

Taqiyyah (Expedient dissimulation)

Work file: taqiyyah.pdf
Project: Answering-Ansar.org Articles

Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
0.0.1	25.09.2003	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

Contents

1. <u>HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF NASABIS INNOVATIONS IN TAQIYYAH</u>	4
2. <u>INNOVATION IN TAQIYYAH BY IBN TAYMIYYAH</u>	6
2.1 FIRST VERSE:	6
2.2 2ND VERSE:	6
2.3 3RD VERSE:	6
2.4 IBN TAYMIYYAH'S COMMENTARY ON VERSE [3:28]	6
2.5 CONCLUSION OF IBN TAYMIYYAH'S FATWA / (INNOVATIONS)	7
2.6 OUR RESPONSE	7
2.7 THE QUR'AN REFUTES IBN TAYMIYYAH	7
2.8 THE SUNNAH OF RASUL ALLAH (S) REFUTING IBN TAYMIYYAH	8
2.9 TALHA AND ZUBAIR VS. IBNE TAYMIYYAH	8
2.10 WHY DID UMAR PRACTICE TAQIYYA BEFORE HIS SUBJECTS - WERE THEY KAAFIRS?	9
2.11 WAS MUAWIYYAH A KAFFIR RULER? [IBN TAYMIYYAH VS. MUAWIYYAH]	10
2.12 ULAMA OF AHLE-SUNNAH VS. IBN TAYMIYYAH (FATWA OF IMAM NAWAWI)	11
2.13 IBN TAMIYYA VS. IMAM ZUHRI	11
COMMENT	11
2.14 SHAH WALIYULLAH VS IBN TAYMIYYA	11
COMMENT	12
2.15 MAULANA SAYYID NAZEER HUSAYN VS IBN TAYMIYYA	12
COMMENT	12
3. <u>INNOVATIONS IN TAQIYYAH BY MUFTI OF SIPAA SAHABA</u>	13
3.1 WHAT IS ACTUAL SHI'A DOCTRINE OF TAQIYYAH?	13
3.2 MUFTI KHALID'S CLAIM THAT TAQIYYAH IS HARAM FOR GOD APPOINTED PEOPLE LIKE PROPHETS AND IMAMS	14
3.3 MAULA ALI (AS) VS. "FEAR OF LIFE"	14
3.4 NOT A SINGLE "MOMIN" IS ALLOWED TO HAVE "FEAR OF LIFE" IN LITERAL SENSE	15
3.5 MUSA (AS) ALSO FEARED FOR HIS LIFE FOR THE SAKE OF ALLAH'S RELIGION	15
3.6 1ST CRITIQUE:	16
3.7 2ND CRITIQUE:	16
3.8 THE MOTIVE BEHIND THE NASIBI'S SELECTIVE VERSE APPLICATION	17
3.9 THIRD CRITIQUE:	19
3.10 DID ANY PROPHET EVER PRACTICE TAQIYYAH?	19
3.11 REPLY ONE - PROPHET MUHAMMAD (S) PRACTISED TAQIYYAH DURING THE FIRST 3 YEARS OF HIS MISSION AND HE PREACHED SECRETLY	19
3.12 REPLY TWO - RASULULLAH (S) PRACTISED TAQIYYA BEFORE THE NEWLY CONVERTED SAHABA	20
COMMENT	20
3.13 REPLY THREE - NASIBI THEMSELVES CLAIM THAT IBRAHIM (AS) PRACTISED TAQIYYAH AND TOLD A LIE	20
NASABIS DEEM IT PERMISSIBLE TO EVEN SEND THEIR WIVES TO OTHER TYRANTS, WHEN THEY ARE IN FEAR OF THEIR LIVES	22
TEHRIF IN SAHIH BUKHARI	23
3.14 REPLY FOUR - THE AHL 'UL SUNNAH ULEMA HAVE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT FEAR OF TYRANNY ENTITLES PROPHETS TO INDULGE IN KUFR (I.E. PRACTISE TAQIYYA)	23

