



# REVEALING THE TRUTH

## How to approach Sunni Brothers

**Work file:** how\_to\_approach\_sunni\_brotherspdf  
**Project:** Answering-Ansar.org Articles

### Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
1.0.0	26.12.2006	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	
1.0.1	27.12.2006	Answering-Ansar.org	Missing paragraph inserted.	
1.0.2	01.01.2006	Answering-Ansar.org	Typing mistake fixed.	Thanks to a reader who spotted it.

## **Contents**

**1.REFUTATION OF THE ARTICLE “HOW TO APPROACH THE SHIA BROTHERS”**  
**..... 3**

**2.COPYRIGHT..... 37**

## 1. Refutation of the article "How to Approach the Shia Brothers"

The article "**How to Approach the Shi'a Brother**" published at [www.allahuakbar.net](http://www.allahuakbar.net), which has been rotating all over the internet since then purports to be an irrefutable method of refuting the Shi'a, using the same arguments about Imamate and the Qur'an made at Ansar.org. The author who claims to be an ex Shi'a that found the right path, has become a revered personalities for the Nasibis, and they extol the author and the worship the article, in the same way that the misguided Jews extolled Samari and worshipped a golden calf, whilst Musa (as) went to Mount Tur! The author opens his article with an observation: that debates between Sunnis and Shi'as revolve around the same old issues, without there ever being a positive result. He lists several such debates:

Original article can be found here: [Allahuakbar.net](http://www.allahuakbar.net) - (Cached)

Allahuakbar.net states:

1. The story of Fadak
2. The story of Omar (RA) and Pen and Paper
3. The battles of Siffin, Jamal
4. The attitude of Moawiah against Ali (RA)
5. Karbala and the martyrdom of Hussain (RA)
6. The story of Ghadire Khom (this is more relevant than others but still far away from the main issue)
7. The debates about Tahrif of Quran
8. The debates about Bukhaaree and Muslim and their collections
9. The stories regarding our mother Ayesah (RA)
10. The stories regarding Saqifah of Bani Saedeh
11. Combining the prayers, issues about Azan, ablution and so on
12. Things like visiting graves, calling a dead and so on

He then argues that such debates tend to be futile. Instead, the author advises, Sunnis (or "mainstream Muslims" as he refers to them) should not enter into debates with the Shi'a about things like Saqifah, Fadak, or any other such thing, but rather to attack the Shi'a about their core doctrine of Imamate. This, he feels, is the Achilles heel of Shi'ism, and that a Sunni can successfully convert a Shi'a to Sunnism by focusing on this issue and avoiding all else. For according to the article, the doctrine of Imamate has no Qur'anic basis, and once this is proved any un-biased Shi'a will immediately leave his religion to join the "mainstream Muslims."

The fact that the author of this article is advising the Sunnis to not enter into debates about these issues proves the degree to which the Sunni stance is proven wrong on all of them. The author's real intent is to do what all Sunni polemicists do: minimize issues of massive importance in Islamic history. He is also attempting to make an artificial separation between the above-listed issues and the question of Imamate. But as we can see, nearly all of the issues listed above figure directly upon the question of Imamate. The author is attempting a very

subtle deception here. Certainly, it is the height of madness to think that the hadeeth (not the "story") of Ghadir Khum, where the Prophet (s) said: **"Whoever I am the Lord [mawla] of, then Ali is his Lord as well"** has nothing to do with the issue of Imamate, and that it is a side issue. Let us cite the Hadeeth from the pen of Allamah Dr Muhammad Tahir ul Qadri in the Ghadir Declaration wherein he recorded 51 Hadith in relation to the event of Ghadir, this is the fifth narration:

**"It is narrated by Bara' bin 'azib (r): We were on a journey with Allah's Messenger (s). (On the way) we stayed at Ghadir Khum. There it was announced that the prayer was about to be offered. The space under two trees was cleaned for Allah's Messenger (s). Then he offered the zuhr (noon) prayer, and, holding 'Ali's hand, he said: Don't you know that I am even nearer than the lives of the believers? They said: Why not! He said: Don't you know that I am even nearer than the life of every believer? They said: Why not! The narrator says that he said while holding 'Ali's hand: One who has me as his master has 'Ali as his master. O Allah! Befriend the one who befriends him ('Ali) and be the enemy of one who is his enemy. The narrator says that after this 'Umar (bin al-Khattab (r)) met 'Ali (r) and said to him: O Ibn Abi Talib! Congratulations, you have become the master of every male and female believer, morning and evening (for ever)."**

**Ahmad bin Hambal related it from Bara' bin 'azib through two different chains of transmission in al-Musnad (4:281); Ibn Abi Shaybah, al-Musannaf (12:78 # 12167); Muhib Tabari, Dhakha'ir-ul-'uqba fi manaqib dhawi al-qurba (p.125), ar-Riyad-un-nadrah fi manaqib-il-'ashrah (3:126, 127); Hindi, Kanz-ul-'ummal (13:133, 134 # 36420); Ibn 'Asakir, Tarikh Dimashq al-kabir (5:167, 168); Ibn Athir, Asad-ul-ghabah (4:103); and Ibn Kathir in al-Bidayah wan-nihayah (4:169; 5:464)]**

*The Ghadir Declaration, page 25*

When the Prophet (s) openly announced that all must obey 'Ali, and brought all the Muslims to come and take ba'yah with 'Ali, then how can we say such an event has nothing to do with Imamate? The story of Fadak is another critical issue. It is the Shi'a contention that Abu Bakr usurped the inheritance of Fatima (as), the daughter of the Prophet (s). If he actually did this (and all Sunni hadeeth literature bears witness to this event), then any open minded Muslim would have to ask himself: *Was Abu Bakr suitable to be the Imam of the Muslims? Was he really the inheritor of the Prophet (s), or not?* By telling his Sunni brethren to avoid entering into these issues and focus on theory of Imamate, he is affectively telling his Sunni brethren to avoid discussing some of the most contentious issues surrounding Imamate, and stick to something which he thinks it is easy to attack the Shi'a on (and, as well will see, this is not the case).

Furthermore, by avoiding these issues, the Sunni author opens himself up to another fatal problem: once you have successfully called the Shi'a away from his belief system, what are you calling him to? Is it legitimate to call him to a belief system in which the robbery and murder of the Prophet (s)'s family are subsidiary issues? If the violent oppression of the Prophet (s)'s family is only a side issue, then what is a main issue in Islam? To artificially separate the questions of Fadak, Saqifa, Ghadeer, and Karbala from the issue of Imamate is, indeed, the height of caprice. In the end, the author's casual dismissal of Karbala and Fadak shows the general casual disregard of the Prophet (s) and his family that exists throughout Sunni aqeedah and fiqh. A Muslim who loves the Holy Prophet (s) can never consider Karbala to be a side event, or something that is not of importance. There is nobody, in the world, who denies that Imam Hussain (as) was brutally murdered, along with almost all of his male relatives (and some female as well) on the plains of Karbala. This happened. If somebody has the slightest love for the Prophet (s) in his heart, how can he not look at such an event with horror, and rage at the ones who did it. This is a sign of belief.

But then one must ask a further questions: *what about the people who enabled the despicable tyrant Yazid to murder Imam Hussain (as)?* When one realizes that the person who murdered

him, Yazid son of Mu'awiyah, was put in power by his father for no other reason except that he was the eldest son, than a real believer will have to ask himself about the character of Mu'awiyah and his suitability to being Imam of the Muslims. When one realizes that Mu'awiyah was also a "companion" of the Prophet (s), one must then begin to doubt the truth in the Sunni belief that all the companions will go to Paradise, that all of them are righteous, and that "whichever one you follow, you will be guided." Finally, if one looks in the history one realizes that Mu'awiyah was not the first sultan of the vicious Umayyad dynasty that ruled over the Muslims for centuries, but rather that Mu'awiyah owed his power, wealth, and armies to 'Uthman, the third of the "rightly guided" khalifas. Once that is questioned, it throws the entirety of the Sunni belief system into disarray. These questions are not side-issues; they are integral to one's faith. To casually dismiss the murder of the Prophet (s)'s grandson, or to casually dismiss the usurpation of his only daughter's inheritance, is the sign of somebody who has never felt genuine love for the Prophet (s).

The real reason, of course, that the Sunni author is telling his brethren to avoid entering into these debates is because victory in these debates is hopeless. How can anybody hope to defend the massacre of Karbala? How can anybody claim that the event of Fadak never happened, when all Sunni hadeeth literature bears witness to it? How can anybody claim that Abu Bakr had not forged the hadeeth "*Prophets do not leave any inheritance*," when Allah (swt) says in the Qur'an "**Solomon inherited from David?**" These arguments are, indeed, futile for those who are attempting to uphold the wilayat of Abu Bakr and 'Umar over and above the wilayat of 'Ali ibn Abi Talib. The author does not say this, of course. Rather, he writes:

Allaahuakbar.net states:

The above are the issues for which there are lots of material provided by Shia in Internet and Shia feels very easy and comfortable to find the relevant material and copy and paste it in a discussion. Actually for them it is like repeating a same prescription. Most of the above issues at the end rely on Hadeeth and what happens is that Shia base the argument on certain Hadeeth and mainstream Muslims base their argument on another sort of Hadeeth and they will ended up with fighting to prove a Hadeeth is authentic and the other one is not. From there they usually get no where, because first of all, people generally do not have enough knowledge about verifying if a Hadeeth is authentic and even if they do so, they still cannot prove their points cause verifying if a Hadeeth is authentic is itself depending to the words of mouths of fallible scholars. While I agree that in many of the above cases, Shia people try to disfigure the story and very ruthlessly attack great SAHĪBAH on the basis of their biased understanding of these stories, I still remain in my position that talking about the above leads the two sides to no where (as evident in the last 1000 years).

The point, then, is that such debates cannot be finished. But this is non-sense; such debates finish quite easily, if only the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt (as) will drop their prejudices and think rationally. Such debates become circular and endless because of the mind-bending logic used by Sunnis in such discussions. To present a personal example:

*I was once arguing with a Sunni about the question of Fadak. I posed him the question: "Do you agree that Fatima (as) was angry at Abu Bakr over Fadak?" To which he replied: "Yes, of course," for there is no doubt about this, and not a single Sunni 'alim has ever denied it. I then asked: "Do you think it is rational to believe that the Prophet (s) never got around to telling Fatima (as) that she was not going to get one penny of inheritance from her father? Would not any sane, loving father (much less the Prophet of Islam (s)) tell his daughter about this at some point in her life?" To which he responded: "Well, the Prophet (s) was very busy. Maybe he forgot."*

This type of response is insulting to both parties in the debate. It is really demeaning for a Sunni to utter such non-sense, that any rational person would recognize as foolish. The type of Sunni-Shi'a debates this Sunni author eludes to tend to get nowhere because the Sunni side resorts to such non-sense when they are back into a corner.

The fact is that all of these issues (Fadak, Karbala, etc.) are glaring examples of Sunni Islam's intellectual and spiritual poverty. This particular author has realized how futile are the arguments and debates offered by websites like ansar.org and Nida al-Islam Magazine. Instead of doing this, because Sunnis are hopeless outclassed by their own 'ulama and their own hadeeth literature, he is now calling on us to return the issue of Imamate to the Qur'an and put us aside all of Sunni history's most embarrassing and disgusting moments. Now, let us turn to the Qur'an on this issue.

