for the Sahaba like those born in the faith] were to read up on this event then the untouchable concept of 'see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil' – when it comes to the Sahaba may be called into question.

Our reply to Afriki is most certainly not aimed at appeasing the followers of Mu'awiya. It is a case of fighting fire with fire. We are saddened by the fact that even amongst our Shi'a brethren there are many who do not like our use of strong language. Nevertheless a minority believes that we should have the freedom to express our extreme and on-target beliefs and this minority has won. Every individual has the right to defend himself / his people / beliefs.

At Answering-Ansar.org, we are proud to contribute to this rebuttal, - and this shall be the first use of literary "weapons of mass destruction".

Do not condemn us; we warn you now, for what you shall read in this book shall lead you to understand our vicious hatred of the cult of the Santas that for so many years have misguided many. Whilst most Shi'a writers fight with conventional weapons our approach at Answering-Ansar.org is to only use the literary atom bomb. If this causes upset in some quarters we should point out that the Nasibi have used a *'No holds barred approach'* against the Shi'a. If you analyse their websites you will observe that they deem it permissible to hurl any insult they like at the Shia, and to cite ANY reference they find from our books, as PROOF against the Shi'a even if that means citing the weakest of weak tradition.

They have stooped so low as to insult the honour of Imam Ali (as) and Imam Mahdi (as) and they shall most surely regret that as we expose their oppressive leaders. Despite this, we have not followed this approach of lying and relying on weak reports, we have relied on classical Sunni sources as our proofs and have ensured that the sources are correctly translated. The

only similarity in approach with the Salafis lies in the language that we have adopted. If they have no regrets when they shout abuse at us and insult Imam 'Ali (as) they should not shed tears if we adopt the same approach.

One of the Answering-Ansar.org team member himself was a victim of such propaganda against the Shia for more years than he care to remember, and this is just the beginning of our assault against his former Nasibi captors.

Let the Nasibis live in cloud cuckoo land thinking that the companions were all and sundry, a bunch of saintly old men with woolly white beards that the Christians got their idea for Santa Claus from. That's the Public Relations (PR) hype, so if they want to believe the likes of (Spin) "Doctor Abu Huraira (ra)" so be it.

Here is the portrayal that Mr Afriki and like-minded stooges like to pass of as fact to their followers:

**"A long, long time ago, in a city far, far away, there was a beautiful. Then there were also lots and lots of other Santas in that city. At the barbers, all there could be seen were strands of woolly white hair everywhere. They all had these really long, woolly white beards that sprouted from their radiant faces. Where did all these saintly old men come from? They were all companions of the Holy Prophet (saws) and they lived in a place called Madina. The Santas were into group hugs, cooking halal feasts for the pilgrims, surviving on one date a day, praying all night long, organising tea parties for the orphans, campaigning to save the desert palm-tree from extinction, and they used to say Salam 'Alaikum with the biggest chuckles you ever did hear. Oh, what a bunch of saintly old men.....AND, when the kaffirs attacked, they were the biggest, bravest, most daring warriors you ever did see.**

**Sometimes they would bring their swords with them to group picnics, minor disputes would break out and sometimes the swords that were used for cutting sandwiches ended up being used as weapons! Despite this they all loved each other very much; they were just truthful Santas who were never subject to vices such as corruption, greed, lust or power. My heroes."**

This is the idyllic image that is portrayed in the popular Sunni consciousness about the companions. Women must have been throwing themselves at their feet to get hold of these strong, sensitive types with the older man look. And they were powerful...another aphrodisiac. OR .....could it be.....that the Santa story was just..... PR? Let's go into the world of the Santas and examine some of the tools they used to get hold of their power in this context ... this fairytale is in reality a very GRIM fairytale...in fact the Santas were actually FRAUDS living in a very seedy world....with some of the best spin doctors in history, rivalling those of the Christian church.

May Allah (swt) accept our intention, and bless Prophet Muhammad and his purified family.

Answering-Ansar.org team

## 2. The status afforded to Sayyida Fatima (as) by Rasulullah (s)

The defender of the Nasibi faith and hero of the kaftan-clad, Afriki, writes:

Ansar.org states:

One such case of the invention of history is the "persecution" mentioned by Shi'i reporters of history to have been meted out to 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and his wife Sayyidah Fatimah immediately after the demise of Rasulullah.

Afriki calls the persecution of Ali (as) and Fatima (as) an "invention" of the Shia historians...he would have us believe this, rather in the way that Santa Claus is an invention. But we shall see there is incontrovertible evidence to suggest that Santa was really a psychopathic arsonist and the persecution the Shia historians write of, is testified to by the great Sunni historians as well, and is indeed testified to, in abundance, from all corners of the Sunni world. Therefore Afriki is guilty of a mistaken premise here: the Shi'i AND Sunni historians note the vicious persecution of Ali (as) and Fatima (as) at the hands of the despotic khalifas (those saintly old Santas in the ten times revised Sunni edition of Islam) - we shall expose this by lifting the Nasibi kaftan very shortly and see exactly what lies beneath. Note how the cunning defender of the Nasibi faith, Afriki, dodges the implications of the great Sunni historians, simply by pretending they don't exist. Before going straight into this topic we feel that it is important to present some hadith to our readers, so that they can recognize that esteemed rank Fatima (as) has in the eyes of Rasulullah (s).

### 2.1 The virtues of Sayyida Fatima Zahra (as)

As our evidence we shall cite hadith from *Sahih al Bukhari Volume 4, Book 56, Number 819*:

**Narrated 'Aisha:**

**Once Fatima came walking and her gait resembled the gait of the Prophet . The Prophet said, "Welcome, O my daughter!" Then he made her sit on his right or on his left side, and then he told her a secret and she started weeping. I asked her, "Why are you weeping?" He again told her a secret and she started laughing. I said, "I never saw happiness so near to sadness as I saw today." I asked her what the Prophet had told her. She said, "I would never disclose the secret of Allah's Apostle ." When the Prophet died, I asked her about it. She replied. "The Prophet said 'Every year Gabriel used to revise the Qur'an with me once only, but this year he has done so twice. I think this portends my death, and you will be the first of my family to follow me.' So I started weeping. Then he said. 'Don't you like to be the mistress of all the ladies of Paradise or the mistress of all the lady believers? So I laughed for that.' "**

This hadith makes it absolutely clear that Sayyida Fatima (as) is the Leader of ALL the women of Paradise, those that preceded her and those that shall come after her. No woman can exceed her in rank / status and this includes the wives of Rasulullah (s), including Hadhrath Ayesha.

### 2.2 The anger of Sayyida Fatima (as)

We also read in *Sahih al Bukhari Volume 5 hadith 61*

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

This hadith makes it clear that Sayyida Fatima (as)'s anger is on par with the anger of Rasulullah (s). This is all the more significant when we recognize that one who incurs the wrath of Rasulullah (s) also incurs the wrath of Allah (swt), and Allah (swt) makes it clear in Surah Fateha that we should steer clear of those that incur the wrath of Allah (swt).

### 3. Analysing the event from classical Sunni sources

Nasibi warrior Afriki, in his pathetic efforts to deny the existence of historical facts from the works of the Sunni big boys, argues from the false premise that the Shi'a have falsely alleged that the Ahl'ul bayt (as) were persecuted following the death of Rasulullah (s) stating:

Ansar.org states:

The incidents as mentioned by these unscrupulous narrators-  
of 'Umar ibn al-Khattab threatening to burn down the house of  
Fatimah with her and her family inside

of 'Umar ordering the door of the house to be broken, with  
Fatimah being wounded and losing her unborn child in the  
process, and six months later dying from that same injury

and of her husband, the valiant 'Ali being dragged out of his  
house like a common criminal to give his oath of allegiance to  
Abu Bakr

all of these have to the Shi'i mind become undisputable and  
incontestible facts of history, no matter how spurious their origin,  
or how blatantly they clash with authentic historical facts.

The above is an example of the Pinochio factor in Nasibi thought. By using impassioned words that stress the "them" (Shias) and "us" (the Nasibis) the impression is deliberately created that such forceful Nasibi rhetoric MUST in fact be correct and could not possibly be proceeding from a flawed premise i.e. that the persecution of Fatima (as) is not testified to by great Sunni sources.

If the Shi'a have deemed these events to be indisputable and incontestable facts of history valid to the historical perspective of all Muslims, it is on account of the fact that this persecution has been consistently reported by the entire spectrum of leading classical scholars of Ahl'ul Sunnah, making it undeniable.

Especially for the benefit of the advocates of Mu'awiya we shall cite a further list of Sunni scholars that have recorded this event in their books:

1. al Imama wa al Siyasa pages 18-30 Dhikr Bayya Abu Bakr
2. Tareekh Abul Fida Volume 1 page 156 Dhikr bayya Abu Bakr; we relied on the Urdu translation by Maulana Kareem'ud Deen al Hanafi pages 177-179;
3. Iqd al Fareed page 179
4. Tareekh al Tabari Volume 13 page 1818 Dhikr Wafaath Nabi, we relied on the English translation Volume 9 page 187
5. al-Istiab, by Ibn Abd al-Barr Volume 1 page 246 Dhikr Abdullah in Abi Quhafa
6. Sharh ibn al Hadeed Volume 1 page 157
7. Al Mihal wa al Nihal Volume 1 page 77, Dhikr Nizameeya
8. Muruj adh-Dhahab by Abd al-Hasan Ali ibn al-Husayn al Masudi Volume 3 page 198

9. Izalath ul Khifa by Al Muhaddith Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi Volume 2 page 226 (Urdu translation, Qur'an Mehal publishers, Karachi)
10. al Bayana Izalathul Khifa Volume 2 page 29
11. Tareekh Kamil by Ibn Atheer Volume 11 page 113
12. Tareekh Ahmadi by Ahmad Husayn Khan Sahib pages 111-112
13. Taufa Ithna Ashari, by al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi page 292 Dhikr Muthain Umar
14. Al Murthada by Hafidh Abdul Rahman al Hanafi page 45 (Amritsar edition)
15. Mukhthasar Kanz al Ummal bur Hushiya Musnad Ahmad ibn Hanbal Volume 2 page 184 (Egypt).
16. Kitab Mukhthasar fi Ahbar al Bashar Volume 1 page 156
17. Tahqeeq Mubashraab Sunni page 110 bu Maulana Waheedudin Khan al Hanafi
18. Ansar Ashraf, by al-Baladhuri, v1, pp 582-586
19. Tareekh Ya'qubi, v2, p116
20.  [Fathul Aineen page 88](#)
21. al Faruq Volume 1 page 92 Dhikr Saqeefa Bani Sa'ada
22. Ruh al Mustafai Volume 3 page 36

Before commenting on the event in question we shall quote verbatim the main sources of these reports.

### 3.1 First Reference - al Imama wa al Siyasa

Let us begin with Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim bin Qutaybah (d. 276 Hijri) who in his famous book *al Imama wa al Siyasa* pages 18-28 states as follows:

**"When news reached Abu Bakr that the people had gathered in the house of 'Ali and were refusing to give bayya, he sent Hadhrath Umar in their direction. Umar called out to Akraan who was in the house of 'Ali, but he refused to come out. Umar then said:**

**'I swear by He who controls the life of Umar, if you people do not come out of the house I shall set fire to it, and everyone inside shall perish. The people said 'Abu'l Hafs (Umar), Fatima (daughter of Rasulullah (s)) is also in this house'. Umar replied, 'I do not care about this, people should leave the house of 'Ali and give bayya'. 'Ali replied I have sworn that I shall not set foot outside my home until I have completed compiling the Qur'an.'**

 [Al-Imama Walsiyasa Page 12](#)

**Sayyida Fatima arrived at the door and said:**

**'I have no association with those individuals that acted in such a manner as to abandon the funeral of Rasulullah (s) (ie Abu Bakr, Umar and co), and on this matter (leadership) they decided themselves (ie stole the khilafat), they did not even so much as consult us. They also took that which was rightfully ours (Fadak).**

Umar then left and he began to dispute with Abu Bakr, 'Do not leave (in peace) those that are refusing to give bayya'. Abu Bakr then sent his servant Qunfaaz to summon 'Ali. Qunfaaz reached 'Ali and said 'The Khalifa of Rasulullah (s) is summoning you'. 'Ali replied (mocking this new title of Abu Bakr) 'You have gone against the words of Rasulullah (s)'. Qunfaaz relayed these words to Abu Bakr, upon hearing this he (Abu Bakr) spent a considerable amount of time weeping. Despite his sending his Servant, 'Ali still did not come.

Then Hadhrath Umar accompanied by a group, arrived at the house of Fatima and began to bang on the door. When Fatima heard their voices she proclaimed loudly:

**'O people, after Rasulullah (s), the son of Khattab..'**

When the people heard Fatima's voice and her anguish they left in grief weeping, fearing that their hearts would be torn apart... Only Umar and some others remained, the rest returned to their homes. They removed 'Ali from his home by force and brought him before Abu Bakr, and said 'Give him bayya'. Umar said:

'By Allah, who alone is worthy of worship, I shall otherwise strike off your neck'.

'Ali replied:

'Would you kill a Slave of Allah (swt) and the brother of the Prophet?'

Umar replied 'I accept that to you are a Slave of Allah, but not that you are the brother of the Prophet (ie he accuses Ali (as) of lying)'.  
 Umar replied 'I accept that to you are a Slave of Allah, but not that you are the brother of the Prophet (ie he accuses Ali (as) of lying)'.

Abu Bakr remained silent, and Umar said:

'Why are you not demanding the bayya from him?'

Abu Bakr replied 'As long as Fatima is by his side, I shall not pressure him'.

Then 'Ali went to the grave of Rasulullah, embraced it crying aloud 'Your Ummah now considers me to be weak and they wish to murder me'.

Meanwhile Umar said to Abu Bakr 'Accompany me to see Fatima as we have incurred her anger'.