3.15	REPLY FIVE - ACCORDING TO IMAM OF AHLUL SUNNAH RADHI, PROPHET IBRAHIM (AS) RECITED KUFR IN A STATE OF TAQIYYA	24
3.16	REPLY SIX - ALLAMAH SUYUTI ALSO SAID A PROPHET CAN COMMIT KUFR (IN A STATE OF TAQIYYA) BY PROSTRATING TO OTHER THAN ALLAH UNDER DURESS	24
3.17	WHY AMMAR YASIR DID "TAQIYYAH" AND WHY HIS PARENTS DIDN'T?	24
3.18	REPLY	24
3.19	DID RASUL ALLAH (S) DISCOURAGED TAQIYYAH [PERMISSION VS. ORDER]?	25
3.20	OUR REPLY:	25
3.21	ONE MORE INCIDENT OF "TAQIYYAH"	26
3.22	MAKING HALAL OF ISLAMIC SHARIA HARAM	26
3.23	UTHMAN IBN AFFAN VS. MUFTI SAHIB	27
3.24	"PERMISSIBILITY THEORY", WHEN ONE IS DYING OUT OF HUNGER	27
	OUR QUESTION TO MUFTI SAHIB:	27
3.25	MIGRATION ISSUE	28
3.26	OUR REPLY	28
3.27	VERSE OF QURAN ABOUT MOMINEEN, WHO LIVED UNDER TAQIYYAH UNDER TAQIYYAH IN MAKKA	29
3.28	NASIBI FIQH EVEN ORDERS TO NOT TO FIGHT/ (OR MIGRATE) IN CASE OF TYRANT MUSLIM RULER	30
3.29	WERE AIMA MASOOMEEN (AS) EVER COMPELLED TO KILL OTHER MUSLIMS?	31
3.30	TAQIYYAH OF AIMA MASOOMEEN (AS) VS. MIGRATION	31
3.31	HADHRAT YOUSUF (AS) IN COURT OF "KAFFIR FIROON" VS. MAULA ALI (AS) DURING 3 KHULAFAH	31
3.32	AIMA (AS), WHO SPENT THEIR LIVES UNDER HOUSE ARREST AND GOVERNMENT CONTROL	32
3.33	AIMA (AS) VS. COMMON SHI'AS	32
3.34	MIGRATION OF "SADAAT" TO DIFFERENT LANDS, IN ORDER TO GET RID OF TYRANT RULERS	33
4.	<u>MAULA ALI[AS] VS. TAQIYYAH</u>	<u>34</u>
4.1	WHY MAULA 'ALI (AS) DIDN'T RAISE "DHULFIQAR" AGAINST SHEIKHAIN?	34
4.2	REPLY ONE - IT WAS ABU BAKR'S DUTY TO RETURN WHAT WAS NOT HIS, NOT IMAM ALI TO DEMAND IT	34
4.3	REPLY TWO - IMAM 'ALI DID NOT WANT TO CAUSE OPEN DIVISION AND BLOODSHED	34
4.4	REPLY THREE -THE WIDER SITUATION MEANT IT WOULD HAVE BEEN DISASTROUS TO ACT	35
4.5	REPLY FOUR - IMAM ALI WAS FOLLOWING THE SUNNAH OF RASUL (S), DESISTING FROM ACTIONS THAT MIGHT BE EXPLOITED BY NON MUSLIMS	36
5.	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	<u>37</u>
6.	<u>COPYRIGHT</u>	<u>38</u>

1. Historical Background of Nasabis Innovations in Taqiyyah

Taqiyyah is a part of the religion of Islam. Its order has been revealed in Quran. The Sunnah of Prophet Muhammad (s) has also testified to the legitimacy of Taqiyyah is Halal until the Day of Judgement. Imam of Ahl ul Sunnah Hasan Basri states in Sahih Al-Bukhari, Egypt ed., vol. 9, pp. 24-25, Kitab al Ikra:

".... And ` Abd ibn Hamid has narrated from al-Hasan (al-Basri) that he said: ` Taqiyyah is lawful upto the day of resurrection. And ` Abd (ibn Hamid) has narrated from Abu Raja' that he was reciting, ` illa an tattaqu minhum taqiyyatan'; and ` Abd ibn Hamid has narrated from Qatadah that he was reciting (likewise) taqiyyatan with ya"....And Hassan (Basri) said: ` Taqiyyah is upto the Day of Resurrection And the Prophet (s.a:w.) said: ` Deed are according to intention

These instructions in Quran and Sunnah are so clear that even Nasabis cannot claim that Taqiyyah is Haram in Islam. So, these enemies of Allah devised an alternative "Satanic Plan" to destroy the Religion of Allah (swt).