## 1. Imamate and the Qur'an

The Sunni argument that Imamate has no basis in Qur'an is not an original or new one. The author writes:

Allaahuakbar.net states:

When you want to help a Shia to realize how deviated he/she is from Islam or to help a fellow Muslim from the mainstream not to be deceived by Shia, there are TWO QUESTIONS that completely do the job for you:  
 Question One: Where is the doctrine of IMAAMAT in Quran?  
 Question Two: How does the current IMAAM lead Shia?

Let us deal with the first question, as the second question is dealt with in the final chapter of the book. Before we begin, let us understand the terms of the debate. The author, in using the term Imamate, carefully points out that he does not mean the question of leadership per se. He does not mean Imamate in its general sense, but rather the specifically Shi'ite doctrine of Imamate (infallibility, Divine appointment, etc.).

His question, then, is a challenge to locate this specific doctrine of Imamate in the Qur'an. If we read the article carefully, we will see what a hypocritical question it is. Of course, it is clear that the authors goal in posing this question is immediately shift the debate against the Shi'a, and avoid the question of where the Sunni doctrine of Imamate is to be found in the Qur'an, i.e., that drunkards, homosexuals, and murderers can be given leadership over the Muslims and are owed the same obedience as is owed to God. Note that he writes in his article:

Allaahuakbar.net states:

Any groups of people tend to elect some one as their leader. And the rational and most reasonable way to do so is by election. This is a routine social/political practice. Certainly no system of public election was established at that time and the election of Aboobakr was done through negotiation of present people. You might think that it was not a good choice or that not all qualified people were presented at the time, that's your opinion but it has nothing to do with looking for evidences in Quran about it. It's just a routine social practice that was and is and will be done in any society and no logical mind would expect a divine evidence for that Having said that, once the SAH İBAH of the holy prophet agree on a great SAH İBAH like Aboobakr (RA) to become the Khalifah, then it is the duty of all Muslims to obey him for the sake of Islam and unity

This is a very bold statement: that we must obey a person, even if we believe he is a sinner and an enemy of Islam, simply because the majority (or even not the majority!) decide to make him the Imam.. Oddly enough, this doctrine has absolutely no basis in the Holy Qur'an. He is saying that it is the duty of all Muslims to obey such an individual, and we should assume that by "duty" he means that it is something obligatory in Islamic law. Yet the author provides no evidence for it, and in fact dismisses the whole question. After calling upon the Shi'a to justify their doctrine in Imamate, he has the audacity to write

Allaahuakbar.net states:

You might think that it was not a good choice or that not all qualified people were presented at the time, that's your opinion but it has nothing to do with looking for evidences in Quran about it.

This, then, is the author's stance about Imamate: that we do not need to bother going to the Qur'an to see whether or not the Imam selected is a proper Imam or not. It is merely a matter of opinion. If this is the case, than why do we need to even bring this question to the Qur'an? The author is demanding that we prove our belief in our Imams on the Qur'an, while simultaneously saying that we should not go the Qur'an in order to see whether or not the Imam selected by the Muslim community is suitable for that position or not. This is insanity. How would the author feel if the Shi'a response about Imam 'Ali (as) was: "*Well, we don't have any evidence from the Qur'an, and deciding on who the Imam is has nothing to do with looking for evidences in the Qur'an about it. We just like 'Ali and think he was really great, and we just don't like Abu Bakr and think he was really bad.*" Is this an Islamic argument?

So let us understand exactly what the author is saying: even though the question of who should be the Imam has "*nothing to do with looking for evidences in Qur'an about it,*" we are supposed to justify our belief in Imamate based on the Qur'an. This is a wonderful double-standard: Sunnis do not have to ground their belief in Imamate on the Qur'an, but Shi'as do. In spite of the author's glaring hypocrisy, however, we will take up his question. We will not ask him to justify his belief in the Qur'an because "Allah does not command a soul more than it can bear," and most certainly attempting to use the Qur'an to prove that homosexuals, drunkards, and murderers are suitable to be the successors of the Prophet (s) is more than any soul can bear, and as such we will be just and not command them to do the impossible and make  $2+2=5$ .

We may now turn to the debate itself. The challenge is to find the doctrine of Imamate in the Qur'an. This is how the author defines Imamate:

Allaahuakbar.net states:

The doctrine of Imaamat: Apart from Prophets, there are another group of God appointed persons called Imams. These are people who are infallible and have access to a knowledge that is not accessible by ordinary people. The world cannot be empty of an Imam otherwise it will be destroyed. In the Islamic context, these individuals are 12 people among the descendants of the Holy Prophet who are appointed by no one but God to lead Muslims. Any one who chooses any leader other than these 12 is misguided and not a complete believer. The twelfth (last) of the above Imams is Mahdi and is alive and in occultation (now) for more than 1000 years and will come out of his occultation when God wants".

The first problem is that this is *not* the Shi'ite doctrine of Imamate. The doctrine of Imamate is not that there were Twelve Imams (as) after the Prophet (s), though this is part of the doctrine of Imamate. Rather, the doctrine of Imamate is that there is always an infallible, Divinely appointed guide amongst the human race. Sometimes this person may be a Prophet, sometimes a Messenger, and sometimes merely the inheritor of a Messenger or Prophet, but there is *always* such a person regardless of his particular status. This is the doctrine of Imamate, pure and simple.

Now, challenging us to prove that this doctrine is in the Qur'an is a bit like challenging someone to prove that there are trees in the forest. Next to the Oneness of God, the doctrine of *constant* constant human guidance is the singularly most common theme in the Holy Qur'an. It is reiterated again and again and again. We have in our discussions on Imamate in the Qur'an cited the fact that Allah (s.w.a.) makes statements such as **"We made from amongst them leaders who guided by Our command"** (Surah as-Sajdah: 23-24), ... **"We wished to make them leaders"** (Surah al-Qasas : 5),, ... **"(Oh Allah!) make us leaders"** (Surah al-Furqan: 74). These verses reiterate the fact that 'Imams, 'Khalifas' (leaders) are selected and appointed ONLY by Allah (swt) and not MEN. This is the clear and unshakeable position of the Holy Quran on this point which has been FURTHER REINFORCED Besides the specific verses where Allah (swt) praises Himself for sending every people a guide, we also see that every historical account of the past prophets serve to emphasize this fact.

Allaahuakbar.net states:

Ask Shia to ONLY give you the verses with NO additions to the translation and NO Hadeeth to support a certain interpretation of the verse and NO personal commentaries. Do this and you will see how helpless the arguments will be.

Alhamdulillah the Qur'anic evidences of Imamate have been refuted in our article on Imamate and we would urge our readers to read it before reading this chapter further.

## 2. Responses to Questions Posed

We have seen that these evidences do not require any hadeeths to interpret them, and they are obvious to any open-minded Muslim who reads the Qur'an with sincerity. Now we will deal with some of the "responses" the author at allahuakbar.net poses. He lists several "standard" Shi'a responses to the objections he has raised, and attempts to refute them. The Shi'a "objection" is written in italics, and his "refutation" is written below.

### 3. Response #1

Allahuakbar.net states:

*There are also no verses in Quran to tell us how to pray. We learn some of our duties from Hadeeth not Quran.*

Prayer has been referred to EXPLICITLY and STRONGLY more than ninety times in Quran . In each of these verses one of the aspects of prayer is covered. Many of these verses talk about the details of prayer, like how to come prepared for prayer (ablution), prayer in travel, etc. Certainly with such a vast and strong reference from Quran , Muslims will refer to the Prophet to know the details. In comparison, the total number of the verses that Shia refers to for Imaamat is no more than 5 or 6 and yet non of them can be interpreted by a non-biased mind in the way that 12ers interpret it. In fact none of them are explicit and strong enough to prove Imaamat doctrine. This is while Prayer is not at all comparable with Imaamat. **Imaamat is the fundamental of belief. Shia calls it one of the Osoole Din (Fundamental of religion). Prayer however according to Shia is one of the Foroo'e Din (Subsidiary)** Imamat is important enough to convince Shia to separate themselves from the mainstream Islam. If the only difference between Shia and the Mainstream Islam was the way they perform prayer they would never become a sect out of the mainstream Islam.

One will quickly see that the author has not even dealt with the question, i.e., that the way of performing prayer is not dealt with in the Qur'an even though it is of vital importance. He says that the obligation is referred to explicitly and strongly, but that its method is not. He says, however, that the reality of prayer's obligation is referred to with such emphasis that, undoubtedly, the Muslims would go to the Prophet (s) in order to learn how to do it.

Now, we have seen that the Qur'an contains countless stories of Prophets and Messengers, and the Divinely appointed guides sent to all peoples. However, the Qur'an does not specify the Twelve Imams after the Prophet (s) in detail. It does not specify the names of the other 124,000 Prophets, nor does it even specify that number. However, we learn from the Qur'an

that always and everywhere there is a guide sent to the people. Did not Allah (swt) say:

***Indeed, you are the Messenger, and to every people there is a guide.***

This ayat is only summarizing one of the most singularly important themes in the Holy Qur'an: the constant, living presence of Divine guides who are not chosen by the Muslims of the time, but are appointed by God Himself. This is a reality confirmed again and again in the Qur'an, and the Sunnis are at a loss to explain why, in the middle of the seventh-century, right before a period of incredible violence and civil war, Allah (swt) stopped doing this, even though He said:

***You will never find any change to the sunnah of Allah.***

Sunnis ask why the names of the Twelve Imams, and why the number Twelve is not specified. We would use the exact same response as the Sunni author has with regards to prayer: that for the details of who the Imams are, for the details of their names and their number, there is no doubt that the true believers will go to the Prophet (s). Once they have been told:

***Indeed, you are the Messenger, and to every people there is a guide.***

then there is no doubt that the Muslims will ask the Prophet (s): "Who will be the guide, or guides, for the people after you?"

Sunni, however, seems to be unwilling to accept such a response. He says the doctrine of Imamate is a core matter of belief, and should be explained in the Qur'an. However, he has once again confused the issue. He has defined the Shi'a doctrine of Imamate as the belief in the Twelve Imams, which is false. The Shi'a belief in Imamate is that there will always be an Imam, in all times, and that he is sent by God, not elected by people. The belief in the Twelve Imams is a part of the doctrine of Imamate, just as the belief in the Five Glorious Prophets (Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad (as)) is a part of the doctrine of Prophecy. The Shi'a doctrine of Imamate is that there is always an Imam of some kind or another, whether he lives in hiding or openly amongst the people. There was an Imam present in the world, even when Abraham was living away from the people in the deserts of Makkah. Even though he was incommunicado from the rest of humanity (other than his immediate family), he was still the Imam of his time. The Twelve Imams are a particular group of such Imams, who have always existed in history. The question of who the Imams are after the Prophet (s), and how many there will be, is a matter of significance but a matter that was left to the Prophet (s), just as the significant matter of how to pray to Allah (swt) was left for the Prophet (s) to explain. The author's confused definition of Imamate, and his misunderstanding about the Shi'a belief in Imamate, has led him to make this confused response to the Shi'a objection.

As such, we see the fact that Allah (swt) sends a guide to every people is confirmed in the Qur'an, and nobody can deny this. This is the belief in Imamate, and it is firmly present in the Qur'an. The subsidiary question of who the Imam of our time was, as well as the past generations who lived after the Prophet (s), is a specific matter that was left for the Prophet (s) to explain, which he did on numerous, numerous occasions.