They both wanted to see Fatima and so they approached 'Ali, who took them to see her. He ['Ali] sat them down but Sayyida Fatima turned her face away from them. They both conveyed salaam to Fatima but she did not reply. Hadhrath Abu Bakr then said 'Beloved daughter of Rasulullah (s) I love you more than my own daughters, and I cannot tolerate the fact that I remained alive on the day that your father had died. I know your exalted rank and status, but I did not uphold your claim for possessions as Rasulullah had stated 'Our property will not be inherited, whatever we (i.e. prophets) leave is Sadaqa (to be used for charity)'.  
 Umar then said 'I have heard that you are a Slave of Allah, but not that you are the brother of the Prophet (ie he accuses Ali (as) of lying)'.

Fatima said 'If I remind the two of you about a hadith that you are aware of, will you then act in accordance with it?'

The two said 'Yes, do tell us'.

She said 'I want you to swear by Allah if you can testify to hearing this hadith:

**"Fatima's happiness is my happiness and her anger is my anger. Whoever has maintained friendship with Fatima had maintained friendship with me, whoever**

**upsets her, upsets me".**

**Both confirmed hearing this hadith from Rasulallah(s). Sayyida Fatima then said:**

**I testify before Allah (swt) and his Angels that you (Abu Bakr and Umar) have upset me, you did not keep me happy and I shall complain to Rasulallah (s) about this when I see him.**

**Abu Bakr then said 'I seek protection from Allah's anger and your (the Prophet (saws)'s) anger'. At that moment tears filled Abu Bakr's eyes and Sayyida Fatima said:**

**'I shall curse you in every prayer.'**

**Abu Bakr left the house hysterical and screamed at the crowd of people that had gathered outside:**

**'You people have it (so) easy and go to your beds in peace with your wives at night, whilst you have engulfed me in a terrible crisis (of conscience). I do not need your bayya, revoke the bayya that has been given to me.'**

**The people said 'Khalifa of Rasulallah (s) the Khilafat cannot work without you at the helm'.**

Yes, it's a real **shocker**. In an attempt to cover up the truth, the Sunni Ulema have adopted one of their old habits, by denying the authority of any book that goes against the romantic image of the Santas. We therefore feel that is incumbent to cite the authority of the writer, so as to eliminate any doubts that might exist amongst our opponents. This man was in fact the Chief Qadhi (Chief Islamic lawgiver of the Muslim world) and judge of the Abbasid khalifas, so loved by Sunnis for their persecution of the Shias. This man, Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muslim bin Qutaybah (213 - 276 Hijri), was the author of this work *al Imama wa al Siyasa*. In regards to him Shams al Hind Allamah Shibli Numani al Hanafi praised him in *al Faruq Volume 1 page 7* as follows:

**"Abdullah bin Muslim bin Qutaybah (born 213 Hijri A.H and died in 276 AH). The fame and authority of this writer are unchallenged. Even the traditionalists are unanimous as to his integrity and trustworthiness. The Ma'arif is the name of his famous historical work which has been printed and published in Egypt and in several other countries".**

Indeed it is clear that bin Qutayba was trying to dish the Shias by heaping insults on Ali (as) and Fatima (as) - the cosy Ashari Creed was in its infancy i.e. Sunni Islam was in its early days, and at the time of the Abbasids there was no stigma in condemning the Shias and their historical leaders ie Ali (as). Thus he spoke his mind. Ibn Qutayba was in fact condemning Ali (as) and Fatima (as), for by narrating this account he aimed to portray a pathetic and weak Ali (as), who was left at the mercy of the now powerful Umar and Abu Bakr against whom he was "rebellious" - he was trying to rub it in deep that from the earliest days after the death of the Prophet (saws) the Shias had been a persecuted and rebellious minority and that the 'great and good' majority of Sunni Islam could take pride in the supremacy of its earliest potentates - that's why he wrote the full explicit account. May God curse Ibn Qutayba, for while he wrote the truth, his purpose was actually to vilify the honour of Ali (as). Ibn Qutayba was nothing more than Nasibi scum and we read in *Ayan al Khabar Volume 4 page 16*:

**"Hafidh Bayhaqi commenting on Ibn Qutayba said that he adhered to the Banu Umayya madhab, some Ulema said he was a Nasibi that opposed the Ahl'ul bayt".**

There is no need for supporters of the Sahaba to turn into switch off mode by deeming this as

grounds to reject Ibn Qutayba - since his only sin was that his writings indicated his enmity to Ahl'ul bayt (as), the authors of the Saha Sittah did one better and actually narrated traditions on the authority of those that killed Imam Husayn (as) (see our article 'Who killed Imam Husayn (as)?'). If those that raised their swords against Imam Husayn (as) are graded as men of truth in the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah then there is no reason to reject Ibn Qutaybah who 'only raised his pen against the Ahl'ul bayt (as).

### 3.2 Second Reference - Tareekh Abul Fida

Sunni historian Abul Fida in his discussion on the attack on the house of Fatima (as) recorded the event, in a very low key / cautious tone, but as a scholar of integrity and honesty he has refused to cover up history and has still acknowledged that the event did indeed take place and Umar threatened to burn Fatima (sa) alive:

**"Then Abu Bakr sent Umar bin Khattab with the objective that those 'people gathered in the house of Fatima and Ali come out, and that if anyone objects to coming out then you should fight them'. Hadrath Umar approached with fire in his hands to set the house ablaze. At this point Hadrath Fatima approached and said 'Would do you dare, Ibn Khattab? Do you wish to set my home on fire? Umar said 'Give bayya to 'Abu Bakr and enter into that which the majority of the Ummah has agreed to.'**

*Tareekh Abul Fida Urdu translation by Maulana Karrem'ud Deen al Hanafi pages 177-179*

The writer of *Tareekh Abul Fida* was Abu al-Fida 'Imad al-Din Isma'il b. 'Umar (d. 732 Hijri). Praising him, renowned Sunni scholar Allamah Ya'afi: stated:

**"In 732 Hijri died Sultan Hamatul Malik Al-Moyid Ammad-ud-din Ismail bin Afdhal Ali Ayoobi. He wrote one book in history and one book "Taqweem-ul-baladan". He was a man of great virtues and he was also a master in Philosophy."**

### 3.3 Third Reference - Iqd al Fareed

Ibn Abd Rabbah al-Malik in his book *Iqd al Fareed Volume 3 page 283* states:

**"Those that were opposed to the bayya of Abu Bakr were 'Ali, Abbas, Zubayr and Sa'd bin Ubada, amongst whom 'Ali and Abbas were sitting in the house of Fatima. At that time Abu Bakr sent Umar with the order 'that you remove those gathered in the house of Fatima, and if they refuse to come out then kill them'. Umar brought fire to the door and Fatima said 'Ibn Khattab have you arrived in order to set my home on fire?'. Umar replied 'I have come with the intention that you people give bayya to Abu Bakr as others have done".**

 [Al'Aqdul Fareed Page 273](#)

Ibn Abd Rabbah is also a well known classical Sunni scholar, Abu Fida writing on the events of 328 Hijri states:

**"In 328 Hijri died Abu Umar Ahmad bin Abd Rabbah bin Habib Al-Qurtabi, whose forefather was the slave of Habib Al-Qurtabi Abdur Rehman Umwi, who conquered the Spain. He has written a book Al-Aqdul Farid, which is a very good book. He was born in 246."**

### 3.4 Fourth Reference - Tareekh Tabari

The most renowned Sunni historian Ibn Jareer al Tabari also recorded this event. We read in *al Tabari (English translation) Volume 9 page 187*:

Ibn Humayd - Jarir - Mughirah - Ziyad b. Kulayb: Umar Ibn al-Khattab came to the house of Ali. Talha and Zubair and some of the immigrants were also in the house. Umar cried out: "By God, either you come out to render the oath of allegiance, or I will set the house on fire." al-Zubair came out with his sword drawn. As he stumbled (upon something), the sword fell from his hand so they jumped over him and seized him."

 [Al Tabari Vol.9 Page 187](#)

The academic and authoritative translator Ismail Poonawalla, in the footnotes of this event (same page), provides us with an interesting background to this event:

**Although the timing is not clear, it seems that Ali and his group came to know about Saqifa after what had happened there. At this point, his supporters gathered in Fatimah's house. Abu Bakr and Umar, fully aware of Ali's claims and fearing a serious threat from his supporters, summoned him to the mosque to swear the oath of allegiance. Ali refused, and so the house was surrounded by an armed band led by Abu Bakr and Umar, who threatened to set it on fire if Ali and his supporters refused to come out and swear allegiance to Abu Bakr. The scene grew violent and Fatimah was furious.**

*Ansab Ashraf, by al-Baladhuri in his, v1, pp 582-586;*

*Tareekh Ya'qubi, v2, p116;*

*al-Imamah wal-Siyasah, by Ibn Qutaybah, v1, pp 19-20*

Lest there be any attempts by the Nasibi to suggest that Ismail Poonawalla is an Ibn Saba agent that has sought to misinterpret the words of Tabari as a means of casting aspersions on noble Umar's character we also attach the original text of *Tareekh Al-umam Wal'Malool By Jareer al-Tabari, Volume 2, Page 443 "The events of 11 Hijri"*

 [Tareekh Al-umam Wal'Malool By Jareer al-Tabari, Volume 2, Page 443](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

How could Tabari at the time of his writing have been a Shia? As these great Sunni scholars have implied, only some diehard bigots amongst the Sunnis, and not a single major traditionist, have said such a thing. To do so, is to remove from the Sunni hall of fame their greatest historian. It's like saying William Shakespeare was French. Indeed, conclusive proof of Tabari's staunch Sunni faith is found in the work of that bastion of Sunni'ism, the legendary Ibn Hajar al Asqalani. Here we find that Tabari firmly believed in the institution of khilafat that was established in Saqifa, and this above all can only mean one thing: he was a Sunni. If any doubt remains over this matter, then allow us to narrate this event recorded by classical Sunni scholar Ibn Hajr al Asqalani in *Lisan al-Mizan (5:101)*:

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

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

It is ironic that when it suits them, they expose their hypocrisy wholeheartedly by quoting events narrated by Tabari and others like him as HISTORICAL FACT to the Sunni masses. Now, aside from the fact that men like these are acclaimed Sunni Masters by their own kind, look at it from another perspective...take a step back and look at the big picture. By rejecting these scholars these Nasibi should know that they are in effect pressing the self destruct button on Sunni Islam, for it was the likes of Tabari that GAVE you the majority school its image of what the Holy Prophet (s)'s life was...it's not found in Hadith, that's sayings, history is found in the works of the big historians and biographers, so if you wish to go and call the William Shakespeare of Sunni historians a Shia, why don't you obliterate from popular Sunni consciousness any record of the Battles of Badr and Uhud, the fall of Makkah, and just about any other event in the life of Muhammad (saws)...because they're all based on Tabari and you are quoting his testimony as fact... a Tabari who clearly detests the Shia and passes a fatwa putting them to death.

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

This type of reasoning is as ridiculous as saying the Pope is Jewish. Afriki's kind have also

claimed that the Ayatullah Khomeini was an American agent! We must confess, even most Sunnis we have seen have been embarrassed by that one, as well as the one about Maudoodi having had Shia inspiration...embarrassed at the pathetic nature of Nasibi arguments from men who decide to take on the Shia and in the process humiliate Sunni Islam when they are intellectually cornered by producing warped arguments, the worst forms of illogic, that turn undeniable facts and truisms upside down...all because they don't have the conscience and the courage to admit like our convert team member did that Sunnism is based on fairytales...so they start saying the Islamic equivalent of "The Pope is Jewish."...and sad people believe them!!

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

Alhamdulillah, the Shi'a, whilst acknowledging that the Shaykhain were political leaders of the people, do NOT deem them to be Imams of Guidance. While Tabari's firm belief was that they were and that one who rejects this notion should be executed clearly indicates that he had extreme Sunni views close to those espoused by today's Salafi and Deobandi Nasibis. By Tabari's fatwa, Shias should all be killed. Yet this most prominent of all Sunni historians writes (alongside other reliable sources), with a full chain, that Umar tried to burn Fatima (as) alive. To burn ANYONE alive, or even to threaten to commit an act of arson like this, is against the laws of Allah and His Prophet (s). Such extreme behaviour clearly suggests that Umar was a psychopath of the first order. It is ironic that Tabari wanted to introduce the death penalty for those that reject the Shaykhayn as Imams of Guidance, whilst those that physically attack the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) are perfect role models / Imams of guidance, whom Allah (swt) is pleased with.

NOTHING is above the commands of Allah (swt), and burning a believer alive because he or she doesn't agree with you is HARAM no matter WHAT the motive. As Allah (swt) says in the Qur'an, **"There is no compulsion in religion."** So what was Umar up to - now that we have conclusively established that he did indeed try and burn the Chief of the Women of Paradise alive? You ask yourselves that if you're a Sunni. You're the people who love him because of the Public Relations Spin that has been engineered about him in 1,400 years of Sunni history ....and history is written by victors, whether that be Bukhari, Tabari or Muslim.

This reference can also be located in *Rawdah-al-Manazir fi al-Awai'l wa al 'Awakhir*. As a true kneejerk response, its Sunni Hanafi author Muhibudeen Abdul Waleed Muhammad al Halabi al Hanafi, has now also been accused of being a Shi'a by the Nasabis! To counter such stupid claims we should point out that Hanafi scholar Maulana Hai in *"Takefath ad Sureeya"* stated:

**"Muhibudeen Abdul Waleed Muhammad al Halabi was a Sunni, a lover of the Ahl'ul Sunah, he died in 817 Hijri his book Seerath al Nabawiya is excellent, he was born in 741 Hijri, he was learned in the field of hadith".**

Please note the disunity amongst the Ahl'ul Sunnah. They keep accusing EACH OTHER of faithlessness. I wonder how many Sunnis prayed behind this supposed Shia during their lives?

It should be called McCarthyism in Islam.

### 3.5 Sayyida Fatima (as) suffered a miscarriage on account of Umar's actions

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authoritative work *Sharh Kushajji page 407* under the chapter Mubais Imamate as follows:

**"Abu Bakr sent Umar when Ali had refused to give bayya to Abu Bakr. Umar went with fire and this caused Fatima distress as a result of which she suffered a miscarriage".**

What is this "distress" that led to Fatima (as) miscarrying her child so that the infant was stillborn? If it was Santa beating up a woman then Santa must surely also be a murderer.