#### 4. Response #2

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*There are certain verses but you need to look at Hadeeth to understand their true meaning cause we are advised to learn Quran from the Prophet and Hadeeth is his teachings.*

Why only when it comes to Imaamat, we need

Hadeeth to help us? We don't need a Hadeeth to understand from Quran that reading prayer, performing Hajj, fasting, Jihad etc. are obligatory upon Muslims. We don't need Hadeeth to understand from Quran that a Muslim needs to believe in Oneness of God and his Prophets and the Hereafter. We don't need Hadeeth to understand from Quran that God has angels, there were Prophets in the history of mankind and some of them had books, and that the destiny of man is in the hands of God. All of the sudden when it comes to Imaamat, Hadeeth becomes a vital tool to understand Quran . Quran how ever does not need a tool to be understandable. It is written in Quran that this book has been made easy to get guidance from. It is true that the Prophet explains certain verses of Quran but explaining is different from interpreting. Explaining means giving the details. Interpreting means giving the meaning. Quran needs no tool to be meaningful otherwise it wasn't the book of guidance. Also there are many contradictory Hadeeth in explaining verses of Quran and at the end of the day it is impossible to verify exactly which ones are authentic. How could God expect people of our time to use Hadeeth to understand the MEANING of Quran? Is this the way that God says in Quran that Truth and False are separated and clear evidences have been shown? I don't think so.

As we have seen, we do not need hadeeth to help us. The hadeeths explain more about who the Imam was after the Prophet (s), and who the Imam was after him, and so forth. But the reality of Imamate is concerned, and we do not need any hadeeths to realize that there are other infallible people in the world to be obeyed other than the Prophet (s). Did not Allah (swt) say:

***Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger and the holders of authority from amongst you.***

Who, then, is the holder of authority from amongst us? George W. Bush? Certainly some Sunnis have embarrassingly argued that this ayat indicates upon the obligation to obey whoever holds temporal authority, but we have already seen the poverty of this argument. We know that we have been ordered to obey somebody who is from amongst our ownselves, but the Sunnis are at a loss to explain who this is. Such a person is infallible, or otherwise Allah (swt) would be ordering us to disobey Him when that person goes astray, which is illogical non-sense. The question of who this person is was answered by the Prophet (s) on the Day of Ghadeer. But the fact that such a person existed and would always exist is proven decisively by the Qur'an.

The author's argument is also absurd, for the Sunnis continually contradict the Qur'an, and yet when they are asked about it, make the defense that the Sunni 'ulama and companions knew the Qur'an better than us and we shouldn't question it. Let us take the issue of divorce. We read in Surah at Talaq, verse 2:

***Thus when they fulfil their term appointed, either take them back on equitable terms or part with them on equitable terms; and take for witness two persons from among you, endued with justice, and establish the evidence (as) before Allah.***

Allah (swt) commands us to take two witnesses in a divorce. But according to Sunni fiqh, this is not necessary, because 'Umar ruled that it was not necessary. As such, we see that 'Umar, as well as the Sunni 'ulama who follow him, have committed an enormous act of bid'a in removing this obligation from Islamic law. It is obvious that Allah (swt) is ordering us to take two witnesses, but Sunni fiqh contradicts this. Yet if a Sunni is asked about this, the immediate response is: **"I don't know the tafsir of this"** or **"I don't know if the hadeeths explain this differently"** and so forth. According to the ordinary lay Sunni, then, the Qur'an is so complicated and arcane that when it says **"take for witnesses two persons from among you"** that we can't figure out this means "take for witnesses two persons from among you." Rather, we must do enormous research into tafsir, hadeeths, fatwas of various 'ulama, and so forth, before we can understand what the Qur'an says.

As such, whenever Sunnis contradict the Qur'an, their universal defense is exactly the same as the supposedly Shi'a argument given above:

Allaahuakbar.net states:

There are certain verses but you need to look at Hadeeth to understand their true meaning cause we are advised to learn Quran from the Prophet and Hadeeth is his teachings

Why is it, then, that Sunnis are allowed to say this, but Shi'as are not? Now, the Sunni author might respond that the Qur'an may be vague in matters of law, and never in matters of belief. Why, then, do they hold to the doctrine of bi la-kayf, **"without asking how,"** whenever they examine verses about the Hand of Allah? When Allah (swt) speaks of His Hand, while continually emphasizing that He has no body or physicality like us, then any rational person will read the Qur'an and understand that the Hand of Allah is a metaphor for the Power of God, just like people speak about the police as **"the long arm of the law"**. Sunnis, however, do not except this. They say that Allah (swt) does have a Hand, but we do not know what that means. This is the universally accepted doctrine of Sunni Islam. Now, isn't the question about whether or not God has a Hand or not, whether and how He can be described in such ways, a more fundamental question than Imamate or Prophecy? This concerns the most fundamental aspect of our belief system, tawhid. Yet for Sunnis, it is enough to say: "We don't know," i.e., that the Qur'an is so complicated and arcane that we can't possibly figure out what Allah (swt) is talking about when He refers to His Hand in the Holy Qur'an. As such, Sunni Islam makes the Qur'an out to be a lot more complicated and unreadable than we do, dismissing vast numbers of verses as inexplicable, even when they concern our most basic belief systems.

## 5. Response #3

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Long and complicated analysis of certain verses of Quran to prove that even without the help of Hadeeth, they are proving Imaamat.*

same argument goes here. Quran is not a book of riddles and puzzles. God does not expect an ordinary Muslim to have a search in Quran and have a professional analysis of the verses of Quran to understand what should be his belief and what are his duties as a Muslim. Of course it is very beneficial to analyse the verses of Quran to understand more from it. Quran is like an

ocean. However to say that our fundamental belief can only derived from Quran after such an analysis is in contradiction with the use of Quran as a book of guidance. (For a detailed review of the verses that 12ers usually use and the discussion of the way they attempt to misinterpret these verses please refer to my other article: "[The Quran refutes the Shiite concept of Imamate.](#)" and this article also [The Qur'ân and The Imamah](#)

How much analysis does it take to understand that when Allah (swt) says:

***For every people there is a guide***

that it means that, amongst ourselves, there is a living guide appointed by God? Rather, it takes a very complicated and artificial mind to think that this ayat means that Allah (swt) has not sent us a guide. Sunnis have to resort to enormous mental gymnastics to prove that the verses of Imamate do not indicate upon Imamate, and to prove that it is suitable for a liar, drunkard, homosexual, and murderer like Yazid to be the Imam of the Muslims. No sensible person would believe that the verse:

***Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger and the holders of authority from amongst you.***

means that all Muslims in America have to obey George Bush, or whoever happens to hold temporal authority at the time. The Qur'an makes it as obvious as possible that He is in continual contact with us through the Imam of the time, whoever that person may be.

The only reason that such arguments become "long and complicated" is because of the absurd arguments which Sunnis make in order to explain away these verses. Following the path of our Imams (as), the Shi'a have learned to cover all the bases when they make an argument. Rather than waiting for the Sunnis to come up with a silly and bizarre interpretation of a verse, we present the refutation of that non-sense. It is only because Sunnis refuse to accept the obvious that we debates become long and complicated. Any reasonable person will understand that the verse

***Indeed, you are the Messenger, and to every people there is a guide.***

Means what it says it means: that we have a guide, someone other than the Prophet (s). And as will be seen, that guide can be no one other than Imam Muhammad ibn Hassan al-Mahdi (as).

## 6. Response #4

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*There are no mention of the name of our Prophet in Bible but still Christians need to believe in the Prophet.*

I appreciate that this justification is very out of line but because I have heard it, I am going to address it here: Firstly we believe that Bible in fact gave the information about our Prophet but these verses were removed (Quran tells us).

However the most important thing is that Christians are not expected to accept the Prophet only based on their Bible. Christians along with other human being are given a brand new guidance that is Quran. It is Quran that challenges Christians not merely their own book. The last point is that the comparison is illogical. We are asking for proof of the Shia doctrine from our book of guidance, what does it have to do with the proof of our Prophet in the Bible?! There are many belief that Christians have but are not in their Bible, we however as Muslims have to disregard any belief that is not supported by Quran. On the other hand, another misunderstanding here is that we are not asking about the name of a particular Imaam. We are asking about the CONCEPT of **Imaamat**. The concept of prophethood is well established in Bible (both old and new testaments). It is only after the establishment of this concept in the Christian holy book that they are expected to believe in ANOTHER prophet that is Muhammad (PBUH). The CONCEPT of Imaam (in the way that 12er Shia put it) however has not even referred to (in a convincing way) in Bible, let alone being established. Therefore from this respect too, the comparison is illogical.

No Shi'a with the ample education would give such an inane argument. Obviously we do not expect Christians to believe in Prophet Muhammad (s) on the basis of their corrupted version of the Injeel. The author is talking non-sense here.

But let us take this argument a step further: once we understand that living, Divine guidance is something that is always part of human life, don't we see this elaborated and discussed in the Bible with the same degree that it is in the Qur'an? We read about the life of Jesus (as), albeit in a distorted form. We read about John the Baptist before him, indicating that there was another Divinely appointed being before Jesus (as). We read throughout the Bible the distorted stories of the Prophets, but we see that Prophets are always sent, again and again and again. While the historical details and the sometimes pornographic stories about the Prophets (as) are something that we would not accept (though, of course, the Sunnis have no problem attributing similar types of obscenity to the Prophet Muhammad (s) in books like Bukhari), we see that the Bible presents a similar reality as the Qur'an: that for every people there was a guide, and such people were appointed by God, not men. Was King David appointed by people, and elected? No, he was sent by God to be the King of the Jews. Was Jesus (as) made the Messiah by the election of the Jews and Gentiles of Jerusalem? Of course not, he was sent by God, so much so that He was created directly by the Hand of God without the medium of human sexual reproduction. This is the sunnah of Allah, the sunnah of Divine appointment (nass). But for Sunnis, all of this stopped in the middle of the seventh-century, for no reason. The Muslims were left in a state where they would go to war with each other, and absolutely nobody had a Divine mandate for the fighting that went on.

This is not reasonable. In reality, the doctrine of Imamate is as equally present in the Bible as it is in the Qur'an. When the author accepts that the concept of Prophethood is confirmed in the Bible, he misses the point: Imamate is a part of Prophethood, not separate. They are two manifestations of one fact: that the sunnah of Allah (swt) is to send and appoint guides:

***Indeed, you are the Messenger, and to every people there is a guide.***

## 7. Response #5

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*The verses of Quran are usually general and it is not the style of Quran to name people (i.e. Imaams)*

No body asked for names. Only some general verses that give us the above doctrine. Something as simple as: "Oh Muslims, be aware that there will be certain Imaams for you after the Prophet from his generation who are appointed by God and you need to follow them". It is as if (God Forbidden) God was worried about talking about **Imaat** explicitly. Having said that, we have the name of Zaid (Ra) in Quran who was a SAH IBAH and his name is there to refer to a very minor issue. It is not unfair to ask for a single verse with the name of Ali in it if (according to Shia) he had such an important role (Imaam).

The verse:

***Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger and the holders of authority from amongst you.***

is saying exactly the same idea expressed in the author's made up verse:

***"Oh Muslims, be aware that there will be certain Imaams for you after the Prophet from his generation who are appointed by God and you need to follow them".***

In the verse where Allah (swt) instructs us to obey the holders of authority from amongst us, we see that Allah (swt) is telling us that there are other holders of authority other than the Prophet (s), and that we must obey them. Allah has said: "From amongst you." This indicates that there will be holders of authority from amongst the generations who come after the Prophet (s). So who is the holder of authority from amongst us? The author could never, of course, give an answer to the question. The most inane reply our opponents come up with is their interpretation of words "**From amongst you**" which according to them is the instruction to obey the ruler (elected by the humans). But the fact is that the words "**From amongst you**" at no point tells us to elect or appoint a ruler by ourselves rather we are left to seek for 'those people who are vested in authority and they are amongst us'. If the words "**From amongst you**" according to our opponents gives the notion to elect or appoint a ruler at our own then what they have to say about the following verse revealed for Prophet Muhammad [s]:

***"Certainly a Messenger has come to you from among yourselves; grievous to him is your falling into distress, excessively solicitous respecting you; to the believers (he is) compassionate..." (Quran: 9:128)***

Do the words "**from among yourselves**" means that Prophet Muhammad [s] was appointed or elected by the people?

As such, all the ideas that the author sought to express in his made up verse are expressed in a more succinct and beautiful way in the ayat al-amr quoted above. The very fact that Allah (swt) is giving the command tells us to be aware. It is obvious that it is addressing not just Muslims, but all mankind. We need to follow them. And these people are obviously mas'um (infallible), or it would be illogical for us to have to follow them in an absolute way. The only thing that this verse does not indicate upon which the author's made up verse seeks to express is the family lineage. The author asked us to find a verse that said something like "there will be certain Imams for you after the Prophet from his generation." But why on Earth would a Shi'a of 'Ali ever believe that such a verse existed, or could ever exist? For Imam 'Ali (as) was not from the generation of the Prophet (s), i.e. that he was not from the off-spring of the Prophet (s), than there is no reason Allah (swt) would have said: 'Oh Muslims, follow the Imams (as) from the Prophet (s)'s progeny." If He had said this, then it would have cut Imam 'Ali (as) out of the Imamate, in which case the Prophet (s) would have been suspicious when he said: **"Whoever I am the master of, then 'Ali is his master as well"** at the Day of Ghadeer. As such, we have a verse, the ayat al-'amr (Obey Allah, and obey the Prophet and the holders of authority from amongst you) that says exactly what the Wahabbi author wants. Will he know abandon the foolish religion of 'Umar and join the path of the Ahl al-Bayt (as)?

## 8. Response #6

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Quran says "follow the Prophet". There are Hadeeth from the Prophet that prove the doctrine of Imaamat and this should be enough for a Muslim if he wants to follow the Prophet.*

Again why is that only for this article of faith we need to consult Hadeeth? Let's test something. Take Quran in your hand and open it by chance. I can guarantee that no matter where it is opened, few verses before or after are about one of the Oneness of God, Prophet hood, Day of Judgement, Destiny of Human Being, or Duties of Muslims. Now how far you need to go in order to find a verse that (with the help of certain Hadeeth) could be interpreted as Imaamat in the 12er doctrine? How come for our other fundamental believes Quran is quite direct, even for our main duties as Muslims but when it comes to Imaamat, we need to refer to Hadeeth? This is inconsistency and God is far greater than having inconsistency in his perfect book. Hadeeth is not the second volume of Quran. Authentic Hadeeth is explanation of Quran not a secondith to see what is our religion? This is even more difficult when bare in mind that for every Hadeeth that Shia use to prove Imaamat, there are other Hadeeth that are in contradiction with it. In fact even Hadeeth (as a whole) are not structured in a way that could prove Imaamat. Such a justification is in fact the main reason for having different sects in Islam. Zaidis too have their own Hadeeth, same for Ismailis and same for Bahayees. All have the same problem, they are trying to understand their religion from the

sources other than Quran. Please note that I am not denying the importance of Hadeeth (I am not a Quranist). However believing that certain parts of our fundamental belief has to be derived from Hadeeth rather than Quran is far different from using Hadeeth as a source to Prophet's Sunnah. There are no use of discussing the ahaadeeth of the prophet with 12ers when it comes to the fundamental issues. To all Muslims except those who have made sects the fundamentals of belief need to be derived from Quran, if they are not then either they are wrong or they are not fundamental and thus not acceptable reasons for

Let us bear in mind, of course, that the Qur'an also says "**follow the holders of authority from amongst you,**" and the Sunni belief system is helpless to specify who that individual is now.

In any case, let us do our own test: if we open up the Qur'an, we will inevitably see, on every page, a discussion of Divinely appointed human being sent guide human beings from darkness into Light. This reality is so integral to the Qur'an that we cannot find a single page where this reality is not mentioned. We ask again:

*Why is it when Allah (swt) has specifically said that for all people there is a guide, and that we learn from the Qur'an that throughout history such guides have always existed, that all of a sudden Allah (swt) ends this practice?*

*We know from history that the so-called companions of the Prophet (s) were, with rare exception, not the most exceptional human beings. There was mass slaughter and political strife for decades after the Prophet (s). There is nothing about the community of Muslims, much less the human race as a whole, that indicates that a people who had so recently been worshipping idols and statues were now longer in need of Divine guidance. The foolish author does not understand that Imamate is only one form of Divine guidance, and that it is the only type of Divine guidance that occurs after the sealing of Prophecy with the Prophet Muhammad (s). Imamate and Prophethood are, in essence, one reality, that of Divine Guidance manifested in human form. The Qur'an expounds upon this concept again and again, and yet for no apparent reason this stopped in the middle of the seventh-century. Why?*

The argument about hadeeths is also ill-founded. When hadeeths contradict each other, the first thing we should do is compare them to the Qur'an. Those hadeeths that say that there is always a guide clearly conform with the verse

***Indeed, you are the Messenger, and to every people there is a guide.***

while the fabricated Sunni hadeeths that seem to indicate humanity has been left in the hands of innovators like 'Umar clearly contradict the Qur'an. As such, a rational person who is endowed with faith in the Qur'an will go with the narrations that confirm that there is a Divinely-appointed guide for every people, and will reject the ones that contradict this reality. But if we do this, the standard Sunni responses will come into play: "We don't know the tafsir of these verses, etc., etc." This is blatant dishonesty.

In reality, the author is being extremely relativist here, and is speaking like post-modernists in the West. His basic belief seems to be that it is utterly impossible to prove anything based on hadeeths, and so we should just leave them. This is the same type of argument made by agnostics. "Well, there's so many different religions. Christians have their Bible and Muslims have theirs and Hindus have theirs and how can we every know which one is right? As such, we

should just leave this whole religion thing.” The fact that people differ about something, and the fact that they continually differ after a thousand years, does not mean that nobody is right and wrong. Jews have been arguing for 2,000 years that Jesus was an imposter. Does that mean we should just leave the question, and not bother to discover whether or not he was really a Messenger of God? Of course not. The author’s approach is to dismiss everything that makes him uncomfortable as being a side issue, and this leads him to basically deny the value of all hadeeth literature. While he states that he is “not a Qur’anist” and does not deny the value of hadeeths, in practice this is what he does. It is obvious from the entire tone of his article that he does not believe in the hadeeth literature at all. If we look at his previous statement:

Allaahuakbar.net states:

Any groups of people tend to elect some one as their leader. And the rational and most reasonable way to do so is by election. This is a routine social/political practice. Certainly no system of public election was established at that time and the election of Aboobakr was done through negotiation of present people. You might think that it was not a good choice or that not all qualified people were presented at the time, that's your opinion but it has nothing to do with looking for evidences in Quran about it.

We see that he doesn’t really have much faith in the Quran’s ability to decide the question as to who the Prophet (s)’s successor was. As such, this person does not really believe that much of anything can be proven. Hundreds of companions report that the Prophet (s) made them pledge allegiance to ‘Ali, but this proves nothing because it’s a hadeeth. The Qur’an does not give any evidence as to who the Prophet (s)’s successor is, so we should abandon it on this issue. Rather, we should follow the author’s blind speculation that we have to follow whoever comes into power (whether it be through election or otherwise) for the sake of unity. Is this Islam?

## 9. Response #7

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*There are not explicit verses because if they were, Quran was in danger of fabrication.*

This is actually guessing God's intentions and is very close to Kufr. From where one could come to this conclusion? Is there any verse in Quran that says God has not revealed certain things because if he does, you will change Quran? In fact the verses of Quran are supportive to the opinion that nothing has been left out for us from Quran and that God keeps Quran safe and that the Prophet should not be worried about delivering the verses. This is in fact attributing Taqqiyyah to God himself (God forbid).

The author’s prejudices continue to blind him. There are explicit verses in the Qur’an, and if a Shi’a says that there are not, than he is an ignorant person who needs to study his religion

better. The Prophet (s) was explicitly ordered to nominate a successor. We are explicitly ordered to follow others than the Prophet (s), who are also infallible. We are explicitly told to love the Prophet (s)'s family, and that they have been purified from all impurity. We are explicitly told that a guide has been sent to us, someone other than the Prophet (s). What more is needed?

## 10. Response #8

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Finally among the classic scholars of Shia at the old times there were some of them who hold that Quran is changed by Sahabah and that certain verses are removed from it.*

In fact this is the most logical reply that one can get. However no Shia scholar these days refer to this response. They have changed their minds about this opinion (although among them there are still some individuals that do not deny the possibility). However every one knows that this is opposed to the verse of Quran where God promises to keep the book. Also if this is the case then how we know that there weren't some verses in Quran in support of (say) Baha'ollah or (say) George w. Bush? By this assumption no basis will remain to hold any opinion as a Muslim. On the other hand, God could reveal as much as needed about **Imaat** (like 98 verses about prayer). Just imagine how difficult would it be if some one wanted to remove all the verses about prayer from Quran, God could do the same for **Imaat**.

There is far more hadeeth literature about corruption of the Qur'an in the authentic Sunni literature than the Shia hadeeth literature. These include:

**Abu Musa al-Ashari invited the Quran readers of Basra. Three hundred ( 300 ) readers responded to his invitation. He told them you are the readers and the choice of the People of Basra. Recite the Quran and don't neglect it. Otherwise a long time may elapse and your hearts will be hardened as the hearts of those who came before you were hardened. We used to read a Chapter from the Quran similar to Bara'ah in length and seriousness, but I forgot it. I can remember from the Chapter only the following words: "Should a son of Adam own two valleys full of wealth, he should seek a third valley and nothing would fill Ibn Adam's abdomen but the soil. We also used to read a chapter similiar to the Musabbihat and I forgot it. I only remember out of it the following: "Oh you who believe, why do you say what you do not do? Thus a testimony shall be written on your necks and you will be questioned about it on the day of judgment."**

*Sahih Muslim Chapter CCCXI, p500, Tradition #2286*

**Anas reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying: "If the son of Adam were to possess two valleys of riches, he would long for the third one. And the stomach of the son of Adam is not filled but with dust. And Allah returns to him who repents."**

*Sahih Muslim (English), Chapter CCCXCI, Tradition #2282*

**Anas b. Malik reported: I heard the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) as saying this (the sentence of the above tradition), but I do not know whether this thing was revealed to him or not, but he said so.**

*Sahih Muslim (English), Chapter CCCXCI, Tradition #2283*

We read in the Arabic-English version of Sahih al-Bukhari, volume 8, hadeeth 817. When Umar performed his last Hajj, he said:

**Certainly Allah sent Muhammad with the truth and revealed him the Book. One of the revelations which came to him was the verse of stoning. We read it and understood it. The Messenger of God stoned and we stoned after him. I am concerned that if time goes on, some one may say ' By God we do not find the verse of stoning in the Book of God '; thus, the Muslims will deviate by neglecting a commandment the Almighty revealed. Again, we used to read in what we found in the Book of God :*Do not deny the fatherhood of your fathers in contempt because it is a disbelief on your part to be ashamed of your fathers.***

Muslim reported in the book of nursing ( al-Ridha ), v10 pages 29 (Arabic), that Aisha said the following:

**There was in what was revealed in the Quran that ten ( 10 ) times of nursing known with certainty makes the nursing woman a mother of the nursed child. This number of nursing would make the woman 'Haram' to the child. Then this verse was replaced by ' five known nursing ' to make the woman forbidden to the child. The Prophet died while these words were recorded and read in the Quran.**

Once again in Sahih Muslim Book 004, Number 1316 we see that the words recited by Ayesha and other wives of Holy Prophet [s] in yet another verse cannot be found in the current Quran though again Ayesha testifies that those words should have been in the original version:

**Abu Yunus, the freed slave of 'A'isha said: 'A'isha ordered me to transcribe a copy of the Qur'an for her and said: When you reach this verse:" Guard the prayers and the middle prayer" (ii. 238), inform me; so when I reached it, I informed her and she gave me dictation (like this): Guard the prayers and the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer, and stand up truly obedient to Allah. 'A'isha said: This is how I have heard from the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him).**

And the author shall not try any feeble attempt to bring the usual 'abrogation' excuse in his response since if that was the case, the Sahabah themselves should have mentioned the fact in the above cited traditions on the contrary we see that Ayesha emphasized that those words were being recited till the death of Prophet [s] but unfortunately we see all **Sunni scholars these days refer to this response**. We will inshallah deal the issue of supposed Tahreef in Quran in a separate article very soon.