Sunni scholar Salahuddin Khalil al-Safadi in his book *'Waafi al-Wafiyyaat'* under the letter 'A' cited the view of Ibrahim Ibn Sayyar Ibn Hani al-Basri, well-known as Nidhaam:

**"On the day of 'Bay'aat' (paying allegiance), Umar hit Fatimah (AS) on the stomach such that child in her womb died."**

The Sunni thinkers categorised as the Nizameeya also hold the view that Umar attacked Sayyida Fatima, and the section of their treatise that deals with this issue is enlightening. Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Abdul Kareem Shahrastani in *"al Milal wa al Nihal" Volume 1 page 77* "Dhiky Nizameeya" states:

**"The Nizameeya believe that Umar struck the stomach of the daughter of Rasulullah (s), that resulted in her losing the child in her womb. [They also believe] Umar had threatened to set fire to the house, including those inside, this included 'Ali, Fatima, Hasan, Husayn and others".**

What's also worth noting is that this book, [ALL Sunnis, on the different sects in Islam, also regard al Milal wa Al Nihal, as the most important classical Sunni treatise](#), and here it clearly states a major body of Sunni intellectual thought that concurs with the opinion that Umar was guilty of this action.

Hanafi scholar al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Haqq Dehlavi in *Murujj al Nubuwwa "Chapter 4, the events of 2 Hijri 'Tajweez Fatima'"*:

**"Allah (swt) gave Fatima and 'Ali the following five children, Hasan, Husayn, Zeyneb, Umme Kalthum and Muhsin, who was martyred following the Ummah's oppression, this illness and pain led to the death of Fatima".**

He places the blame for this action on the Ummah, without mentioning the chief architect of this aggression. We know from the other accounts that it was Umar who dealt the fatal blow. Umar MURDERED BOTH Fatima (as)'s unborn child Muhsin (as) and Fatima (as) herself, who died a few months later from her injuries.

If this was an Islamic court of law, there is no doubt that given so many reliable testimonies, Umar would have been found guilty of murder. At the very least, he'd be locked up and the keys thrown away for the wellbeing of pregnant women in society as a whole. Savages exist in society; most of us count our lucky stars that we don't meet them, and if we do we distance ourselves from this violent type of man, and keep our women and children well away. But sadly this type of man exists. Would you allow your sister to marry a man with Umar's type of temper? But Fatima (as) was also no ordinary woman. This wicked treatment given to the daughter of Muhammad (saws) who was mourning the recent (within a day or so) departure of her beloved father has been commented upon by Muslim legal experts. What of Umar's specific punishment for harming her in such a horrific manner?

## The Islamic penalty for one guilty of causing Sayyida Fatima (as) to have a miscarriage

We read in *Sharh Ibn al Hadeed page 531* "Dhikr Badr" as follows:

**"Naqeeb Abu Jafer states that when Jabir bin Asood who frightened Zeyneb causing her to suffer a miscarriage, Rasulullah (s) deemed it permissible (mubah) shed his blood. Had Rasulullah (s) been alive he would have likewise deemed it permissible to shed the blood of the individual that frightened Fatima, to the extent that she had a miscarriage".**

Some modern day Nasibis shall automatically ignore this reference by using their kneejerk response that this is a Shi'a source. We should point out that *Sharh Nahj'ul Balagha* by Ibn Abi Hadeed is NOT a Shi'a text. The author was a Mutazzali scholar, which is a rationalist branch of Sunni thought, alive to this day, that places especial emphasis on logic and in particular logical application of Muslim Law. In his *Sharh* he has constantly sought to defend the legitimacy of the first three khalifas which is diametrically opposed to Shi'ism, and Ibn Abi Hadeed glorifies Umar's khilafat as rightful - he was certainly no Shia. Imam of the Nasibis, Ibn Taymeeya states:

**"The claim of the Shi'a Ulema that all groups of Ahl'ul Sunnah seek to prove the Khilafath of the first three khalifas on qiyas is false, since the Ahl'ul Sunnah are split into numerous sects such as the mutazzila, Fiqh Baghdhawiya, Dhareeya, and individuals such as Daud, Ibn Hazm and others did not prove their Imamate's by relying on Qiyas" (Taken from Minhajj as Sunnah Volume 1 page 89).**

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Muhammad bin Shakir bin Ahmad in his text *Nawaathil Wafeeyath Volume 1 page 248* states:

**"He [Ibn al Hadeed] was famous for his poetry Allamah Dhamiyathi narrated traditions on his authority, he was an adherent of the Mutazzila madhab".**

Allamah Kamaladeen Abdul Shaybaani in *Mujmu' a' Adaab fi mujumaal al kaab*, stated:

**"Ibn al Hadeed was a great scholar, he was an adherent of the Mutazzila school, he authored Sharh Nahj'ul Balagha".**

Anyway, no matter what Ibn Abi al Hadid and his legalistic Mutazzail'ite intellectuals thought, fact is that Umar:

1. Threatened to burn Fatima (as) AND her young children (all aged under 10) alive, and
2. ALSO punched her in the belly so that she miscarried and the child, named Mohsin at his burial, was stillborn.

As far as we can see, if someone did this to your wife, sister or mother in a Muslim country, you'd expect one punishment from the Islamic court and one only - DEATH.

To prove that the attack on the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) took place we have cited four authoritative works of Ahl'ul Sunnah and the admissions of other Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema. The authenticity of these works has been substantiated not merely by popular acclaim by Sunni scholars but by the specific judgments of major and trustworthy Sunni scholars. All the cited scholars have been of the first rank of Sunni scholarship, ranging from Tabari to Ibn Rabbah. We now present the comments of Allamah Shibli Numani who spent his entire life advocating the superiority of Umar ibn al Khattab. In his efforts to defend the actions of dear old Umar, Numani in *al Faruq Volume 1 page 92*, states as follows:

**"The learned Tabari in his Tareekh Kabir has narrated a tradition to the effect that Umar, standing at the door of Fatimah's house, exclaimed 'O daughter of the**

**Prophet! I swear by God that we love you best of all but if your house continues any longer to be a rendezvous for conspiracy I will set fire to it on account of this.**

**The authority of this tradition is doubtful having not been able to glean particulars regarding its narrators, but there is no reason to deny the occurrence of this incident in the light of rationalisation. Umar was a man of hot and irrational temper and such an act would not have been inconsistent with his nature".**

 [Al-Farooq Vol.1 Page 92](#)

Indeed dear Mr Numani, "Maulana Sahib" as your followers from the Indian subcontinent address you, we have proven beyond doubt the authenticity of the event from other sources, perhaps your polite rephrasing using gentlemanly words attributed to Umar (about to commit an act of arson) are in reality the weak narration, more explicit versions are fully authentic. Yet, strangely, even you admit that it's probably true, and Umar did do this. After all, was not Umar also the man who had tried to kill Prophet Muhammad (saws) before convertin? his history of woman beating is well-known - he would beat his muslim sister before she converted, and came to kill Muhammad (saws) in this conjunction - these events are not denied by anyone - and when can consult works such as al Faruq for further clarity. It was part of his personality, which Numani studied in detail, and which led him to say that it's true. He was, by Numani's own admission, a psychopathic man. We all get put off by angry, violent, belligerent men who act with their fists and not with their head...that's what Umar was. It is sad that Sunni Islam has made this most vile of male personalities, exemplifying the worst masculine tendencies of beating up females, a personality cult to be emulated! If you ask us, there was a case that he needed to be emasculated, for the benefit of society at large. Deny the incident if you can, because you can't.

Even from this reference by Numani the actions of Umar can be proven. We wish our readers to take note of the facts that the attack on the house of Fatima (as) led by Umar has been widely reported in the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah, so much so that even Numani, the staunchest EVER advocate of Umar and keeper of his personality cult states **"there is no reason to deny the occurrence of this incident."** We are sure that these Nasibi will curse the day the Keeper of Umar's iconic memory wrote his book, because for all the fabricated Sunni traditions he cited to glorify him he made a categorical blunder by citing this reference. These eleven words serve as sufficient proof coming from who wrote it ... this President of the International Umar Fanclub himself acknowledges that this persecution did indeed take place. It's a message as resounding as IF Ayatullah Khomeini had praised Abu Bakr and Umar With this admission in many ways there is not even a need for us to expand on this matter in any further detail.

We read in *Kanz al Ummal Volume 3 page 139* (Egypt edition):

**"Zayd bin Salma narrates that when the bayya was administered to Abu Bakr following the death of the Holy Prophet, 'Ali and Zubayr were in the house of Fatima discussing their opposition to the khilafath of Abu Bakr. Umar obtained receipt of this information and went to the home of Sayyida Fatima and said 'Oh daughter of Rasulullah (s) after your father there is none that I love dearer more than you, but because of this matter I shall not prevent the setting of your house on fire on account of the discussions of these men'.**

This episode has been narrated on the authority from Ibn Sheeba, and can also be found in al Bayana Izalathul Khifa Volume 2 page 29. Al Muhaddith Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi also narrated this from Abu Bakr bin Abi Sheba from Zayd bin Salma and states that the chain Sahih according to the criterion of authenticity that had been set by the two Shaykhs (Bukhari and Muslim). Umar's character is clearly proven from this reference. Despite his awareness of the exalted rank of Sayyida Fatima (as), he was willing to push this aside and humiliate her by setting her home on fire. I mean, even assuming you have a grievance with someone else, including even someone like Afriki, what justification can there be to set their house on fire, and that too with them inside, as is clearly the case from other Sunni sources? What lovely Islamic

Ahkam did Umar possess? Amongst those individuals who were in the home opposing Abu Bakr, were just two men, 'Ali (as) and Zubayr and yet Umar deemed this matter as serious enough to burn them all alive.

This reference makes it clear that Maula 'Ali (as) and Sayyida Fatima (as) were both unhappy with Abu Bakr's coming to power, Umar was fully aware of this and he deemed Sayyida Fatima (as)'s home to be a house of conspiracy. The true misrepresentation of history is that which is presented by the Sunni Ulema to the masses. On the one hand these men of truth paint this romantic image of the four khalifas who were the best of friends who worked together in an atmosphere of love and co-operation, and that Imam 'Ali (as) deemed Abu Bakr to be the Khalifa of Rasulullah (s) and superior to him, and yet on the other hand they say that the house of Fatima (as) was where gatherings against Abu Bakr were taking place, and hence it was incumbent on the State to issue forceful threats to these insurgents and burn the residence down.

It sounds like something out of the most ruthless rebellions in history. For that's what it was...Abu Bakr had usurped the Khilafat and was hell-bent on destroying all resistance from the opposition camp, even to the degree of exceeding the limits set down by Allah and His Prophet (saws) and burning people to death, even Prophet Muhammad (saws)'s daughter. This kind of thing went on in the dark ages, and it was going on here and being instigated by the founding fathers of Sunni Islam. It's a dilemma for the Sunnis, not us. We follow Ali (as) and not these individuals. Ali (as) used his strength to fight the kuffar on the battlefields...that's manhood... these personalities used their strength to beat up pregnant women...what models of manhood!

## 4. The respect afforded to house of Sayyida Fatima (as) by Rasulallah (s)

### 4.1 The exalted rank and respect afforded to the house of Fatima (as)

Ahl'ul Sunnah's leading Sunni scholar of Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 5 page 51, al Hafidh Jalaladeen Suyuti in *Tafseer Durre Manthur*, narrates from Ibn Marwaya - Uns bin Malik - Burhaida:

**"Rasulallah (s) recited this verse 'and amongst houses is a house that Allah has ordered to be exalted'. A Sahaba asked 'O Prophet of Allah whose house is being referred to here?' He (s) said this refers to the houses of Prophets. At this point Abu Bakr pointed in the direction of the house of Ali and Fatima and asked is the house of 'Ali and Fatima included amongst the homes of the Prophets?' Rasulallah (s) replied 'Yes their home is superior to their homes'.**

It is tragic that a house that Rasulallah (s) had testified to having such a rank, where guidance shone out from in Paradise, was attacked with Umar threatening to set it on fire! We ask those with open minds, can there be a more heinous act than that? The devil had taken hold of Umar's mind. The sheer impudence in his personality, the arrogance with which he treated the Holy Prophet (saws), cannot be forgiven.

### 4.2 Rasulallah (s) would stand up when he saw Sayyida Fatimah (as)

We read in *Sunan Abu Daud* Book 41, Number 5198:

**"Narrated Aisha, Ummul Mu'minin:**

**I never saw anyone more like the Apostle of Allah (peace\_be\_upon\_him) in respect of gravity, calm deportment, pleasant disposition - according to al-Hasan's version: in respect of talk and speech. Al-Hasan did not mention gravity, calm deportment, pleasant disposition - than Fatimah, may Allah honour her face. When she came to visit him (the Prophet) he got up to (welcome) her, took her by the hand, kissed her and made her sit where he was sitting; and when he went to visit her, she got up to (welcome) him, took him by the hand, kissed him, and made him sit where she was sitting.**

We would urge those that love Ahl'ul bayt (as) to consider the rank that Rasulallah (s) gave Sayyida Fatima (as). He (s) would stand up to meet her, and yet Hadrath Umar threw this respect aside and attacked Sayyida Fatima (as). This lady's demeanour and personality were as gentle as her father's was. Umar attacked her home and physically attacked her, she herself died from these wounds a few months later ...he murdered her.

The gentlest of women was meted out treatment that in the Islam taught by her father is forbidden even for a dog. Think about that. It is shocking....earth-shattering and something the Sunnis now cannot deny happened. Umar did something totally haram - a major crime - indeed he committed several major sins, from threatening to burn women, to beating up a pregnant woman, to miscarrying her child, to inflicting injuries that led to her death....each carries the death penalty under the Shari'a - there are no "if's", no "But"'s - for what he did was unforgivable by the Qur'an.