As for the opinion of the Scholars, here we present the 'research' of the esteemed Deobandi Imam Anwar Shah Kashmiri known as 'Imam al Asr' [Imam of the time]:

فإن التحريفَ المعنويَّ غيرُ قليلٍ فيه أيضًا، والذي تحقَّقَ عندي أن التحريفَ فيه لفظيٌّ أيضًا، أما إنه عن عمدٍ منهم، لمغلطة. فإتعالى أعلم به

**"The tahreef of meanings in Quran has not been taken place in a lessor amount. In my eyes, this is proved by research that the tahreef of words has taken place in Quran and either this tahreef was done intentionally or by mistake"**

*Faiz al Bari Shrah Sahih Bukhari, Volume 3 page 395, Kitab al Shahadaat*

The vast majority of our own hadeeth literature says that no such change occurred, though we

do have some hadeeths that contradict this and say that the Qur'an has been changed. However, we have been taught by our Imams (as) that when two hadeeths contradict each other, we should accept the one that contradicts the Sunni hadeeths. Since the Sunni hadeeth literature is pretty explicit that the Qur'an has been changed, and very few explicitly saying that it hasn't, then we should therefore reject those Shi'a hadeeths that say the Qur'an has been changed on the grounds that they accord with the Sunni hadeeth literature.

But since the author says that the Qur'an does not say anything about who the Imam should be, then there is no basis whatsoever to claim that somebody is legitimate or illegitimate as a leader. Based upon the author's strange belief-system, we must accept people like Yazid as our leader, even when they murder and rob the Prophet (s)'s family. Since the Qur'an is absolutely silent on who the Imam should be, and since one can never disagree with the de facto Imam on the basis of Qur'an, then there is really no grounds to ever disagree with a leader whatsoever or to say that he was unjust. Now, the author at allahuakbar.com seems to know this through his great study of Islam, but the grandson of the Holy Prophet (s) himself, Imam Hussain (as), didn't seem to know this when he rose up against Yazid. It is obvious that Imam Hussain (as) believed quite firmly that, on the basis of the Qur'an, that Yazid could not be the successor of the Prophet (s). But according to the Sunni author, it would be impossible to reject Yazid as a khalifah on the basis of the Qur'an, because as he put it:

*You might think that it was not a good choice or that not all qualified people were presented at the time, that's your opinion but it has nothing to do with looking for evidences in Quran about it.*

## 11. Response #9

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Where in Quran it is said that Muslims should choose a khalifah by themselves?*

Firstly it is not appropriate to answer a question with a question. Shia needs to adjust their doctrine with Quran and only after that it is appropriate to ask such a question.

Nevertheless this question only shows the misunderstanding of some brothers about the belief of the mainstream Muslims. Believing in **Khulafaaye Raashedin** is not a fundamental element of Islam. According to the main stream Muslims, there are only 6 Articles of Faith and 5 pillars of Islam and believing in khilaafath of Aboobakr is not part of either of them.

Any groups of people tend to elect some one as their leader. And the rational and most reasonable way to do so is by election. This is a routine social/political practice. Certainly no system of public election was established at that time and the election of Aboobakr was done through negotiation of present people. You might think that it was not a good choice or that not all qualified people were presented at the time, that's your opinion but it has nothing to do with looking for evidences in Quran about it. It's just a routine social practice that was and is and will be done in any society and no logical mind would

expect a divine evidence for that.

First of all, it is perfectly appropriate to answer a question with a question in this case. The Sunnis are attacking the idea of Imamate, without providing any reasonable substitute. They are telling us that 'Ali was not appointed by God, that no one was appointed by God, and that the Muslim umma was abandoned to the hands of people like 'Umar who openly acknowledged their bid'a, such as 'Umar's prohibition of mut'ah.

Secondly, the idea that accepting the caliphate or *imamate* of the caliphs is not integral to Sunni Islam is non-sense. Sunni fiqh and belief system revolves around this fact, and the first argument why Shi'as are considered to be kafir is that they don't love, adore and adhere to the first three. If any Wahabbi scholar, such as Bilal Phillips, read that the author at allahuakbar.net has said that it is not wajib to strictly adhere to the *imamate* of their khalifas and to consider them as Imams of the Muslims, Bilal Phillips would undoubtedly declare the author of this article as a kafir. Not only Wahabies, but prominent Hanafi works also affirm the obligation of having belief in the "*Imamate*" of Abu Bakar and Umar. A Sunni author in his anti-Shia book quoting from various Hanafi authority works declares the rejecter of their caliphs to be Kaafir. For example he quotes from *Barjundi Sharah Naqayah, Volume 4 page 21 published in Lucknow* which quoted *Fatwa e Zaheeriya*:

**"The rejecter of the Imamate of Siddiq Akbar [ra] is Kaafir and some have said that such a person is ill-madhab and not a Kaafir while the correct view is that he is Kaafir and similarly the rejecter of the Imamate of Farooq Azam [ra] is also Kaafir according to correct view.**

**... Bahar al Raiq, Volume 5 page 131 published in Egypt states that the rejecter of the Imamate and Khilafat of Abu Bakr or Umar is Kaafir"**

 ['Imam Ahmed Raza aur Shia Madhab' page 53 \(Ahmed Raza Publishers, Lahore\)](#)

The author cites similar kinds of edicts from *Kiafaya Sharh Hidayah, Vol 1 (Bombay)* and *Mustakhlis al Haqaiq Shrah Kanz al Dhaqaiq, page 32 (Ahmedi publishers)*.

In order to show how ignorant the author is about the obligation of adhering to the *imamate* of their caliphs, let us cite the authority Sunni work 'Hashiat al-Tahawi ala al-Maraaqi' Volume 2 page 299:

وان أنكر خلافة الصديق كفر كمن أنكر الإسراء

**"If someone denies the Khilafa of al-Siddiq he is kafir like the one who denied al-Isra"**

 [Hashiat al-Tahawi ala al-Maraaq, Volume 2 page 299](#)

We also read in 'Sawaiq al Muhriqa' by Ibn Hajar al-Haythami, Volume 1 page 138:

**"The doctrine of Abu Hanifa may Allah be pleased with him is that whoever denies the khilafa of the Siddiq or Umar is kafir"**

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Volume 1 page 138](#)

On Volume 1 page 139:

**"It is written in al-Fatawei al-Badi'a that whoever denies the Imamate of Abu Bakr may Allah be pleased with him, is kafir"**

 [Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Volume 1 page 139](#)

If this is not suffice to show the ignorance of the author about the belief he is trying to defend, let us further cite from 'Al-Sawaiq al-Muhriqa' Volume 1 page 145:

**"The Hanafi Imams have declared anyone who denies the khilafa of Abu bakr and Umar may Allah be pleased of them as Kafir. the statement is recorded in al-Ghaya and other books as it is mentioned in the book of Muhammad bin al-Hassan may Allah have mercy upon him and it appear that they took the judgment from their Imam Abu Hanifa may Allah be pleased with him"**

[Al-Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Volume 1 page 145](#)

Perhaps the author does not deem the revered Sunni scholars/authors of the above mentioned books amongst the mainstream Muslims!

Furthermore, if it is not *wajib* to accept them as rightly guided, then why is the author writing this article? What are we debating? If we don't have to accept them, then why are we misguided? If it is a matter of choice and has nothing to do with Qur'an or sunnah, if we are allowed to have our own opinions on this issue (and, as we have seen, we are not allowed to), than why is it not a sufficient argument for the Shi'a to simply say: "We have no basis in Qur'an or sunnah for our Twelve Imams. However, we like them and we think they should be Imam." This author really is confused, and seems to have no idea what he is talking about at all. He has said that the office of Imamate has nothing to do with Qur'an, that nowhere does Allah (swt) designate the successor of the Prophet (s), and that no one can come along and criticize a particular leader on the grounds that there is no Qur'anic basis for his Imamate. If this is true, then there is certainly nothing in the Qur'an about following the majority opinion, and as such the author should simply give up and say: "I like Abu Bakr, and you like 'Ali. Let's agree to disagree." In the author's view, it's all about opinion, without any Islamic evidence. However, he decided to sit down and write this article as a manual for refuting Shi'as. Why do we have to be refuted if believing in Abu Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthman is not an important part of our belief system?

As for people getting together to elect a leader, the fact that this is a natural process means nothing. It is a natural process for people to blindly follow the traditions of their ancestors. This does not mean it is Islamic. Nowhere do we see Allah (swt) accepting the idea that people should appoint the Divine guide sent to every people. Rather, we see the opposite, and we see how the polytheists are cursed for wanting to have "their say" in who got to be the Prophet. If the author is actually attempting to argue that choosing the successor of a Prophet (s) is fine because people always select their own leaders, than this is the height of caprice. It is irrelevant what people normally do and what they normally do not do. People also normally disobey Prophets and fight against them, just as 'Umar tried to murder the Holy Prophet (s) before claiming to become Muslim. The fact that something is the norm has nothing to do with religion.

Furthermore, it is not the norm that people select their leaders. They may do it to some extent in Western democracies, but in most of the world they don't. In fact, we can more easily say that it is the norm for great leaders to be inherited by their sons or near family members. Certainly in the Prophet (s)'s time, this was the norm in almost every society on Earth. After all, that is what Mu'awiyah did with Yazid. As such, it was the norm for Imam 'Ali (as) to become the khalifah, because he had the closest family relationship to the Prophet (s), and it was the norm for Imam Hassan (as) to become the successor to Imam 'Ali (as), being the eldest son. That was the norm all over the world during the seventh century, so why shouldn't people have just followed that traditional norm and immediately accept Imam 'Ali (as) as their khalifah?

Allaahuakbar.net states:

Having said that, once the SAH 'IBAH of the holy prophet agree on a great SAH 'IBAH like Aboobakr (RA) to become the Khalifah, then it is the duty of all Muslims to obey him for the sake of Islam and unity.

If a Shia asks me what is my proof about this, I

will give him/her a source that Shia holds as a very strong proof:

Nahjolbalaqah, letter No. 6 of Imaam Ali to Mo'aviah (note that in some versions of Nahjul balagha. This letter is few numbers before or after): **"People who did Bayat to Aboobakr and Omar, did bayat with me in the same way. So the one who is present cannot select any one else for Khalifah and the one who is absent cannot disobey people in their selection. Shurah belongs to Mohajer and Ansar, so if they gather around a person and appoint him as their Imaam this is to the satisfaction of Allah. If any one disapprove them on this or innovate something about it he should be taken back to the people who he has left (by accepting the appointed Khalifah), and if he refused to do so people has to fight with him as he is going to a path other than of Muslims."**

(Note that in the Shia websites like al-islam.org, certain words have been inserted in the translation -like the word "suppose" - without putting them in the brackets in an attempt to change the meaning of the text.)

Now it's up to the Shia brothers and sisters whether they want to attribute Taqyah or lie or politics or what ever to their Imam and whether they like to justify his comment in the same way that they justify verses of Quran.

(also please bear in your mind that we have an explicit verse in Quran that says **"va amrohom shoora baynahom", (and their affairs are done by consultancy between them)**. Surely the question of leadership is one of the affairs of Muslims. However I won't use this verse to prove anything about Khilaafath in Islam. Unlike the Shia brothers and sisters, I am quite cautious about playing Lego with the verses of Quran) So let us not compare apple with orange.

**Imaamat** doctrine is a fundamental belief of Shia, election or selection of **Khulafaaye Raashedin** is just a routine and common socio-political practice.

## 12. Reply one

We have noticed that some of the Ahle Sunnah get overly excited when they find this letter from Nahjul Balagha and submit it as conclusive proof that that Maula Ali bin Abi Talib [as] believed in the correctness of Shura to appoint a Khalifa. Unfortunately they fail to consider the context in which Maula Ali [as] used these words. Our opponents are not ignorant of the context; rather they treacherously suppress the context so that they can give their naïve adherents at least one piece of evidence to support the bizarre doctrine for selecting an Imam.

The contents of this letter needs to be looked at in terms of its historic context. Muawiyah was amongst those people who had professed to the soundness of the approach and system adopted by the handful of companions who had selected a Khalifa, because these same khalifas granted him positions during their reigns. Following the murder of Uthman, the adherents of this man made appointment methodology, swore allegiance to Ali [as] on the same principles. Muawiyah realized that Ali [as] knew Muawiyah's evil malicious nature, and was aware that he would never grant him any position or privilege during his reign. Muawiyah was looking at what he viewed 'the biggest prize' if 'Ali (as) was going to give him nothing, then he might as well show his true colours and oppose him openly as a means of vying with him for the position of khalifa. Muawiyah sought to do this by raising objections over the method of selection adopted by the people, which lead to him becoming the khalifa. Alhamdolillah, the gate of knowledge, countered this reasoning with an argument that left him speechless. Maula Ali [as] pointed out to him that the people who believed in that method of selection had swore allegiance to Him [as] on the same principles that they had sworn allegiance to their previous caliphs whom Muawiyah supported (on the same principles), but when it came to Ali [as], Muawiyah's filthy eyes began to find flaws in the method. Maula Ali [as] in his letter was logically and theoretically paraphrasing this fact. So his words for instance **"Shurah belongs to Mohajer and Ansar, so if they gather around a person and appoint him as their Imaam this is to the satisfaction of Allah"** were not His [as] notion rather he was paraphrasing the very flawed arguments which had been previously adopted for the selection of caliph. And when Muawiyah revealed his grudge against Ali [as] and started to create problems for him [as], Maula Ali [as] reminded him that the people amongst Muhajireen and Ansar who had given allegiance to the first three on certain principles had pledged allegiance to him on those very same principles. This therefore made the argument of Mu'awiyah null and void, he had no right to raise his filthy tongue on this issue since he was neither from the Muhajir nor from Ansar as recorded by Ibn Taimiyah:

**"Verily Muawiya bin Abi Sufian and whoever is like him are from tulaqa who converted to Islam after the day of Makka conquest"**

*Majmoa al-Fatawa, Volume 35 page 64*

Also see *Majm'oa al-Fatawa, volume 28, page 579, Tahdeeb al-Kamal, volume 28, page 177 and Al-Istiyab by Ibn Abdulbar, volume 3, page 1416.*

Therefore, those who cite these words of Maula Ali [as] before the Shi'a should keep that context in their mind before rejoicing.

For those naïve followers of our treacherous opponents, let us spoon feed the situation and make it further understandable by citing an example.

*Suppose five individuals A,B,C,D & E competing for a Local Authority business tender. Amongst these bids E is the only eligible person for that task and he meets every aspect of the tender. The first four individuals A,B,C & D share a decent relationship with each other, while D's whole existence is influenced by an abhorrence and envy of E. The individuals A,B,C colludes together, and via back door diplomacy with the authority and without informing E, they allow A to secure the tender on the condition that B,C & D will get some sort of share from A. On enquiry by the eligible E, they advance the argument:*

**"The authority has selected him on the principle that the one who is present cannot select any one else for this task and the one who is absent cannot reject people in their selection. The selection method belongs to A,B,C,D and their supporters, so if they gather around a person, quit in his favour and chose him for the task this is to the satisfaction of the highest authority in federal."**

*Despite this, when the individual A dies and there comes the time to chose another person to continue the task, the same episode is repeated with the same arguments advanced. Upon the*

death of C, when at last authority has no other choice but to resort the most eligible candidate i.e. E, the until now suppressed hatred of D for E arises and he objects to the method of appointment that he had previously supported, E paraphrases the arguments that had been previously been advanced to deny him the tender:

**"The authority who had chosen A,B & C has chosen me on the same principles. So the one who is present cannot select any one else for this task and the one who is absent cannot reject people in their selection. The selection method belongs to A,B,C,D and their supporters, so if they gather around a person, quit in his favours and chose him for the task this is to the satisfaction of the highest authority in federal."**

This paraphrasing by E to D does not anyway endorse the validity of the method used to deny him his right, E has used this to silence D, who had supported the same approach that lead to the appointment of A,B and C.

Coming back to the letter of Maula Ali (as), what our Imam (as) was saying was 'you cannot keep your cake and eat it' i.e. affirm your belief in the method that brought the first three khalifas to power and then reject him, when the people who like him, upheld this concept likewise appointed him (as). Mawla 'Ali (as) was through his pen showing Mu'awiya and all generations of Muslims what a hypocrite the son of Hind was.

### 13.Reply Two

We should also point out that whist showing his dissatisfaction over the translation of the sermon, he has advanced the translation from his own pocket wherein he forgot to mention the name of his third caliph which is the part of the actual letter.

 [Screen Shot of the Letter No.6 cited at www.allaahuakbar.net](http://www.allaahuakbar.net)

But in any case, if there is anything wrong in the English (Shia) translation available on the internet then it is in the very first sentence where certain words are missing at the end as it should be:

**Verily, those who took the oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman have sworn allegiance to me on the same principles as they had taken allegiance to them.**

The dissatisfaction of author and his likes was anticipated since they cannot draw their desired meanings from the cited letter of Nahjul Balagha because of its original context we presented above. Thus we see that some Sunni individuals also make a feeble attempt to put the word 'right' and in the letter and make the sentence look:

**"So anyone who was present has no right to go against his pledge of allegiance, and anyone who was absent has no right to oppose it. And verily is only the right of the Muhajirs and the Ansar."**

This is absurd since we see that the Arabic word for 'right' i.e 'Haq' cannot be found anywhere in the sentence of the letter of Maula Ali [as]. If the proponents of this translation try to use the Arabic word 'LIL' used in the sentence, then they really need to become rational since the word in this context does not mean 'right' and at best it can mean '**belongs to**' or '**confined to**'. But even those who want to put 'right' in this sentence would earn nothing because as we all know that these were not the views of Maula Ali [as] rather he was addressing to Muawiyah according to his (Muawiyah's) beliefs.

If our opponents are insistent on the word 'right' and also portray this as the view of Maula Ali [as] rather than paraphrasing by him [as] then what will our opponents say about the words of

Maula Ali [as] that he delivered straight afterwards, he [as] was given Bayah by the majority (those who adhered to the theory of Ijma) and it was on this basis that they deemed him their fourth caliph:

**“This is the time when right has returned to its owner and diverted to its centre of return.”**

*Nahjul Balagha, sermon No. 2*

Unlike the Letter No. 6, the words of Maula Ali [as] are quite explicit here and most importantly the word 'Haq' (right) has been clearly used. Can those of our opponents who always remain adamant to bring the word 'right' for Muhajir and Ansar in Letter No. 6 elaborate as to why Maula Ali [as] said the cited words of Sermon No. 2?

Some of our opponents also rejoice over the next sentence of the letter and they think that it shows that Maula Ali bin abi Talib [as] was satisfied with the selection of the first three:

**“so if they gather around a person and appoint him as their Imaam this is to the satisfaction of Allah.”**

The sentence is the continuation of previous paraphrasing kind of sentences and being the part of the letter this sentence is too in the very context which we mentioned above. Imam Ali bin abi Talib [as] in his brilliance, eloquence and rhetoric, was in fact addressing the ridiculous theory of Ijma that was set out at Saqifa and which, by the passage of time became the core belief of the Sunni school, the theory which suggests that selection of a person by a few of companions would mean that he is the caliph from whom Allah is satisfied and now no one can go against him. This is a belief which has puzzled the Sunni world to the point that they are left with no other choice but to believe in the caliphate of people like Yazeed (la) despite his homosexuality and alcoholism. Since Abu Bakar and Umar had previously used the precise notion to firm the foundation of their argument, Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] cited the same argument (in a paraphrasing manner) to refute the objection of Muawiyah.

The bottom line is, whatever translation one may do, Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] was not presenting his own views in this sermon rather whilst addressing Muawiyah, he was rhetorically paraphrasing the concepts which Muawiyah adhered to, since it is one of the basic aspects of a debate where you reject the stance of your opponent on the basis of beliefs of your opponents. This goes to the heart of all polemical debates, when Muslims seek to refute the doctrine of trinity from the Bible they do so, by citing verses from the Bible, not by citing the Qur'an. Citing the Bible does not in any way endorse Muslim belief of the text. Similarly Sunni / Shi'a polemics involves both parties supporting their stance from one another's texts.

In the modern world, you will often see in court cases one lawyer citing comments of the opposing side, to highlight contradictions in their positions / actions that they had previously adhered to. This is common with employment law cases, when a senior partner objects to the procedures adopted to dismiss him, a stance that is destroyed is it can proven that the same officer had previously dismissed staff on the basis of the same procedure.

## 14. Reply Three

It is clear that the statement of Ali [as] doesn't portray his own belief, rather it is making it Hujjah on Muawiyah, and hence this should be termed as "Ilzami". An argument referred to as 'ilzami' or 'ilzam alal khassam' means to adopt the technique of proving your opponent wrong from what he firmly believes in. It is an accusing or argumentative style, where the beliefs of your opponent are applied in order to prove him wrong. The perfect example of this is any Shia-Sunni debate, in which the Shia give references from books of AhleSunnah and the latter give references from Shia books (though they are misquoted). For example, if a Sunni gives a reference from al-Kafi (a Shia book), then can he be accused of actually believing in al-kafi? Of

course not, and if not, then the same rule should be applied when Hazrat Ali[as] is using the same technique of debate against Muawiyah.

The greatest orator of humanity, the lord of eloquence and articulacy leaves no room for Muawiyah to escape after proving his [as] caliphate on devious Muawiyah, saying:

*O Muawiyah! You say that caliphate can be established only through shura of Muhajireen and Ansar. Considering this as a principle, you accept the caliphate of the three prior to me. You should be knowing that I have been elected exactly in the same manner, on the same rules and principles which had made the ones prior to me, then what makes you to accept their caliphate and reject mine.*

For understanding this conversation, one should view it in the context of the whole dialogue between Hazrat Ali [as] and Muawiyah. This series of letters and dialogue between Ali [as] and Muawiyah are very lengthy and include various letters written from both sides, therefore it is important that for understanding one letter, a person studies and understands all the letters and then extracts the true meanings. These letters are copied in history books and they prove that this letter was a refutation to Muawiyah and left no leeway for him to make excuses.