Did Umar not think about the consequences of his actions? He knew Sayyida Fatima (as) was in the house, if there was any doubt that her (as) remonstrating with him, confirmed this. Despite this he arrogantly replied to her and made his intention clear that he was willing to kill her and those in the house if bayya was not given to Abu Bakr. Just imagine a madman like that in your neighbourhood- you would warn your wife and kids not to go anywhere near him...his actions

would make the national news headlines... *"PSYCHO TRIES TO BURN PREGNANT WOMAN AND HER CHILDREN TO DEATH"*... indeed it is so shocking it made the Islamic headlines also... all the great SUNNI men of letters we quoted noted it...it's preserved there over a thousand years later. Note that even in jihad, it is forbidden to terrorise women and children...so what was this man doing?

Their blind love for this psychopathic act has prompted them to level a charge of a corrupt judiciary being levelled at Sunni scholars - they try to defend the indefensible. Oh yes - go back and see how the Sunni Ulema said Umar's terrorism was justified simply because he was seeking to protect the usurped khilafat - see the corruption endemic in Sunni scholarship: they make a blatant wrong, a terrible sin, indeed an ABSOLUTE SIN in the Qur'an, that NO ONE is exonerable from and NO SITUATION justifies, justifiable and okay for Umar - just because Umar did it he's made above the Law of the Qur'an. This is disgraceful.

Our readers should know that this is just part of the dark side to Nasibi aqeedah that has sought to pass itself off as Sunnism. Here Umar stands opposed to the Qur'an's verdict - he is GUILTY of SEVERAL massive SINS CARRYING THE DEATH PENALTY - and they revere him - and just go back and see their excuses like those from Numani. These scholars seek to justify a HARAM action simply because Umar did it; with no proof for their stance...indeed the Qur'an blatantly forbids the harming of women and children EVEN in jihad, which this was not. NOTICE the unwritten VIP Clause in Sunni Islam - a case of perverting the cause of Allah's justice, God's express commands in the Qur'an, to protect a Sunni VIP in the persona of Umar... the more I studied Sunnism the less and less my conscience could bear it...I would have left Islam were it not for the true path of Ahl-ul-Bayt rather than the religion written by the Khalifas.

Our revert member always used to listen, slightly perturbed, in his wide-eyed Sunni days to the sayings about Umar's temper...he never quite understood all those hot-headed acts of temper for which they glorified him as a hardman... he pretended that it was just a case of exuberance, zeal, a no-nonsense personality that he assumed must still have a heart of gold and some love in it somewhere. But even then, some of the stories they recited about his personality and his violent streak he still couldn't understand and they stood diametrically opposed to the conduct and Islamic Ahkam expected from a true believer - could someone like this have really been as close to the Prophet (saws) as they said...if so, why didn't Umar's personality become refined through emulating the gentle Prophet (saws)... why was he prone to these violent mood swings? Then he saw the impudence Umar showed to the Prophet (saws) in his own lifetime, even preventing Rasulullah (s) from writing his Will at his deathbed, an article compulsory for all Muslims (please see our article on this matter). It was this, Umar's conduct above that of any other companion that made him have doubts as to what these companions were really like.

Maybe they were corrupt leaders like St Paul for the Christians - or maybe it was just a cultural gap...but most Arabs he met, with the exception of members of the violent brand of Nasibism and the Bin Laden wannabes, by and large weren't like Umar....some people, bad people, bad men, in any community, however, ARE. If you visit an Irish bar after 10 at night and you'll find men there who go home and beat their wives and kids up.

Our team member also started to see that there was more to these traditions than met the eye...these were chinks in the Public Relations (PR) armour created for Umar by generation after generation of Sunni traditionalist all the way down from Bukhari (most on the payroll of the Khalifas who hated the Shias and were scared of their Imams, the true inheritors of the Khilafat)...history written by victors as it always has been... and the more he read of Umar's personality, the more unsavoury it became. His barbaric treatment meted out to Sayyida Fatima (as) was just like that of Saddam, Attila the Hun or Vlad the Impaler.

And yet these Nasibi are fully aware of what he did and still they revere him as a saint. This is no worse than the Catholic Church who granted Sainthood to Isabella despite her barbaric actions of slaughtering innocent women and children. The Marwani clergy are fully aware of Umar's actions, but they have adopted a code of silence on this matter, and counter it via Afriki

type dishonest tactics, namely lie to the masses, deny the event, deem it a Shi'a fabrication keep the masses ignorant. It is this ignorance that keeps the majority sitting comfortably in the Sunni Camp; they are snug in their overconfidence that being in the majority means they're safe...Our member gave up on that notion when he left Christianity. He forgives them for it, but don't forgive the Nasibis who actively resent Ali (as). As for the rest, if they'd just used their mind a bit, they'd wake up to the cover-up...it's just sitting there waiting to be exposed in their own books, for you cannot hide truth totally - never has a regime in history been able to totally cover up its misdemeanours. You can write a lie, but even that lie is still based on fact, and this is exactly how the real story of Islam unfolded to him through the Sunni books, their most prized books upon which they base their whole religion after the Qur'an.

## 5. The reaction of Sayyida Fatima (as)

### 5.1 Sayyida Fatima (as)'s anger

A household that Rasulullah (s) had compared to Noah's ark and the port of guidance, came to be viewed as the enemy of the new and illegitimate State. The common reaction of any family friends is to console the bereaved family over the loss of a parent. In this instance consolation came by bringing fire to the home of the bereaved and threatening to set it on fire rather. Do the Nasibi really expect us to believe that after THIS that Sayyida Fatima (as) remained happy with these individuals? Sayyida Fatima (as) was persecuted and hurt and she left the earth angry with the Shaykhayn. The Nasibi can offer as many excuses as they want but the fact is even Sahih al Bukhari vouches for her being upset with them, and it must have been something pretty damn serious to warrant this:

We read in *Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 325*:

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

The end of this reference makes it clear that Sayyida Fatima (as) finished ALL relations with these individuals, she wanted nothing to do with them, and never spoke to them again while she remained alive. Nasibis often suggest that good cordial relations were resumed soon after the Fidak dispute though one wonders how this could be the case when Ayesha in the Sahih of Bukhari testifies to the fact the Leader of the Women of Paradise NEVER spoke to Abu Bakr again. Sayyida Fatima did not speak to Abu Bakr for the last six months of her life and this is significant since it is also stipulated in *Sahih al Bukhari Bab al Adab, Volume 8, Book 73, Number 100*:

**"Narrated Abu Aiyub Al-Ansari:**

**Allah's Apostle said, "It is not lawful for a man to desert his brother Muslim for more than three nights. (It is unlawful for them that) when they meet, one of them turns his face away from the other, and the other turns his face from the former, and the better of the two will be the one who greets the other first."**

Rasulullah (s) stated that in Islam one cannot be angry with a fellow Muslim for more than three days, but such was the anger of Sayyida Fatima (as) with regards to the treatment that was meted out to her, she never spoke to Abu Bakr for the last six months of her life, and when Abu Bakr sought forgiveness (as we cite in *al Imama wa al Siyasa*) she turned her face away from him. Something extremely serious had happened between them.

Sayyida Fatima (as) was so upset that she gave an order that Abu Bakr NOT attend her funeral that is why Imam 'Ali (as) buried her in secret, at night. (Bukhari). Tell us Mr Afriki you blind bigot...are the 'unscrupulous' Shi'a also making a mountain out of a molehill here? Was Sayyida Fatima (as) blowing the matter out of proportion?

Afriki might try and suggest that this reference means nothing, but the fact of the matter was that it was so serious that Sayyida Fatima despised Abu Bakr to the degree that she did not even want him to participate in her funeral prayers or attend her funeral. Sayyida Fatima (as) stipulated that no one attends her funeral, who she was upset with, and this testimony has been vouched for in the following books of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Tabaqat ibn Sa'd, Dhikr Fatima page 19
2. Mustadrak al Hakim Dhikr Fatima page 192
3. Hilayath al Auliya page 43

Fatima (as)'s position is higher than that of any wife of Muhammad (saws) (see start) and is on a par with Mary (as) the Mother of Jesus (as), indeed higher as it is Fatima (as) and not Mary (as) who is the Supreme Leader of the exalted women of Paradise where reside the noble mothers and daughters of prophets. In Heaven, even one of Fatima (as)'s followers, Mary (as), is so exalted herself that a whole Surah of the Qur'an is named after her. Fatima (as)'s testimony is clear proof that she, exalted by Allah (swt) more than even the Virgin Mary (as), was persecuted at the hands of the nascent Sunni State, and that this injustice was so severe that she wanted to let all future generations be aware of it. As Fatima (as) left the Earth to become Leader of the Women of Paradise she was still at War with Abu Bakr. Now Sunnis believe a fabricated PR Spin doctored Hadith that Abu Bakr is also one of the 10 companions promised Paradise. So, are we talking of war in Paradise? Contradiction abounds in Sunnism - just like it does in Christianity. No, Abu Bakr is NOT guaranteed Heaven... the Holy Prophet (saws) never said anything like that about him, your PR machine made that one up. That was just PR. As a onetime catholic, our team memberr still love Jesus (as) and Mary (as), and to think of what that these personalities did to Mary (as)'s Mistress Fatima (as) means that we the Shi'a want nothing to do with him.

## 5.2 Sayyida Fatima (as)'s eulogy of her suffering

The words of Sayyida Fatima (as) can be located in the following reputable texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Kashaf al Ghumma page 174
2. Tareekh Khamees page 173
3. Murujh al Nubuwwath pahe 443 Dhikr Dufun Rasulullah (s)
4. Ruh al Mustafai page 36
5. Al Fuaadh al Zayaath page 44
6. Muqathal Ahysaan page 80 Chapter 5
7. Fusul al Muhimma page 148
8. Durre Manthur fi Dhikr Tabaqat rabaath al Hazoor page 362 Dhikr Fatima

For the sake of brevity we shall simply quote from *Fusul al Muhimma page 148*:

**Hadhrath 'Ali stated 'following the death of Rasulullah (s), Fatima (s) went to the grave of the Prophet (s) and recited these words:**

**O my beloved father, since your death I have faced such troubles that had these fallen on the day it would have turned into night"**

These words have entered the Arabic language as a mournful expression in prose, so powerful are they. These words, used by countless Arab women ever since down to the present, including the daughters of martyred fathers falling at the hands of injustice, originate from those of Sayyida Fatima (as) all those years ago and stand as proof that she had suffered immense torment following the death of her father - it is clear evidence that she was persecuted and was so hurt by her treatment that she complained to Rasulullah (s) after his passing.

Without even realising it, any distraught Arab daughter that uses this expression is acknowledging the depth of Fatima (as)'s supreme pain. Pain inflicted by Umar has become a metaphor for pain for one thousand four hundred years. Nasibi Afriki can deny the persecution as much as he likes, but these two lines of Sayyida Fatima (as) destroy his assertion that the persecution of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) was a lie.

The haunting memory of Fatima (as)'s pain is testified to also in the fact that uniquely amongst those that died during that period, her grave in Madina is unknown. She was also buried at night. Why? Because the Umar and his Cronies could not force themselves onto her funeral procession....and also so her grave would be a secret...an oddity that makes the enquiring mind, for time immemorial, ask questions as to how this came to be.

### 5.3 A Sunni scholar's fatwa that the suffering of Ahl'ul bayt should not be discussed

Sadruddeen al Hanafi in *Ruh al Mustafai Volume 3 page 36* makes the following comments:

**"Discussion of events that took place following the bayya that was given after Rasullah's death, such as Fidak should be done so carefully. It is better to refrain from mentioning events such as Hadhrath Umar's threatening Banu Hashim, and Sayyida Fatima (ra)'s complaints. Sayyida Fatima (ra)'s will that none of these individuals attend her funeral, is clear proof that she left this world in a distressed state."**

This Hanafi scholar's desire that these events should NOT be discussed is clear proof that this persecution of Ahl'ul bayt (as) did indeed take place, which is why he deemed it important to steer clear of such discussions to preserve the fiction of the friendly Sahaba. Whilst his silence is on account of his view that questions should not be asked of the Sahaba, we at least commend this Hanafi scholar for having the courage to admit that Umar's threats and the distress of Sayyida Fatima (as) are facts that cannot be denied.

It is ironic that Afriki the Nasibi Preacher had the gall to attack the Shi'a as follows:

Ansar.org states:

Abu Bakr and 'Umar will ever be thought of by the Shi'ah in terms of the "deeds" of that day, and no true Shi'i who believes in these stories as factual truth could ever be expected to harbour the merest ounce of goodwill towards Abu Bakr and 'Umar-let alone the rest of the Sahabah who stood with them and paid allegiance to them.

Afriki, Nasibi Warrior, condemn us if you want to, but then you CANNOT by the testimony of your own words...you write here in the context of this emotional issue that it is rightfully emotive and feelings of hatred towards Umar AND those companions who supported him are fully justified IF what is said about him could be found in Sunni works...you earlier denied the existence of such Sunni works...you have been proved a liar 20 times over in this regard....so by your own logic, you can understand why we feel angry with Umar...so how can we be condemned? BUT somehow we don't think you're angry, because you love Umar MORE than you love Muhammad (saws). Then burn in hell. First the Christians and then the Nasibi Salafi cult, you people misguided our team convert team member for too many years and cost him many years of blessings. Now he is repaying Allah (sawt) for his favour unto him by showing others the light. This is his first battle with the demons of the Muslim world. Insha Allah more, and more is to follow.

We agree with Afriki 100% the moment that the "deeds" of the Shyakhayn - namely the tragic

persecution of Sayyida Fatima (as) (from your own authentic historical facts) are proven, we as followers of Ahl'ul bayt (as) automatically harbor enmity towards Abu Bakr and Umar. You expect us to harbor good will against those that attacked Sayyida Fatima (as)? Tell us Ansar.org; did Sayyida Fatima (as) harbor any good will to them? If she had even an ounce of goodwill towards them can you explain why she insisted that Abu Bakr be prohibited from participating in her funeral?

Afriki - look at what you said - you said it was understandable and natural - what was? You said that if a man believes Abu Bakr and Umar harmed Fatima (as) then it is only natural to hate these two companions. So that's it.... Of course it is....Sunnis would start hating them too if they believed in what the Shia say they did...so you lie and say they didn't harm Fatima (as), that they were saints. We have however proven without a doubt that the Salaf King Pins believe that Umar and Co. DID in fact commit these wicked acts according to your GREAT MEN OF LETTERS, a fact that you were indeed lying about to try and cover it up and stop people, naturally, hating them - both sunni and shia.