For example it is written in Iqd al-Farid that Imam Ali [as], after the battle of Jamal wrote to Muawiyah:

معاوية بعد وقعة الجمل سئلام عليك  
أما بعد  
فإن بيّعتني بالمدينة لزمته وأنت بالشام لأنه  
بايعني الذين بايعوا أبا بكر وعمر وعثمان على ما بويعوا عليه

**“(O Muawiyah) My general allegiance (bayah) that carried out in Medina has become obligatory (lazumtaka) on you, although you are in Syria, because the same people have paid allegiance to me who had paid it earlier to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman.”**

<http://www.al-eman.com/Islamlib/viewchp.asp?BID=195&CID=29#s11>

Here it is, this letter carries the word “Lazoom” which proves that the letter and argument is “ilzami’ and that is why Muawiyah had to escape from the debate and ended up without arguments (like his Wahabi adherents).

The reply of Muawiyah to the letter by Imam Ali [as] is written on the next page of the same book, recording:

معاوية سئلام عليك  
أما بعد فلعمري لو بايعك الذين ذكرت وأنت بريء من دم عثمان لكنت  
كأبي بكر وعمر وعثمان ولكنتك أغريت بدم عثمان وخذلت الأنصار فأطاعك الجاهل وقوي  
بك الضعيف

**“(O Ali) I swear by my like, that the persons whom you claim of having paid allegiance to you had paid it, and you had nothing to do with the assassination of Uthman, paying allegiance to you would have been obligatory like Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, but the truth is that you provoked people for assassination of Uthman.”**

*Iqd al-Farid, volume 1, page 323.*

<http://www.al-eman.com/Islamlib/viewchp.asp?BID=195&CID=29#s3>

This letter by Muawiyah clearly resolves the issue, it shows that Muawiyah accepted Ali's [as]'s explanation of Muawiyah's belief, but Muawiyah doesn't consider Ali [as] having fulfilled the criteria.

Let's make it clear in points.

1. Ali [as] said that Muawiyah thought shura belongs to the Ansar and Muhajireen.
2. Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman [in Muawiyah's view] were elected and backed by Ansar and Muhajireen, therefore they had the right to rule.
3. Ali [as] proved his own caliphate to Muawiyah, by stating that he had been elected by the same people.

Muawiyah in reply:

1. Accepted the notion that anyone backed and elected by Muhajireen and Ansar has the right to rule.
2. said that Ali [as] has not been elected by Muhajireen and Ansar, therefore he had no right to rule.

This shows that Ali [as] had played his cards perfectly, he had trapped Muawiyah from his own pen, and proven his caliphate, but Muawiyah left with nothing else, had to say that Ali [as] wasn't elected by the people who elected Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, though he accepted the criteria set by Ali [as] as Muawiyah's belief of the right to caliphate.

Moreover, the Nasibis should be more careful in this regard, if the opinion is accepted that Hazrat Ali [as], is the fourth of the rightly guided caliphs of Sunnis, who believed in shura or consensus of the Muhajireen and Ansar to appoint a khalifa, then the caliphates of the first three rightly guided Sunni khalifas is destroyed because the caliphate of none of them conforms to the criterion, as we are going to mention in Reply Six:

## 15. Reply Four

As far as shura goes, we know that there is no shura in matters of Islamic law. There is no shura about whether or not salat is obligatory, for example. As such, how can there be any shura to determine whether or not it is obligatory to follow this individual, or that? Allah (swt) says in his Glorious Book:

***"It is not for a believer, man or woman, when Allah and His Messenger have decreed a matter that they should have an option in their decision. And whoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he has indeed strayed in a plan error." [33:36]***

This clearly states that the affairs that should be decided by "Shura" can only be those in which Allah (swt) or the Messenger (s) have "no position". This clearly excludes the idea of election / selection of Imams, Khalifas of a Prophet, as this requires the leader being appointed by Allah (swt), as we have previously demonstrated. Imamate entails certain shar'ia obligations. If somebody is appointed by God, then he must be obeyed, and that is a fiqh ruling. How can there be shura, then, to say that it is obligatory on us to follow Abu Bakr, 'Umar, or whoever? There is no shura on such issues. The duty to follow a leader is a matter for Allah (swt) to decide, and He (swt) did just that, after the Prophet (s) it was obligatory for us to follow Imam 'Ali (as) and the eleven Imams from his progeny (as).

## 16. Reply Five

The Sunni proponents of the cited letter of Maula Ali [as] who emphasize the concept of Shura mentioned in the letter for the selection of a leader/caliph/representative are also of the view that:

1. The Holy Prophet [s] engaged in Shura throughout his life.

2. The Holy Prophet [s] on many occasions appointed and sent deputies to the people and they had to obey them. They were hence like temporarily or situational successors.
3. Making decisions by consultation (Shura) was an established practice in Arab culture.

It is our challenge to our opponents who support the concept of Shura as proof of the legitimacy of the caliphate of their caliphs:

1. According to Sunnies the Prophet [s] sent Uthman to the people of Quraish as his representative/envoy (according to some Sunnies as his deputy) prior to the event of Hudaibiyah. Can they show us at which place the Prophet of Islam [s] engaged in Shura to appoint Uthman?
2. According to Sunnies the Prophet [s] made Ali [as] as his caliph and left him behind when setting out on the expedition of Tabuk, can they bring a single shred of evidence that demonstrates that the Prophet of Islam [s] engaged in Shura for the selection of Ali [as]?
3. Now lets move on to the Shakhayn for the caliphate of whom Sunnies do not waste a single minute in bringing the notion of Shura. Abu Bakr became the caliph as a result of commando action and wrestling of Umar, neither having the support of Ansar (who wanted their own caliph), nor Muhajireen (not Bani Hashim at least, along with some other true companions).
4. Can they show us single piece of evidence where their first Caliph, the Siddiq, the friend in the cave proposed Shura for the appointment of his successor? Rather Umar became the caliph as a result of appointment by former, who considered caliphate as his personal property. (How stupid, Prophet [s] didn't have the right to appoint successor, but Abu Bakr did have it).
5. And what about the notion of Umar for the appointment of his successor, did he leave the matter in the consultative hands of the majority of the Sahabah or will our opponents suggest that Allah [swt] was satisfied an outcome reached by a Six man Sahaba committee? Uthman became the caliph as a result of a fraudulent six member committee, which had Abdur Rehman bin Auf as the Veto power.

## 17. Reply Six

It is indeed very strange to see how the author has used the words of Maula Ali [as] to support his view by totally ignoring the context in which those words were written and at the same time he closes his eyes from the plethora of Shia texts narrated from the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] wherein they [as] emphasized on the fact that Imamate is not the affair of the fallible and dissimilar people to decide, rather it the task of our Creator who knows what is best for the people. How can one forget the famous sermon of Shiqshiqiyah wherein Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] raised points about his usurped right did not at any point advanced any that would suggest his satisfaction with the caliphate of Abu Bakar.

**Beware! By Allah the son of Abu Quhafah (Abu Bakr) dressed himself with it (the caliphate) and he certainly knew that my position in relation to it was the same as the position of the axis in relation to the hand-mill. The flood water flows down from me and the bird cannot fly upto me. I put a curtain against the caliphate and kept myself detached from it.**

**Then I began to think whether I should assault or endure calmly the blinding darkness of tribulations wherein the grown up are made feeble and the young grow old and the true believer acts under strain till he meets Allah (on his death). I found that endurance thereon was wiser. So I adopted patience although there was pricking in the eye and suffocation (of mortification) in the throat. I watched the plundering of my inheritance till the first one went his way but handed over the Caliphate to Ibn al-Khattab after himself.**

The author and his likes who often place emphasis on the following sentence of Letter 6 **“so if they gather around a person and appoint him as their Imaam this is to the satisfaction of Allah”** should also examine the Sermon of Shiqshiqiyah wherein there is no evidence of Imam 'Ai (as) supporting the notion that the caliph was supported with the satisfaction of Allah [swt] rather he [as] criticised the unrightfully caliph but in the end He [as] deemed patience to be the wiser stance.

We read in sermon 152 of Nahjul Balagha wherein Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] advanced the attributes of Imam and Imamate:

**“Certainly the Imams are the vicegerents of Allah over His creatures and they make the creatures know Allah. No one will enter Paradise except he who knows them and knows Him, and no one will enter Hell except he who denies them and denies Him.”**

We read the following words of Maula Ali [as] in Jame'a ahadith al-Shia, by Sayed Broujardi, Volume 1, page 178 and also in Da'am al-Islam by Qazi al-Nu'aman al-Maghrebi, Volume 2, page 353, hadith 1297:

**“You have to obey the one where there is no excuse in abandoning his obedience, the obedience of us Ahlulbayt. Verily Allah has linked our obedience to the obedience of Him and His messenger, and (Allah) stated that in a verse in his book, because of us Allah conferred grace upon us and you, And made the obedience of Him, His messenger and those vested with authority from the family of the messenger.”**

Amir al-Mumineen Ali bin Abi Talib [as] also said:

**“The one who disobeys Allah is not to be obeyed; and verily obedience is of Allah and of His Apostle and those vested with authority. Verily, Allah ordered (the people) to obey the Apostle because he was sinless and clean (pure), who would not tell the people to disobey Allah; and verily He ordered (the people) to obey those vested with authority because they are sinless and clean (pure), and would not tell the people to disobey Allah”**

*as-Saduq: 'Ilalu 'sh Shara'i', Volume 1 page 123*

Imam Ali (as) also said:

**Verily when the Lord of glory and honour created the creation and chose the best of his creation and chose the preferred of his slaves and sent messengers from them (the preferred slaves) and revealed on him (prophet Muhammad) his book and established for him the religion and ordained the law, Allah all mighty and glory commanded and said: ‘Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you’ verily that (verse) is exclusively about us Ahlulbayt not other than us, so you turn back upon your heels and turned back of your faith and rejected the command and broke the covenant, verily though you (by your deed) do not harm Allah, surly Allah ordered you to refer it to Allah and to the messenger and to those who vested with authority among you who are the proper investigator of knowledge, verily you agreed but then you denied Allah said to you ‘fulfil your covenant with Me as I fulfil My Covenant with you, and fear none but Me’.**

*Bihar al-Anwar, Volume 32, page 96*

Since the above mentioned traits cited by Imam Ali [as] were necessary for a Imam therefore we see that when the people who had been following the man made caliphate and the theory of Ijma and Shura for the selection of a Caliph/Imam gave oath of allegiance to Him [as] after the delay of so many years, Maula Ali [as] clearly stated:

**“This is the time when right has returned to its owner and diverted to its centre of return.”**

*Nahjul Balagha, sermon No. 2*

Allaahuakbar.net states:

On the other hand, let's look at the present situation is Iran. Is there any divine command about how to establish a leadership in the occultation of Mahdi? Let's remember that there were no religious system of governing after the occultation of Mahdi for about 1000 years after the recent revolution of Iran and emerging of the theory of Welayate Faqih. Those who know about Shia and Iran appreciate that Welayate Faqih of Khomeini was only a theory that he derived from some ahaadeeth. Not all Shia scholars agree with that (like Khoiee and his followers). Among the classic Shia scholars only few had referred to this theory and most like Sheikh Ansari had the opinion that it is difficult to derive such a theory from ahaadeeth (refer to Makaseb of Sheikh Ansari). Also among those recent scholars who accept the theory there are un-agreements about the extend of the theory and that how it could be put in practice (Like Montazeri, late Shirazi, etc.). So again as I referred to in the article, Shia too ended up with the same situation as the mainstream Muslims that is to elect a leader by themselves in the absence of any direct divine command.