Then you must excuse former Sunnis like our member, when they leave love of Abu Bakr and Umar and replace it with love of Ahl-ul-Bait. You admit it's only natural to hate Umar and Co IF the claim that they persecuted Fatima (as) could be found in Sunni books.....we have proven this beyond doubt - the persecution of Fatima (as), we've here shown IS what SUNNI ISLAM says they did indeed do - therefore it is natural and understandable for Sunnis to hate them. So don't dare to criticise our hatred as a Shia, because you admitted that such was the evil inherent in harming Fatima (as), if such intent could be proven, then hating her aggressors was natural - that she was harmed has been proven beyond doubt - this equates with our natural hatred for them. Now the Sunnis have come to understand why the hatred runs so deep from some Shia quarters, they will one day also come to understand about how your PR factory made up other Hadith to glorify these characters. If we get a good response with the style of this article, more is coming in the course of time ...meanwhile the moderates can show you the beautiful grandeur of the Shia Imams, while our member vents his "natural" and "understandable" hatred for the State Mafia. He refuses to go back to your misguided religion that takes these despots as saints.

It's a feeling more enlightening than understanding how St Paul, another fraud, this time for the Christians, subverted the true teachings of Jesus (as) and the rest was all a big PR exercise masterminded by him and those that came after him. We are SICK of characters like Paul, Umar and Abu Bakr. Most Christianity is Pauline Christianity, with his early treachery and lies made into a religion for the masses by successive Popes and Pontiffs who wrote history, through THEIR eyes as the victors, hiding the real Christianity deep in the recesses of the Vatican Library and covering up works like the Dead Sea Scrolls... and most Islam is Umar's Islam, substitute Paul for Umar, Popes for Khalifas, and the Vatican Library for Sunni Islam's books. And just like devout Catholics, the Sunnis don't examine their beliefs...the personage of the Pope/Khalifa can do no wrong. But believe us, there is a billion times more ammo to get the adherents of Mu'awiya with through their books than to catch the Christians out with theirs. And we know how flimsy even the latter are.

Consider this:

The Qur'an says

**"Only a minority will be on the right path."**

Since when is Sunni Islam the minority?

Muhammad (saws) said

**"You will go the way of the people of the past people."**

The prophet before Muhammad (saws) was Isa (as) and most Christians after Jesus (as) went the way of Paul's Christianity, same as after Muhammad (saws)'s passing most Muslims went

the way of Umar's Islam.

Perhaps Afriki could answer us this:

If men (albeit your father's friends) came to your door and made threats to set fire to your home, with full knowledge that your wife and children were inside, what would be your opinion of such individuals? (PS this kind of behaviour is not permitted in any Islamic context; it is the language of terrorists) Would you:

Harbour love for them?

Or:

Condemn their actions and distance yourselves from these people?

How do Muslims feel when they see images of the Israeli army attacking the homes of Palestinians, demanding that they be let in, issuing threats to the women? Do Muslim hearts embrace such actions or do we condemn and hate such perpetrators? No doubt all Muslims feel distressed when witnessing these horrendous images on the screen, and yet when Sayyida Fatima (as) is subjected to the same type of persecution by Colonel Umar (Israeli Army), these Nasibi remain unmoved and in fact deem such perpetrators as Imams, esteemed individuals with whom Allah (swt) is pleased. You wonder if these men have ANY softness or love in them. This coldness is proof they do not follow the way of Muhammad (s). You cannot claim to love Ahl'ul bayt (as) and also love those that oppressed them. If Ahl'ul Sunnah wish to adopt this approach then so be it, but we will never be a party to such hypocrisy.

## 6. Analysing the event

All manner of excuse has been put forward by the Nasibi to defend the actions of Umar. Numani seems to suggest that this was a necessity as it was incumbent to quash any activities that were harmful to unity - the meetings in the house of Sayyida Fatima (as), were dangerous in that people were conspiring against 'Abu Bakr, totally disregarding the implications that the behaviour of Umar was HARAM no matter WHAT he feared - you are not allowed to burn someone's house down, to emolliate them, beat them, violently abort their unborn children, to burn children and women alive, to torture them, use physical violence or even the threat of it as a means of extortion, even in war this is prohibited in the Qur'an NO MATTER WHAT THE SITUATION. Now perhaps you can appreciate why the extreme factions amongst the Shia hate Umar...even Afriki understands it and calls it justifiable and understandable, even righteous...IF, he says, such traditions existed in Sunni Islam, which we have shown they do, and do so in abundance, and in authoritative accounts.

We would also like to ask this question:

If the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) had become a meeting point where opposition to 'Abu Bakr was being plotted does this mean that rebellion was being planned in the home of Ali (as) and Fatima (as), in their midst? If the answer is 'yes' this plotting was taking place in their presence then this alhamdulillah this provides immense support for the Shi'a since the following points are proven

1. Sayyida Fatima (as) and Imam 'Ali (as) did NOT deem Abu Bakr to be the rightful khalifa.
2. Hadhrath Fatima (as) and Imam 'Ali (as) deemed 'Abu Bakr to be a usurper.
3. Failure to regard Abu Bakr as the rightful khalifa bears no bearing on one's iman, if it did then the Ahl'ul bayt (as) would have never indulged in such a sin.
4. Abu Bakr was prepared to secure the bayya of Ahl'ul bayt by any means necessary
5. Sahaba had gathered in the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) plotting to overthrow Abu Bakr.
6. Ahl'ul Sunnah aqeedah is that ALL the Sahaba are pious and just, hence the conspiracy being hatched to remove Abu Bakr was also a just one.
7. Rasulullah (s) had told his Ummah to follow the Qur'an and Ahl'ul bayt (as) as two sources of guidance after him. The Ahl'ul bayt (as) had rejected Abu Bakr's khilafath hence their opinion supercedes 'Abu Bakr's concerns.
8. Abu Bakr deemed every method to secure the allegiance to be lawful.
9. If we for arguments sake accept that Abu Bakr's coming to power was rightfull, then that automtically means those that the Sahaba and Ahl'ul bayt (as) opposing him were wrong. Was their mistake in relation to a wordly or religious matter? In case of religion, it is impossible for Ahle Bait to make a mistake, while Rasool Allah [saww] himself has asked the Ummah to follow the Thaqlain after him, who will always be on Haq. And if it was a political mistake, then we have to accept that since the start of new government, there were differences between the policies of government and of Ahle Bait. Now we have the orders to stick with Ahle Bait , therefore, we come to conclusion that politics was related to Ahle Bait. And their enemies were on Batil.
10. Even if we consider that the Khilafah of Abu Bakr was legal, still we have to see if the government tried to discuss and ask the problem from Ahle Bait before trying to burn them in their home

## 6.1 Was a conspiracy being hatched against Abu Bakr?

Advocate of Umar Shibli Numani suggests that Umar's actions were legitimate since the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) had become a meeting point where discussions were over how to overthrow Abu Bakr. The reality is the Banu Hashim and their supporters:

- did not deem Abu Bakr to be the legitimate khalifa,
- were displeased at his appointment
- were angered by the way Abu Bakr came to power.
- deemed this position to be someone else's right.

If our assertion is incorrect then there is no reason why they failed to give bayya to Abu Bakr forthwith, and there certainly would not have been a reason for Abu Bakr to instruct Umar to take the necessary steps to bring these gatherings to an end.

Not only is our assertion logical, it can also be proven from history that Banu Hashim deemed 'Ali (as) to be the legitimate khalifa of Rasulullah (s). Worthy of note is the fact that voices in Saqifa itself also felt the same way. Their opposition led to them gathering in the home of Imam 'Ali (as), in order to discuss what had transpired and what steps needed to be taken to redress the balance. Those involved in these discussions included prominent Sahaba such as Zubayr, all of whom had gathered to discuss their opposition to Abu Bakr's unlawful Government, they were not prepared to accept that the destiny of the Ummah had been decided without prior consultation by the Ansar and 3 Muhajireen. The Sahaba and Ahl'ul bayt had been kept in the dark over the Saqifa meeting, individuals that had built the fabric of the Islamic State through their blood, sweat and tears.

Even leading members of the Quraysh such as Abu Sufyan felt that the discussions of a handful of individuals was a conspiracy, and hence they were voicing their objections, as Rasulullah (s) had said **"Speaking the truth before an unjust ruler is the greatest jihad"** The best fighting (jihad) in the path of Allah is (to speak) a word of justice to an oppressive ruler *[taken from Sunan Abu Daud Book 37, Number 4330]*.

The Banu Hashim and their supporters held Abu Bakr's election to be unlawful, as Umar himself acknowledged as second khalifa "strike". Our assertion is these meetings were lawful since people were voicing their objections against an unlawfully appointed khalifa.

## 6.2 Was it lawful for Abu Bakr to act in the manner that he did?

Advocates of Abu Bakr claim that Abu Bakr was perfectly within his rights as legitimate khalifa to use whatever means he had at his disposal to quell insurgency. Whilst this might give comfort to the Ahl'ul Sunnah, we should point out that this also supports the Shi'a argument, namely that:

1. There was open opposition towards the Ahl'ul bayt and the Sahaba that sided with them.
2. The planning that was taking place against Abu Bakr in the house of Sayyida Fatima is clear proof as to the illegitimacy of Abu Bakr's khilafath.
3. Banu Hashim and Sahaba did NOT deem Abu Bakr to be the rightful khalifa of Rasulullah (s).
4. Abu Bakr's khilafath was NOT rightful and was in fact secured via political manoeuvring and treachery. This can be concluded from the words of Rasulullah (s) declared "'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali", "Ali is with the Qur'an and the Qur'an is with 'Ali" "Whoever pains 'Ali, pains me", "Ali's enemies are my enemies". Those that opposed Imam 'Ali (as) and sought to set his home on fire in order to secure his

compliance had opposed the truth, the Qur'an and had become enemies of Rasulallah (s) in the process.

5. There is a famous hadith of Rasulallah (s) "Whoever does not recognise his Imam of the time dies the death of one belonging to the time of jahiliyya. From the attack on the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) it is clear that 'Ali (as) and Abu bakr opposed each other. By failing to recognise Abu Bakr and not just that, by convening meetings to devise a means to oppose him, were the Banu Hashim and supporters lead by 'Ali (as) indulging in kufr? What is Afriki's reply here?

The harsh reality is the Ahl'ul Sunnah can offer no decent answer to this point, particularly when this destroys the romantic picture that the Sunni Ulema paint of the 4 rightly guided khalifa's working closely with one another, in an atmosphere of mutual love, understanding and co-operation.

The Ahl'ul Sunnah assert that Imam 'Ali (as) deemed Abu Bakr to be more superior than him, but this tragic incident destroys this notion for here we have Imam 'Ali's open opposition and Abu Bakr's attempt to secure acceptance via duress.

### 6.3 The consequences of Umar's actions

It is indeed unfortunate that this violent act of Umar set a precedent for future khalifa's, namely that a khalifa should secure bayya at all costs, and by whatever means he wishes albeit through intimidation, threats and violence. If threats could be made to the daughter of Rasulallah (s) then threats could be made to anyone. This is why the Salaf Imams / Khalifas that followed deemed Umar's actions as a model of best practice; a precedent had been set namely that it was lawful for duress to be used to secure compliance.

That is why we had the fasiq 6th Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Yazeed seeking to secure the bayya of Imam Husayn (as) who could point to Umar's actions as proof of the correctness of such an approach - namely that it was perfectly okay to terrorise Ahl'ul bayt to get your way. It is indeed tragic that the fire that Umar brought to the house of Sayyida Fatima (s) set a chilling precedent, and left a trail that lit the tents belonging to Sayyida Fatima's daughters on the 10th of Muharrum.

Hajjaj bin Yusuf adopted similar methods of intimidation to quell opponents, and indeed this 'legitimate approach' continues until today. (Hajjaj bin Yusuf committed purges and genocide of men just like Vlad the Impaler (Dracula) did in Europe, women and children were killed, human beings insanely tortured though this is forbidden in islam, killing hundreds of thousands of muslims down to babies...he is applauded by many Sunnis today as he did some work on the grammar of the Qur'an! Oh yes, that forgives all doesn't it! He was just a boy having a tantrum!). If today the masses complain of oppression and intimidation by their rulers they should know that their rulers' actions are perfectly lawful since they are adhering to the Sunnah of the Shaykhain.

The Arab world has been ruled by many terrorists who they have hailed as heroes and years later they have glorified them with romantic fairytales...history is, after all, written by victors, and the victors in this context were the Nasibis. You may applaud them, as some Nasibis have, but whatever you feel inside, terrorism is against the laws of Allah (sawt) and His Prophet, and the terrorist burns in Hell where Allah (sawt) will terrorise him.

Now I can see where Hajjaj, Saddam and Usama bin Ladin get their bad habits. There are some Muslims in this day and age who applaud terrorists who kill innocent women and children. There are others who don't like to condemn them, even though deep down they know it's wrong, simply because they get a kick out of getting their own back against their persecutors. There are others who will cover up their actions. And so it is with the Nasibis and their ugly past.

## 7. Defences of Shah Abdul Aziz for Umar's aggression and our replies

Since Afriki's main aim has been to deny the occurrence of this event altogether we felt it important to cite the defences that were provided by one of his leading Imam al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi - whose writings against the Shi'a no doubt have a major influence over Ansar.org and their fellow minded Nasibi brethren.

We will analyse each of his defences and provide a reply, since it should be known that if Afriki is denying this event this great Anti Shi'a scholar after initial reluctance admitted it and then set out a series of defences to defend Umar's act of aggression.

We are quoting from *Taufa Ithna Ashari page 292* wherein he discussed the episode and have divided up his comments in defences:

### 7.1 Defence One

**The episode of Hiraq whereby the house of Fatima was set on fire, she was punched in the stomach that led to the death of her unborn child id a lie since no texts cite it.**

### 7.2 Reply

We have already cited many references that confirm the above hence like Shah Abdul Aziz is merely using the Afriki type tactics of denial in hope that ignorant readers accept what he is saying. Curiously the Shah then makes an about U-turn, exhibiting signs of schizophrenia he then sets out numerous defences for Umar's acts:

### 7.3 Defence Two

**"Threats are connected with one's heart we are not in a position to ascertain what is in a man's heart. The words used bu Umar was to scare those inside the house"**

### 7.4 Reply One

If these were indeed nothing more than just words, then why did Umar not just leave the matter to the point of verbal threats? WE have cited references from Iqd al Fareed, and Tareekh Abdul Fida that confirm that Umar brough firewood to the door, Tabari records him testifying in the name of Allah that he will set the house on fire this makes his intention absolutely clear. If I issue thraets outside a persons home and am arrested by the police with a perol can and lighter on me, then my intentions will not be deemed to be threats alone, rather that items held constitute evidence of a minister aim, namely of physically carrying through my threat. If someone was to make threats to Rasulullah (s) saying 'I will set your house on fire" then the very intention constitutes kufr, if a similar threat is made to the Ahl'ul bayt (as) then we deem this to be transgression, for we Rasulullah (s) and the Ahl'ul bayt (as) are on par with one another, Rasulullah (s) said whoever fights them fights me, curses them, curses me. Pains them pains me.

### 7.5 Reply Two

The best way to understand Umar's intention is to look at the reaction of those inside the house. Did they deem Umar's threat as just words? Cleary not, had this been the case they would have come our peacefully, but from the account in Tabari it is clear that Zubayr came out with his sword raised, ready to fight. This is prrof that Zubayr took the threat to be be a very real one, and hence he sought to counter this threat via self-defence / adopting physical force. Our challenge to those who might seek solace in this defence is to cite us a single narration wherein either Abu Bakr or Umar had stated that the objective behind the threats were to strike fear into those in the house and nothing more.

## 7.6 Defence Three

**"The people of dishonesty had gathered for protection in the house and they were conspiring to harm Abu Bakr's reign".**

## 7.7 Reply One

Shah should have some respect, as we already mentioned Rasulullah (s) praised the house of Zahra as a house shining in Paradise (Tafseer Durre Manthur 5 / 50) and in Tafseer Fathul Qadeer Volume 4 page 271 we learn that Rasulullah (s) spent 6 months reciting 33:33 outside this same house. To deem this house a place of sedition / conspiracy is to in effect mock the practice of Rasulullah (s).

## 7.8 Reply Two

It is interesting that a man whose madhab deems all the Sahaba to be just has deemed the Sahaba (including Talha and Zubayr), the Ahl'ul bayt and the vast bulk of Banu Hashim to be dishonest.

In this house were the young children of Sayyida Fatima (as), including Hasan (as) and Husayn (as) the Chiefs of the Youths of Paradise, there was 'Ali (as), and Rasulullah (s) said 'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali. Is it believable that Shah is suggesting these individuals were troublemakers seeking to spread sedition through the Ummah?

## 7.9 Reply Three

If the Banu Hashim, Ansar and Muhajireen were scheming against Abu Bakr then this makes his reign false since he did not attain the ijma since ijma cannot occur when these groups consent is not secured. We for example read in *Sharh Waqiya page 427*:

**The opposition of even one person contravenes the concept of ijma".**

Ibn Taymeeya al Nasibi in "Kitab al Iman" page 51:

**"An ijma wherein not even one person is opposed, can be described as an injma of truth".**

We read in Mihal Safr page 286:

**"Allah's lanath is on any ijma that does not incorporate 'Ali and his companions".**

We read the fatwa of Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Zi'a al Ameen al Asree in Dhurst al Abeeb page 249:

**"When the Ahl'ul bayt are in opposition then no ijma takes place".**

On the basis of these Ahl'ul Sunnah fatwas we can state confidently that claims that Abu Bakr obtained the ijma with which to reign is false, since prominent Sahaba, Banu Hashim and Ahl'ul bayt (as) opposed to the manner in which he attained power. A false ijma therefore means that Abu Bakr was an illegitimate Khalifa, it was therefore unlawful for him to issue instructions to inflict harm on his opponents. If those in the house were indeed planning to overthrow an illegitimate khalifa then this cannot constitute fitnah until his reign is deemed to be just, and when the Ahl'ul bayt (as) refuse to accept this that no ijma takes place. The Shah therefore has no right to label Abu Bakr's opponents as dishonest elements who were indulging themselves in unlawful acts of fitnah.

## 7.10 Reply Four

These individuals were not causing fitnah rather they deemed Abu Bakr's seizing power as an act of Fitnah and they had turned to Imam 'Ali to put things right - they feared oppression and sought his protection and Umar aware of this tried to force them (physically) to give bayya.

## 7.11 Reply Five

Rasulullah (s) had also told the Ummah to attach itself to the Ahl'ul bayt (as) to prevent dissension, so how can Shah Abdul Aziz suggest that they were the people of dishonesty? Shah's admission in effect brings home some uncomfortable truths - the Ahl'ul Sunnah have no association with the Ahl'ul bayt (as) nor do they really believe that all the Sahaba were just lip service, there only true association is with the Shaykhayn (Abu Bakr and Umar) all there actions serve as a correct precedent, even if their acts contradicts the ethics and the Sunnah of Rasulallah (s).

## 7.12 Reply Six - Rasulallah had identified places of Fitnah

There are many hadith wherein Rasulallah (s) has specifically identified homes as fitnah. We for example read in how he (s) identified Ayesha's house as a place of Fitnah. We are citing this fact from Sahih al Bukhari under the Chapter One-fifth of Booty to the Cause of Allah (Khumus) Volume 4, Book 53, Number 336:

**Narrated 'Abdullah:**

**The Prophet stood up and delivered a sermon, and pointing to 'Aisha's house (i.e. eastwards), he said thrice, "Affliction (will appear from) here," and, "from where the side of the Satan's head comes out (i.e. from the East)."**

We also read in Sahih al Bukhari Bab ul Fitan Volume 9, Book 88, Number 182:

**Narrated Usama bin Zaid:**

**Once the Prophet stood over one of the high buildings of Medina and then said (to the people), "Do you see what I see?" They said, "No." He said, "I see afflictions falling among your houses as rain drops fall."**

Sahih al Bukhari also narrates that Rasulallah (s) had pre warned the Sahaba that the vast bulk would become kaafir's after him and would perish in Hell to the extent that **"I did not see anyone of them escaping except a few who were like camels without a shepherd"**.  
*Sahih Bukhari Hadith: 8.587*

The act of apostasy clearly constitutes fitnah.

We also read in Sahih al Bukhari Bab al Fitan Volume 9, Book 88, Number 214:

**Narrated Ibn 'Umar:**

**The Prophet said, "O Allah! Bestow Your blessings on our Sham! O Allah! Bestow Your blessings on our Yemen." The People said, "And also on our Najd." He said, "O Allah! Bestow Your blessings on our Sham (north)! O Allah! Bestow Your blessings on our Yemen." The people said, "O Allah's Apostle! And also on our Najd." I think the third time the Prophet said, "There (in Najd) is the place of earthquakes and afflictions and from there comes out the side of the head of Satan."**

If Umar sought to quell fitnah and was hence within his rights to set fire to those perpetuating afflictions, then he should have started by setting alight to the homes of fitnah that Rasulallah (s) had pinpointed. He should have accordingly set fire to the house of Ayesha, followed by the homes of the muhajireen and ansar and then the homes of those that resided in Najd, the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) should have come last on his fitnah list. Why did Umar choose to ignore the warnings of Rasulallah (s) and instead target his aggression towards the house of Rasulallah's innocent daughter?

We would also like to know why the State only focused its targets on the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) when we know that Sad bin Ubadad had openly stated that he refused to recognise Abu Bakr as the Khalifa?

### 7.13 Defence Four

**"Hadhrath Fatima was unhappy at the people's presence in her home"**

### 7.14 Reply

If this is true then this is even more damning for Umar, for it suggests that Umar was venting his anger / aggression by threatening to set fire to the home of a woman who had done no wrong and in fact was opposed to these gathering in her home. Would it not have sufficed for Umar to just issue threats to warn these unruly elements? Would these words not have been a sufficient reason with which Sayyida Fatima could have requested these individuals to depart from her home? Why did Umar seek to up the ante by bringing fire wood to the door and making an oath that he would set fire to the house?

### 7.15 Defence Five

**"Whereas people would shut their doors on them, it was not within Fatima's manners to close the door on anybody"**

### 7.16 Reply

The Shah in effect suggests that Fatima deemed Abu Bakr to be the rightful Khalifa, but her excellent manners were such that she could not even turn away those that had differing views to her own! If she (as) did indeed deem that events at Saqifa that led to Abu Bakr's coming to power to be prim and proper then this in effect raises questions on the character of Sayyida Fatima (as), namely:

*How could she remain silent and allow people to partake in acts that she was fully aware was unlawful?*

To permit unlawful illegal activity contravenes the Shari'a since it breaches the duties stipulated within the Qur'an and Sunnah. There was no need to practice taqiyya, Hadhrath Fatima (as) was not being pressured to allow these meetings. If she indeed deemed Abu Bakr's khilafath to be legitimate then we challenge the defenders of Abu Bakr to cite us even a single authentic reference wherein she had expressed her anger towards those inside her house. If Hadhrath Fatima (as) did indeed deem Abu Bakr to be the legitimate khalifa then why did she curse him after every prayer? If no dispute had taken place, then why did Abu Bakr and Umar deem it important to visit her home and ask for her forgiveness?

### 7.17 Defence Six

Shah Sahib also claims that when it dawned on Umar that Sayyida Fatima (as) was unhappy at the presence of this group he issued the threat

**"...when Umar ibn al Khattab became aware of the situation he issued a threat, if you don't get out of the house then I shall burn you all"**

### 7.18 Reply One

It is fascinating that Shah advances this defence without relying on any reference, rather this is just a figment of his imagination, there is no authentic reference that points to Sayyida Fatima (as)'s resentment of the meeting, Umar's threats directed towards them. This is his own personal view, devoid of actual references hence they bear no weighting to this argument. The

claim that Umar threatened only those that gathered in the house is a claim that cannot be corroborated by historical material.

### 7.19 Reply Two

The reality is this disrespectful dialogue transpired between Umar and Sayyida Fatima (as) - no one else - he stated directly to her "I swear that I shall set this house on fire" - and when people pointed out that Sayyida Fatima (as) was in the house he replied defiantly "so be it". Some narrators have stated clearly that Sayyida Fatima said directly to Umar "Ibn Khattab do you intend on setting fire to my home?" and replied to her in an affirmative disrespectful manner that he would. When we look at these narrations collectively then there is no basis to suggest that the threat was directed directly at the group of men in the house, rather they were directed at Sayyida Fatima (as) alone.

If you yourself claim that the threat was not aimed at Sayyida Fatima (as) then why (as shall be discussed) did you seek to compare this action by Umar, to that action taken by Imam 'Ali (as) against Ayesha?

### 7.20 Defence Seven

**"The threat of burning is supported by hadith connected with the comments of Rasulallah (s) to those who did not pray in congregation behind an Imam, that he would set alight to such people's homes. Abu Bakr had attained the position as the Imam of Salat, and Rasulallah (s) and the people supported this fact. This group were not participating in this act, hence Umar acted in accordance with the order of Rasulallah".**

### 7.21 Reply One

The offering of Salat is the cornerstone of Deen, and it is incumbent on parents to teach their non baligh children on how to perform Salat and to force them to read it. Salat is a religious duty, how can this obligation be given the same rank as a bayya that Umar deemed as sudden and evil (Sahih al Bukhari 8:815)? How can you force people to accept an act that is evil? How can an evil act be compared to Salat?

### 7.22 Reply Two

There is absolutely no evidence that Rasulallah (s) ever carried through such a threat (to set fire the homes of those that did not pray Salat in congregation). He never swore in Allah's names that he would set fire to these homes; neither did he bring wood to people's door steps to make his intention clear. If we really wish to interpret this correctly then it was that Rasulallah (s) was seeking to strike fear into the hearts of the people, i.e. that they should carry out this obligatory act - he wanted people to follow the good to attain Paradise, and steer away from the bad or perish in Hell. How can you compare the words of Rasulallah (s) to the actions of an unlawful Leader who was seeking to force consent by issuing order to attack the home where insurgents were gathering and kill them should they refuse - a policy of accept or perish in the fire. If Islam was under threat maybe such an action could be justified, but even then there has to be a limit to the type and level of threat issued. The act of bringing instrument (firewood) to the door was clearly excessive, there was no Islamic duty to accept the bayya that was administered in Saqifa for Abu Bakr. Why was 'Abu Bakr seeking to secure bayya that he himself deemed to be a sudden act that Allah (swt) protected from its evil and that if the exercise was to be repeated the individuals should be killed. Umar's comments are sufficient evidence that the bayya was not some type of Islamic obligation - hence to kill those that refused to give bayya was in itself unlawful and unjustified, how can this punishment be compared to those who refuse to offer Salat?

Rasulallah (s)'s intention was to strike fear into people's hearts so that they practiced good deeds, Umar was seeking to intimidate people so that they entered into an agreement that he himself deemed to be batil (false) as it had occurred without consultation (Shura). The

difference between the two approaches are in effect the difference between truth and falsehood.

Our challenge to Shah's supporters is to show us any reference from authentic Sunni texts wherein this opposition group had stated that they refused to offer Salat in congregation or where the Shaykhain themselves made this allegation against these individuals.

It is not incumbent on people to agree to a false act, hence there is no basis to compare the words of Rasulullah (s) to the actions of Umar.

### 7.23 Reply Three

When this was a sudden thing then how can the act of issuing death threats be deemed to be lawful? Let us just take this argument from this angle, that the bayya at Saqifa was a sudden thing and hence it was perfectly lawful to set alight the homes of those that opposed this sudden action since it was connected with the Shari'a. If this was all done to uphold the Sunnah then did Rasulullah not say that the Ahl'ul bayt (as) were like the Ark of Noah whoever entered was saved". The Sunnah tells you not to harass oppose and threaten them, rather side with them as a source of guidance whoever entered with them in that house was definitely guided to the right, since they were following the Sunnah of Rasulullah (s) to the letter. When the Sunnah was to follow Ahl'ul bayt (as) then the action of issuing threats and deeming them to be the opponents of Abu Bakr, in itself constitutes proof that they were on the wrong path and had flagrantly violated the Sunnah

The State rejected love for Ahl'ul bayt (as) that is part of the Deen, and contravening the Sunnah they conjured up a sudden oath that according to Umar himself was evil, this bayya was against the Sunnah hence they had no right to use against opponents that had sought protection in the home of Hadhrath coercion and threats Fatima (as) to the point that its Chief Engineer Umar even issued threats to set fire to her home.