Iran is Iran, and the political theory of *wilayat al-faqih* in Iran has not been accepted by various Shi'a 'ulama. The fundamentals of Shi'aism does not believe that we can elect a replacement for the Imam (as) and similarly *wilayat al-faqih* is not considered as a replacement for the Imamate, as Imam ar-Rida (as) said:

**No one stands in the place of the Imam, and there is no replacement for him.**

All the Twelvers Shia agree that Imam Mahdi [as] is 'wali amr al muslimeen'. The difference is with the interpretation of the various hadith that say the scholars are the hujjah of the Imams on the people. A fallible can never replace an infallible. Scholars interpreted and deduced from Hadith that there needed to exist a form of leadership during the occultation that pave the way for the reappearance of the Imam (as), and not a leadership to replace the Imam (as). As previously said, there is no replacement for him rather; we must await his return, as has been commanded to us in innumerable hadeeths. Therefore, the logic to compare the Sunni concept of Khilafah with *Wilayat al-Faqih* is flawed.

It is very easy to twist the facts, but with a single twist, that can be unrolled again. The basic difference is that the political system of wilayate faqih has been constituted in connection and in support to the belief of Imamate, whereas the Sunni system of Khilafat was raised in opposition of the belief. The system of Wilayat Fqih paves the way for the reappearance of the Imam of the time, while Khilafat had snatched the right of the Imam of the time. Here the difference lies, at a time when Khilafat was engineered, the divine guide of the time was present and asking for his right, but at the time when Wilayat al Faqih has been established, the Imam of the time is in occultation, its not a parallel system to Imamate, it is an assistance to that.

Shias in no way hold the system of Wilayat al Faqih on par with imamate, it is just that a Islamic political system was needed when an Islamic state was formed. Since the Imam of the time was in occultation, someone had to rule that Shia state, now do the authour and Nawasib say that no one should have ruled that state? Or would they call anyone as Imam who would rule that country? This is stupidity. Since one or the other system had to be followed, the system of Wilayat al Faqih was formed, but again the point remains the same, this is done at a time when the need for a temporary ruler was there, since the Imam of the time was in occultation, but the Khilafat's basis were laid on snatching the right of the Imam of the time. Don't the author and idiot Nawasib find any difference between the two?

## 18. Response #10

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Show us the names of the prophets between ... and ... in Quran if you think that every thing should be in Quran*

The Shia who sends this question cannot realise what is the main issue. The issue is not about NAMES. It is about a CONCEPT.. The concept of prophethood has been addressed in Quran in many verses and there are a few verses that tells Muslims that they need to believe in all the prophets. Allah has given use the story of the main prophets and have left the story of others. There is no need to know the NAME of the (as they say) 124,000 prophets in order to obey Allah. The question is about the concept of **Imaamat** not the names of Imaams. Quran has established the concept of prophethood and its function for us through many verses. There is however not a single verse in Quran that explicitly tells us that there is another position called **Imaamat** which refers to infallible God appointed individuals who are not prophets and that their existence are necessary and there will be such Imams after the prophet.

This non-sense has already been dealt with above. If after reading the Qur'an, the author does not believe that Allah (swt) sends a guide whom He appoints to every people, then there really isn't much else that can be said.

## 19. Response #11

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*It is a test that's why it is not mentioned in Quran*

This claim puts the function of Quran as a guidance under a serious doubt. By this claim there is no use to read Quran to get any guidance

because who knows maybe there is a fundamental part of your belief that is not mentioned in Quran because God wants to test you! By the same token Bahayees claim that Quran talks about their prophet Baha'Ollah. When you ask them but where in Quran they will show you some verses that have nothing to do with their claim. When you say but these verses are not clear about your claim they say Oh because God is testing you, Nice!

No one with any knowledge has ever seriously argued that the Qur'an has not specifically said anything about Imamate as a test. The Qur'an is clear that every people will receive a guide, and we are no different. However, Sunnis have argued that it has specifically said things about God having a hand and so forth, without explaining it, in order for it to be a "test" as to whether or not we will refuse to think about what it means, or whether or not we will come to the obvious conclusion that the Hand of God refers to the power of God. Sunni Islam expects Muslims to believe all sorts of bizarre things that we are supposed to accept without asking why or how. We are not allowed to ask how a murderous liar like Yazid could become *khalifah*. We have to accept it, and not ask why. Does this sound like a reasonable religion?

## 20. Response #12

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Arguments that use few verses of Quran out of the context Here Shia tries to refer to few verses in which the words Imaam or Khalifa are used.*

It is interesting that most of the verses in this category are those that even Shia scholars do not use them to prove their doctrine cause Shia tafasir are clear about the commonly agreed meaning of these verses. There are however non-Scholar Shia youths, those who spend all their youth over internet debating with others that use these verses. To be more specific, these are the verses where the term Khalifa/Kholafa have been used or the verses that the term Imaam has been used in the meaning other than Leader. The Shia friends simply think any reference to Imaam or khalifa means what they think. The best way to answer them in this category is to refer them to their own tafasir like Almizan and Majmaolbayan. Also to remind him of the warning that Allah gives us in Quran about taking the verses out of their context (Arabic: Yoharrefonal Kalema An Mawaze'ehi)

The author has not even said what verses are supposedly lifted out of context. But whatever these verse are, the author has already made the point: that this is the argument of non-scholars. We would ask, then: Is Shi'ism to be refuted according to what "non-scholar youths" think? Could you imagine attempting to refute any religion by focusing on the statements of some of its ignorant followers? Should I refute Sunnism on the ground that a Sunni once said

something dumb to me? Of course not. This is not a logical argument. The author has already acknowledged that the *'ulama* have never referred to whatever verses the author is talking about (he has not specified them), so this entire discussion is entirely irrelevant. In any case, as he has not even mentioned the verses that are supposedly being taken out of context, there is really nothing to refute here, or even to discuss.

## 21. Response #13

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Sunnies believe in Mahdi while he is not mentioned in Quran:*

Firstly the concept of Mahdi for the mainstream Muslims is totally different from the concept that Shia holds for Mahdi. This is another issue discussing of which will extend the length of the article. The Shia who brings this justification has confused his own understanding of the concept of Mahdi with the mainstream's understanding of the concept. However the more important thing is that we cannot compare the belief of the mainstream Muslims about Mahdi with the belief of **Imaamat** in Shia. **Imaamat** is one of the main articles of faith for Shia but belief in Mahdi is not one of the main articles of belief of the mainstream Muslims. The articles of belief of the mainstream Muslims have been listed by the scholars and Alhamdolellah all of them are based on explicit verses of Quran. These are 6 (or 7 depending on the phrasing) articles of belief: Belief in God and his Oneness - Belief in Angels - Belief in God's books (Bible, Quran, etc.) - Belief in God's messengers = Believe in the day of resurrection= Believe in Qadar (i.e. every thing and event has been written). All of these are derived from explicit verses of Quran. The very reason that we cannot see THE BELIEF IN MAHDI being listed among the articles of belief of the mainstream Muslims is that this has not been commanded and explained and established in Quran in the same way that other articles of belief are established in Quran.

The point is that Sunnis believe that, at the end of time, Allah (swt) will send somebody, and he will be the last leader of the people. Sunnis also believe that the first leader of the people, Adam (as), was also appointed by God. They also believe that everybody from Adam (as) to the Prophet (s) was appointed by God. Yet for some reason, everything goes on hold from the Prophet (s) to the Mahdi (as). In that interim, we are supposed to elect our leader, even though this has never happened before, and even though this practice will be abolished with the coming of the Mahdi (as). Why this strange hiatus?

Furthermore, Sunnis are always accusing Shi'as of believing that their Imams (as) will change the law. Yet according to the Sunnis, Allah (swt) allowed the Muslims to elect their own leaders after the Prophet (s). But we will no longer be able to do this after the Mahdi. As such, do they

not then believe that the Mahdi (as) will be abrogating a law of the Prophet (s)? If a Shi'a said that Imam al-Mahdi (as) will abolish some laws of the Prophet (s), or that he will make haram something the Prophet (s) permitted, we would be branded as disbelievers and polytheists. But the Sunnis have no problem believing that the Mahdi (as) will make election *haram*, even though according to them the Prophet (s) made it *halal*.

## 22. Response #14

Allaahuakbar.net states:

*Imaamat is not the fundamental belief of 12ers, the appointment of Ali is the fundamental of belief.*

If one cannot appreciate (in line with the conscious of all the scholars of Shia) that Ali being appointed by the prophet is the direct consequence of the concept of Imaamat and that Imaamat is the core belief of 12er Shia that's fine. I would ask the same question about Ali. The question is a generic one that can be applied to any fundamental of belief: Where are explicit verses of Quran without any Tafsir or Hadeeth that clearly command us about what ever is the fundamental of 12ers' belief that distinguishes them from the mainstream Muslims, being **Imaamat** or the Khilaafat of Ali after the holy prophet. There is no escape from this question as long as one believes that Quran is the ultimate guidance. And if a Muslim is not able to find this in Quran then by God he/she needs to answer God in the day of judgement that why he/she separate him/herself from the mainstream Muslims.

First of all, let us ask a question: Why is somebody answerable for separating himself from the "mainstream" (meaning majority) Muslims? Where is that in the Holy Qur'an? We demand clear, unambiguous verses saying that whatever the majority of people who claim to be Muslim say (acknowledging the fact that, in every age, most people who are born Muslim do not seriously practice their religion) must be accepted and obeyed. Of course there is nothing in the Qur'an to state this, and it is nothing but speculation on the part of the author. It is worth noting that the author claims to be an Iranian ex-Shi'a. It seems his major concern is being part of the "mainstream," whatever that is (Sufi Sunnis? Wahabbis? Bilal Phillips Wahabbis or Bin Laden Wahabbis? Who is the mainstream?). We hate to be the ones to tell him this, but religion is not a popularity contest. You may feel a burning desire to follow along with the crowd, but that does not mean anything about what is the actual truth from Allah (swt). The fact that a large number of alleged Muslims say something does not mean anything. We have to look for the truth, and the truth is that to **every people there is a guide**.

But in any case, the author has once again missed the point. The belief in 'Ali is not fundamental, for otherwise Zaidis and Ismailis would also be considered to have a correct belief system. Of course, according to the Twelver Shi'as, they do not. Nobody has ever said that belief in the Twelve Imams (as) is not important, for this would turn Shi'ism on its head: the point is to know and recognize and serve the Imam of one's time, and if you don't believe that Imam Muhammad al-Mahdi (as) is the Imam of our time, then you are in misguidance. To say

that belief in him is not the main belief is foolhardy, and no Shi'a with any knowledge would ever utter such words. Such a person would, in fact, be a traitor to his Imam.

## 2. Copyright

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

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

The Answering-Ansar.org reserves the right over the contents of the articles if they are used in the original format. You can freely distribute the Islamic references and quotes that we use in our articles in any format.

When using our articles in your websites or if in distribution in print format, please include the source as Answering-Ansar.org.

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

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

If you wish to reproduce, print and distribute our articles in book format, then you will need a written permission of Answering-Ansar.org. If you wish to do so, then please contact us for further details.