When the Shah himself acknowledges Rasulullah (s) left the Qur'an and Sunnah for the Ummah, then the act of opposing and setting their home on fire is definitely a violation of the Sunnah.

### 7.24 Reply Four

Congregational prayers only have an importance when the Imam has not occupied the Mosque unlawfully. Threats are only correct when the faithful believe that the Imam is entitled to lead the prayer. The onus is on Shah Abdul Aziz and his modern day champions to prove the legitimacy of Abu Bakr's khilafath. According to Shah Abdul Aziz himself the muhajireen and ansar who would make up this ijma were inciting fitnah by planning to overthrow Abu Bakr in the house of Fatima this destroys the concept of ijma and Abu Bakr's khilafath!

The reality is Rasulullah (s) refused entertain the thought that Abu Bakr would be the khalifa after him and Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Abdul Hai in Fatawi page 142 (Karach edition) narrates that:

**"Ibn Masud urged Rasulullah (s) to appoint Abu Bakr as Khalifa after him, Rasulullah (s) turned his face away from me, he did not like this name".**

Rasulullah (s) also stated

**"Shirk is moving inside you like an ant"**

*Tafseer Durre Manthur by Hafidh Jalaladeen Suyuti vol.2 pg.163*

Let us also not forget that in Tareekh Baghdad Volume 13 page 373 we read that:

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

When Rasulallah (s) refused to entertain the thought Abu Bakr would succeed him as khalifa, a man who incidentally possessed traits of shirk, whose Iman was on par with Shaythaan, then in our eyes such an individual cannot be deemed to be the legitimate khalifa of Rasulallah (s).

Umar's belated efforts to secure support for an illegitimate khilafa by issuing threats to set alight the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) was a major sin.

## 7.25 Defence Eight

Shah Abdul Aziz attested:

**"Ibn Khathil was a kaafir and at the time of the conquest of Makka, Rasulallah (s) ordered his execution even if he sought protection within the precincts of the Kaaba. When the enemies of Rasulallah (s) could not benefit from protection in the Kaaba, then the enemies of Abu Bakr were likewise not entitled to benefit from protection on the home of Fatima".**

## 7.26 Reply One

By applying Qiyas, comparing an order of Rasulallah (s) as evidence to prop up Abu Bakr's unlawful reign, and to apply qiyas comparing the actions of a kaafir to those of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) is shameful!

How can the Shah try and compare a kaafir to the Sahaba who according to his madhab are all just and stars of guidance? Ibn Khathil was a disgraceful kaafir and he inflicted until pain and troubles to Rasulallah (s), and Rasulallah (s) according to the instructions of Allah (swt) had ordered that he be killed, even if he sought refuge in the Kaaba.

Ahl'ul bayt (as) with Imam 'Ali (as) at the helm were the rightful successors of Rasulallah (s), Abu Bakr and Umar were in the wrong for turning their back on them, and deeming Abu Bakr to be the Khalifa. They then sought to secure this fraud by setting fire to the home of Fatima (as) - whose supporters were sitting quietly inside her house, neither were they cursing Abu Bakr, nor were they subjecting him to harm.

It was incumbent to kill Ibn Khathil on accounts of his acts, the only fault of the Ahl'ul bayt (as) and their supporters was that they did not deem Abu Bakr to be the legitimate khalifa - and Umar was seeking to punish them by setting fire to the house of Fatima (as) where all had gathered.

## 7.27 Reply Two

There is an immense world of difference between causing pain to Rasulallah (s) and causing pain to Abu Bakr. One who pains Rasulallah (s) pains Allah (swt) and is therefore Hellbound. If someone curses Rasulallah (s) the duty under Shari'a is to kill him, as he has become an apostate. This is not the case with Abu Bakr, according to Ahl'ul Sunnah cursing Abu Bakr neither constitutes kufr nor does it merit the death penalty. Mulla Ali Qari in his work of Sharh Fiqh al Akbar whilst setting out Hanafi aqaid on the Sahaba made this clear by stating:

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

*[taken from Sharh al Fiqh al Akbar Matba Uthmaniyah, Istanbul, 1303 page 130 Maktaba Mujtabai, Delhi, 1348, page 86 Matba Aftab e Hind, India, No date, page 86)*

### 7.28 Reply Three

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Naseem al Riyadh Volume 3 page 310, chapter 'Hadith Saqlain':

**"Rasulullah (s) had been endowed with Prophetic knowledge of future events, and the afflictions that would arise, which is why in hadith-e-saqlain he issued a request that the people afford respect towards his Ahl'ul bayt (as)".**

By attacking the house of Hadhrath Fatima (as), Umar opposed the order of Rasulallah (s) and he openly showed disrespect towards them.

### 7.29 Reply Four

We also read in Naseem al Riyadh Volume 3 page 410 that Rasulallah (s) declared:

**"On the Day of Judgement you will be assessed on the way that you had treated the Qur'an and on the way that you treated my Ahl'ul bayt (as) / whether you respected them. Whatever pleases them, pleases me, and whatever pains them cause me pain"**

Umar through his malicious act caused pain towards the Ahl'ul bayt (as), he issued a threat to set ablaze their home, burning them inside, he failed to heed the words of Rasulallah (s) - namely 'whoever pains them pains me'. Sayyida Fatima (as) suffered so immensely that she cried before Rasulallah (s) with regards to her suffering and did do by reciting a tragic prose highlighting the pain that she had been subjected to.

### 7.30 Defence Nine

**Sayyida Zahra was not opposed to the Islamic penalty for those whop indulged in this act, but he manners meant that she had left this matter to be adjudged by Allah (swt). She was unhappy with the presence of these individuals, and the true fact is she had told these individuals to refrain from such activities.**

### 7.31 Reply One

This shows the schizophrenic condition that these defenders of the Sahaba possess. Earlier the Shah had stated that Sayyida Fatima due to her manners did not prevent these individuals from entering her home, and here he states that she tried to prevent these individuals from carrying out these actions. Now which defence is the correct one, the former, the latter or is this just not further proof of this advocate just clutching at straws trying to think up as many defences he can no matter how weak, feeble and contradictory in nature they are?

### 7.32 Reply Two

Now the question arises, when the Sahaba and Ahl'ul bayt and sought political asylum within the house of Hadhrath Fatima (as) - then was this gathering taking place without her consent, or was she allowing illegal activity to be carried out in her home? If she was aware of the Islamic penalty for such sinful acts, then why did she not report this matter to the State, pointing out that she had told these individuals to refrain from their actions but they did not take heed of her words? And why did it not come to the minds of these individuals that they were gathering in a home wherein the owner was opposed to their activities? Is this type of argument really believable? Clearly their seeking protection in this house was on account of the shared sympathies espoused by the owners.

### 7.33 Reply Three

Okay lets accept that she was opposed and she made her discontent clear to the group, then why would they have still deemed the house a safe haven wherein they could continue their seditious planning? If Sayyida Fatima (as) deemed this action to be unlawful then was it not her religious duty to report it? If it was haraam she would have certainly reported this. There is no authentic reference to suggest that she did so, neither to Abu Bakr, nor his four soldier Umar, in fact would the perfect opportunity have been when Umar came to her door? Could she (as) not have told Umar that she disliked the presence of these individuals and that he should help her to remove these individuals from her home?

### 7.34 Reply Four

To state that Sayyida Fatima (as) left the matter to be adjudged by Allah (swt) is ridiculous, since we know that prominent Sahaba and Ahl'ul bayt (as) were present in the house, how would she allow these individuals to seek protection and indulge in illegal activities in her home, activities that according to Shah, she believed merited the death penalty?

### 7.35 Reply Five

History testifies to Sayyida Fatima (as)'s views of the State Leadership that in effect refutes the Shah's suggestions that she opposed insurgency to Abu Bakr. She was so opposed to Abu Bakr that for the remain months of her life she wabted nothing to do with him and she cursed him in every prayer she offered. If Sayyida Fatima (as) really was an ardent supporters of Abu Bakr's reign and deemed it lawful, then there would have been no reason for the state machinery to attack her home, arrest Imam 'Ali (as), force him to accept Abu Bakr as the rightful khalifa.

There is no historical evidence with an authentic chain that she every forgave 'Abu Bakr, expressed happiness for him, deemed his khilafath to be rightful and have him bayya.

### 7.36 Defence Ten

**"In exactly the same way that 'Ali had sought to protect his khilafath by fighting Ayesha, Umar threatened to set ablaze Fatima's home so as to protect Abu Bakr's khilafath... Ali's war was correct and so were Umar's actions".**

### 7.37 Reply One

To try and cover up an action the Shah has deemed it appropriate to cite another action and try and deem both actions to be one and the same. You however never need to analyse the action undertaken, and the context in which such an action is adopted.

For example an individual indulges in jihad by entering the battlefield, he kills an enemy in combat sending him to hell - this type of combat can come within the definition of jihad. On the other hand if an individual in his efforts to steal some items in a market place seeks to whip up a frenzy and kills people to carry through this plan. The intention and background of action in both scenarios are not the same. The result was the same, people were killed but one action was an act that shall merit award, the other was an act that shall lead to eternal damnation. In accordance with this principle when we see the attack on the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) and the battle of Jamal clear differences can be observed.

Hadhrath Umar was seeking to secure bayya that he himself deemed to be false. There is no evidence that Imam 'Ali (as) ever forced people to give bayya to him. Abdullah ibn Umar, gave bayya to the fasiq Yazeed but NEVER gave bayya to Imam 'Ali (as). Despite this, there is no evidence that he ever coerced Ibn Umar to give bayya, whether that be verbally or physically. If 'Ali (as) wanted to, he could have justified aggression to Ibn Umar by citing his father's action of attacking his home to secure bayya - but Ibn Umar knew that such was the esteemed rank of Imam 'Ali (as) that he would never stoop that low. He left the issue of bayya open to the people he even left those who he knew were his opponents, he never forced them to pledge

allegiance neither did he issue instructions that their homes be searched and they be detained. There is no evidence that Imam 'Ali (as) ever personally went outside the homes of those that refrained from giving bayya and threatened to set the house on fire, if they failed to recognise his authority.

### 7.38 Reply Two

It is amazing that Shah sought to compare the actions of Hadhrath Fatima (as) to those of Ayesha. If we are to accept the claim of the Shah, Sayyida Fatima (as) was opposed to these meetings in her home do Umar threatened to set fire to the home of a woman who was in effect innocent of any wrongdoing. Hadhrath 'Ali (as) fought a woman that had violated the order of Rasulullah (s) and the Holy Qur'an, ventured out of her home and mobilised an army to fight the lawful khalifa and entered the battlefield to carry through this objective.

In Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Iqd al Fareed under the Chapter Dhikr Jamal also records that Rasulullah (s) has warned Ayesha:

**"Humayra I have received revelation that the dogs of Hawab shall bark at you, and that you shall become Dhaalim on account of your fighting 'Ali".**

Despite this she crossed Hawab, this reminder came to her mind and yet she still continued on her journey and participated in the Battle of Jamal, took control of the treasury in Basra and the supporters of Imam 'Ali (as) executed. In such circumstances Imam 'Ali (as) as the rightful Khalifa was within his rights to quell what was sedition. Ayesha was at the helm of this opposition and the Shah in Taufa had stated that Imam 'Ali (as) was perfectly within his rights to act in the manner that he had.

History testifies that after the battle the victorious Imam 'Ali (as) treated Ayesha with the utmost respect, he never set her tent on fire nor those of her supporters - rather he gave captives those rights of treatment that are treated to prisoners of war.

When Rasulullah (s) deemed Ayesha's fighting 'Ali to constitute injustice on her part then Shah has no right to object to Imam 'Ali (as) fighting Ayesha.

Sayyida Fatima Zahra (as), the Leader of the Women of Paradise did NOT violate the Qur'an or Sunnah, she did not prepare an army to quash Abu Bakr's khilafath, nor did she leave her home, mount a camel and enter the battlefield. All that this pious lady did was to remain inside her home, she lived only six months after the death of her father, and during that time her inheritance right was snatched, threats were issued against her family and she was physically attacked. Rasulullah (s) had made it clear to the Sahaba that 'whoever pains Fatima pains me'. Despite her remaining within her home Umar still threatened to set it on fire, an act that Imam 'Ali (as) never pursued during his reign. If Sayyida Fatima (as) had rebelled against the State and mobilised an army and met the State in battle then we could accept that comparisons could be struck with Jamal, but clearly this was not the case here.

There is no way that a correlation can be deduced between the action of Imam 'Ali (as) and those of Umar. Imam 'Ali (as) action was based on truth whilst those of Umar were based on injustice - you cannot claim that injustice and truth are the same thing, they are two different things, and to state that a true and false action are one and the same is a batil (false) notion.

### 7.39 Reply Three

We should also stress that Rasulullah has said:

**'Ali is with the truth and the truth is with 'Ali, O Allah turn the truth in whichever direction that he turns"**

*Mustdarak al Hakim Volume 3 page 51, Tareekh Baghdad Volume 14 page 321*

In Taufa the Shah had himself admitted that the Sunni Ulema have confirmed the truthfulness

of 'Ali, by this token Ayesha's opposition to the 'Ali, constituted opposition to the truth i.e. falsehood - she had taken an incorrect route. Umar had brought firewood to the door of Hadhrath Fatima (as), his threats prove that he was Dhaalim, his turning away from 'Ali (as) - means he turned his back on the truth - his action constituted falsehood.

#### 7.40 Reply Four

Imam 'Ali (as) tried numerous efforts at avoiding war, and even wrote to Ayesha to refrain from her activities (see our article on Ayesha). It is unfortunate that Umar at no point tried to negotiate with these individuals, whether in writing or verbally. He could have asked the individuals to politely refrain from this activity as the State deemed it harmful, but he failed to do so, his immediate reaction was bring firewood to the house and issue direct threats to leave the house or die. After all the individuals in the house were prominent respected Sahaba, not unknown despots, could they not have been spoken to at a respectable level. These were those closely linked to Rasulullah (s) reasonable men, so why could Umar not have appealed to Sayyida Fatima (as) that she ask the group to enter into negotiations and iron out their differences in a brotherly manner? Could open discussions not have ensured that the matter could have been resolved amicably? Rather than seek a peaceful settlement what was the need in adopt this violent confrontational stance? Could Umar not have also taken into account that he was threatening to attack the home of a woman who had just suffered the loss of her father. Could this matter not have been approach in a more tactful manner, rather than one that involved threats and physical force?

We cannot find even the weakest of weak reference where Umar had said to Fatima (as) calmly that Abu Bakr had been made the Khalifa at Saqifa, people have given bayya accordingly and you should do likewise and obey him.

Whilst there are ample examples where Imam 'Ali (as) had sought to calmly resolve the dispute with Ayesha, there is no evidence that such opportunity was offered by Umar. Imam 'Ali (as) wrote to Ayesha and told her that she was on the wrong path and he (as) gave her the opportunity to correct herself. Imam 'Ali (as) had initiated Jihad against her false stance. Umar had sought to set alight the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) to secure a false stance, there is hence a world of difference between the stance of Imam 'Ali (as) and that of Umar.

#### 7.41 Defence Eleven

**"The establishment of the administrative Khilafath was based without any forethought, and was achieved from exuberance for Islam. Imposing hurdles to inhibit the development of the Deen, has the potential to harm Iman (Faith). Whilst inhibiting bad intentions towards the Deen are not crimes that merit the death penalty, death threats (against such people) can be issued"**

#### 7.42 Reply One

In this one paragraph the dear Shah has destroyed the man made Sunni aqeedah that was borne out of the Saqifa meeting was without any forethought. Leadership was brought out without any planning / thinking and was such an act to quote the words of Umar himself Sahih al Bukhari "Punishment of Disbelievers at War with Allah and His Apostle" Volume 8 hadith number 817

**"(O people!) I have been informed that a speaker amongst you says, 'By Allah, if 'Umar should die, I will give the pledge of allegiance to such-and-such person.' One should not deceive oneself by saying that the pledge of allegiance given to Abu Bakr was given suddenly and it was successful. No doubt, it was like that, but Allah saved (the people) from its evil"**

Our objection is simple, there is no doubting that opposition to the Deen is sufficient grounds to issue death threats to perpetrators, but if the Saqifa meeting had the objective of developing

the Deen and maintaining stability, then why did Umar deem this bayya to be a sudden thing? Why threaten opponents to a bayya that he himself deemed to be evil? Clearly any movement that is established to counter an evil bayya cannot be deemed sedition and haraam, on the contrary efforts to counter evil can only be deemed to be good!

### 7.43 Reply Two

Despite the Shah's claims the intention was not just restricted to issuing threats, lets look at the entire issue before us, now some narrations state that after the burning episode Sayyida Fatima (as) prevented people from gathering in her home. Whether that's Sahih or false wont be discussed here our question is simple if so much respected had been afforded to her, then why would she have said such a thing to this group?

### 7.44 Reply Three

If these individuals were at odds with the new Government and the gathering was on account of differences with the State then again this could not warrant Umar's assault on the house since according the Ahl'ul Sunnah Sect there is a hadith wherein Rasulullah (s) said:

*differences are a mercy for the Ummah.*

### 7.45 Reply Four

The greatest evidence that Umar was in the wrong here is after this tragic episode and the threats issued against Imam 'Ali, Umar and Abu Bakr then went to the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) seeking her forgiveness. Clearly this proves that Ahl'ul Sunnah's first Imam deemed himself as being in the wrong here who wanted to apologise to those that he had wronged. When this is the case then no Sunni scholar has the right to reject the actions of his Imam.

It is unacceptable to think that Imam Ali (as), Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib, Talha, Zubayr, Amar Yasir, Salman al Farsi, Miqdad who themselves are high ranked in Ahl'ul Sunnah circles are in effect being portrayed as a seditious rabble who were seeking to damage Islam! We would argue that the reality is they were opposed to the incorrect method via which Abu Bakr had attained power, but in an effort to cover up this false methodology the Shah and like minded advocates have inexorably linked this act to the Deen, so that no one raises any doubts / questions over the way that Abu Bakr came into power. Every illegitimate Leader has sought to defend his power by offering these types of excuses.

To issue threats at the door of Sayyida Fatima (as) was dishonesty, unjust, and yet these defenders deem this act to be lawful as these actions were endangering Islam - then we challenge these defenders to make an open declaration that the Sahaba and Ahl'ul bayt (as) who had gathered in the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) were seeking to damage the Deen - then it is incumbent to decide whether or not these elements were worthy of respect.

### 7.46 Defence Twelve

**It is unusual that some Shi'a Ulema have counted Zubayr bin Awan (ra) amongst the group of Banu Hashim against whom Umar had issued threats, Hadhrath Fatima then told the group to leave and not gather in her home in future. "Subhanallah! If Zubayr raises opposition to Abu Bakr, then his actions are correct / worthy of respect. If he comes out demandin Qisas for the death of Uthman then his actions then the duty is to kill and curse him".**

### 7.47 Reply One

We have not relied on Zubayr's role as proof that the stance of Ahl'ul bayt (as) was right, if we have singled him out by name in texts it is because the Sunni Ulema have done so. History confirms that Zubayr was amongst the group that had gathered in the house of Sayyida Fatima (as), his presence neither benefits nor harms the Shi'a argument.

## 7.48 Reply Two

It is amusing that the Ahl'ul Sunnah have counted poor Zubayr as one of those blessed with Paradise and yet you have tainted with the brush of a seditious troublemaker who had set out to damage the fabric of Islam. If Zubayr was seeking to damage the Deen then clearly he cannot be blessed with Paradise. To count him as amongst the people of dishonesty is false, the Shi'a views on those that had gathered in that house is the same - yet the Shah has sought to paint Zubayr as a seditious element.

We see no contradiction in the way that we regard Zubayr. The actions of Zubayr in siding with Sayyida Fatima and then with Ayesha cannot be deemed to be the same. It is a basic fact you praise someone when he does something right - praise him for that particular act. If that same person then does an incorrect act then that same person can be condemned for his actions, we grade people not according to who they are and who they know, but according to the deeds that they do. When Zubayr supported Imam 'Ali (as) in the house of Hadhrath Fatima (as) he was correct, whilst his siding with Ayesha was not. The two actions cannot be deemed to be the same. Zubayr was sitting quietly inside the home of Fatima (as), but when supporting Ayesha he supported a woman whose actions of leaving her home violated the Qur'an, she rebelled against Imam 'Ali (as) galvanised an army to oppose him and played the lead role in a battle in which thousands of Muslims lost their lives. Did Sayyida Fatima (as) venture out into battle and shed the blood of Muslims as Ayesha had done? Our issue is whether the assault on the home of Sayyida Fatima (as) was right or wrong...was this an act of respect or disrespect towards Sayyida Fatima (as). People were entitled to gather in the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) and hence his actions were right, whilst his siding with Ayesha in the battlefield was batil.

People had sort protection within the homes of Sayyida Fatima (as) whilst Ayesha had openly rebelled against the state, and in fact entered the battlefield, the differences between gathering in battle and gathering in one's home is the difference between truth and falsehood.

## 7.49 Reply Three

On the issue of Qisas there are some rules on Qisas, primarily its implementation is the rights of the Imam and a case is presented before the Imam to decide. We however are yet to find any evidence from authentic historical sources that Zubayr placed a claim for Qisas before the Government under Imam 'Ali (as). The reality is Zubayr was not the waris of Uthman that would have entitled him to demand Qisas. There is no right to rebel against the Leader so as to get a demand for Qisas met.

The reality is Zubayr even acknowledged that he was wrong for rebelling against Imam 'Ali (as) (see article on Uthman). He never issued regret at his opposition to Abu Bakr, nor regretted his presence in Sayyida Fatima (as)'s house as reprehensible - we don't even have much as an indication that he was sorry at this.

## 7.50 Defence Thirteen

**On one occasion Rasulullah (s) witnessed a patterned curtain outside the door of Fatima's house and he refused to enter the house until the curtain was removed....this also constitutes disrespecting the door of Fatima.**

## 7.51 Reply

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 3 hadith number 737 that:

**Buraira came (to 'Aisha) and said, "I have made a contract of emancipation with my masters for nine Uqiyas (of gold) to be paid in yearly installments. Therefore, I seek your help." 'Aisha said, "If your masters agree, I will pay them the sum at once and free you on condition that your Wala' will be for me." Buraira went to her masters but they refused that offer. She (came back) and said, "I presented to them the offer but they refused, unless the Wala' was for them." Allah's Apostle heard of that**

**and asked me about it, and I told him about it. On that he said, "Buy and manumit her and stipulate that the Wala' should be for you, as Wala' is for the liberator."**

Whilst we deem the event the Shah presented to be a lie, we would like to point out that Ayesha had gold in her house and Rasulallah (s) was aware of this. The possession of gold is far more extravagant than a patterned curtain! If Rasulallah (s) hated materialism to the extent that he refused to enter the house of Fatima (as) on account of her curtain then by the same token he would have refused to enter the house of Ayesha on account of her wearing a gold ring. No evidence exists that Rasulallah (s) refused to enter Ayesha's house, then why behave in such an extreme manner with Sayyida Fatima (as)? Clearly this is yet another feeble effort of the Shah to try and justify Umar's actions.

## 8. Conclusion

Our Nasibi opponent Afriki in his article 'the marriage of Umm Kalthum daughter of 'Ali to Umar' has stressed this alleged marriage with every breath in his body - since by presenting Umar as the son in law of Hadhrath 'Ali (as) then all those narrations that highlights Umar's persecution of the Ahl'ul bayt are reduced to nothing.

We cited TWENTY-TWO revered Sunni texts that narrated that Umar threatened to set the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) ablaze. Examine the list carefully; were all of these scholars Shi'a, guided by Abdullah ibn Saba? Tabari, Ibn Barr, Ibn Atheer, Masudi and leading anti Shi'a scholars Shah Waliyullah and Shah Abdul Aziz are all leading Sunni scholars who recorded this tragic episode. These Sunni sources attest to the fact that Umar did indeed persecute Ahl'ul bayt (as) by threatening to burn down the house of Sayyida Fatima (as) if they failed to accept Abu Bakr's khilafath. Umar's threat is without a shadow of a doubt a violation of the order of Rasulullah (s) since inflicting harm to Ahl'ul bayt is tantamount to inflicting harm to Rasulullah (s). Rather than distance themselves from this event and deny as Afriki has tried, Umar's die hard advocates such as Shah Waliyullah and Shibli Numani expressed support and understanding for his action, and the great Sunni debater al Muhaddith Shah Abdul Aziz presented a vast array of defences to justify Umar's actions. By replying to the defences of Shah Abdul Aziz are we have sought to prove how baseless the claims of these advocates are, and we leave it to those with open minds to decide whether there is indeed any weighting in the defences that Shah Abdul Aziz had presented.

When all of these leading scholars have recorded this event in their respective texts then there is no basis for Afriki to claim that the event is unauthentic / unreliable from Sunni sources. Was Afriki intoxicated when he wrote this article? He is an unashamed liar. And ANY Sunni or Shi'a can see that. This Nasibi said in categorical words (that we quoted at the start) that the issue of Fatima (as)'s house being burned is a fabrication of Shi'a historians. We have exposed Afriki as a LIAR 20 times over. Any open minded Sunni shall likewise see Afriki as a liar. If we accept Afriki's argument then this only proves how illiterate the Nasibi are. He is one of their big champions, one of their supposed learned men - and this "scholar" has sought to deceive his own people. It's not just Afriki either...We are making an example of him. It is an old habit of the Ahl'ul Sunnah to deny ANY event that weakens its romantic image of the companions, especially Umar, so their scholars lie - it's a knee-jerk response- just lie. So they lie, like tabloid journalists lie about the news....lies, lies, lies. Afriki is nothing special - he's a typical Nasibi preacher. By this Nasibi seeking to deny this event then he is in fact discrediting / and casting doubt upon all the above named leading Sunni Ulema! It is tantamount to urinating on their graves / books / and memory. Such an approach in effects discredits the Ahl'ul Sunnah Sect, it does not harm the Shi'a in the least.

Afriki's attempt to deny this event shows how immature and pathetic the Nasibis are. Facts are ascertained by looking at historical material, they are not shaped by blind love for an individual. There is no logic in Sunnism. The reality is that leading Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema have not denied this event, on the contrary they have strongly advocated in support of Umar, deeming his actions completely lawful, in light of the tense political situation that arose following the death of Rasulullah (s). Now, can you see the lack of logic? What is a totally HARAM action is deemed HALAL simply because Hadhrath Umar (ra) did it. What hypocrisy! It's one law for him, and another for us ... I wish that I could have given these evidences to the judges trying all the other murderers and arsonists that have been executed by Muslim courts...they might all have been let off to defend the honour of Umar...I want nothing to do with such honour. It is indeed sad that in Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 152 we read that Rasulullah (s) had stated that **'the descendants of Fatima are those upon whom Hellfire has been deemed haraam'** - and yet the Ummah deemed it permissible to burn her and her children as they sat in their home.

In our eyes Umar's persecution of Ahl'ul bayt (as) proves that he was an enemy of the Ahl'ul bayt (as), and it is a part of human nature that a man would never marry his daughter to an

individual that was his enemy. Imam 'Ali (as) was under no compulsion to marry his daughter to his enemy Umar - hence the claim that this marriage took place is a lie that was conjured up in the minds of the followers of Mu'awiya as a means of covering up Umar's hostility towards the Ahl'ul bayt (as).

## 9. Copyright

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

You can distribute this "downloaded document" version of the Answering-Ansar.org article, as long as this document remains in its original shape and none of the contents are changed in any format.