They introduced "INNOVATIONS" in the Islamic Doctrine of Taqiyyah, in order to change it according to their own whims and desires.

The AA (Answering-Ansar.org) team has already dedicated a detailed chapter on Taqiyyah, in it's article:

 [The Creed of Shi'a explained](#)

So, here we will not go in details of Taqiyyah, but we will discuss the Innovations in Taqiyyah by 2 Nasabis. They are:

1. Ibn Taymiyyah (Sheikh-ul-Islam of the Salafies)
2. Mufti Khalid Mehmood (The most well-known Mufti and Munazir [debater] of Sipaa Sahaba- Deoband)

During the early centuries, the Nasabis flaty rejected the notion that there was an "Order" of Taqiyyah under the Islamic Sharia. Alhamdulillah, they were successfully refuted by the Shi'a Ulama, who presented clear verses of Qur'an as well as Ahadith of Rasul (s).

Then came Ibn Taymiyyah, who (of his own choosing) devised the following 2 conditions / (innovations) into the Islamic Sharia:

- + Taqiyyah can only be done in front of Kuffar. In case of Muslim, it is not allowed (even against tyrant Muslim Rulers)
- + While practising Taqiyyah, one cannot tell a "LIE". One can remain silent, but in no case tell a lie.

Alhamdulillah, these new innovations were also refuted by Shi'a Ulama with solid proofs and no means of escape was left for the Nasabis.

Unfortunately Nasibi Fitna yet again resurrected itself, equipped with several 'different' innovations. The final mutation has come from the mouth of Mufti Khalid Mehmood from Sipaa Sahaba (Deoband). His approach was to compile all of these innovations.

His book has been published online at the Sipaa Sahaba site kr-hcy.com. It is based on an alleged debate with a Shi'a scholar. During the debate, he developed the following innovations and claims:

1. Taqiyyah is only allowed for the ordinary members of the Muslim Ummah. It cannot be practised by people appointed by Allah (swt) e.g. Rasul and Payghamber (as).

[He wanted to prove that Taqiyyah was Haram for Maula Ali (as), as (according to Shi'a aqeedah, he was appointed by Allah (swt))]

2. Even in the case of ordinary Muslims, Allah (swt) has only given the "Permission" to practise Taqiyyah, and that this cannot be construed as an "Order". He claims that those, who practice Taqiyyah, possess a lower level of iman.

[While in the Madhab of the Ahl'ul Bayt, it is compulsory to do Taqiyyah in order to protect the interests of the community and Islam].

3. Not a single Prophet/Imam (including Rasul Allah saww), ever practiced Taqiyyah.

[While it's a matter of history and according to Madhab of Ahle-Bayya, Rasul Allah (s) and Maula Ali (as) and other Aima (as) themselves practiced Taqiyyah].

It's time now for the Shi'a Community to destroy this new Fitna of Nasibiat along with its excess baggage of evil Innovations.

So, let's begin.

May Allah, his Messenger (s), Salih Momineen, Jibrael (as) and other angels be our Helpers (Qur'an, Surah Tahreem, Ayah 4). Amin.

Allahuma Sallay Allah Muhammad wa Aale Muhammad.

2. Innovation in Taqiyyah by Ibn Taymiyyah

There are 3 verses of the Qur'an, that are so clear on Taqiyyah that no one can deny it. These verses are:

2.1 First Verse:

[Yusufali 3:28] Let not the believers Take for friends or helpers Unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allah: except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them. But Allah cautions you (To remember) Himself; for the final goal is to Allah.

2.2 2nd Verse:

[Yusufali 16:106] Any one who, after accepting faith in Allah, utters Unbelief,- except under compulsion, his heart remaining firm in Faith - but such as open their breast to Unbelief, on them is Wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty.

2.3 3rd Verse:

[Yusufali 40:28] A believer, a man from among the people of Pharaoh, who had concealed his faith, said: "Will ye slay a man because he says, 'My Lord is Allah'?- when he has indeed come to you with Clear (Signs) from your Lord? and if he be a liar, on him is (the sin of) his lie: but, if he is telling the Truth, then will fall on you something of the (calamity) of which he warns you: Truly Allah guides not one who transgresses and lies!

In presence of all these verses, no one can deny that Taqiyyah is not allowed in Islam. But Ibn Taymiyyah tried his best to change the meaning of Quran, by interpreting it according to his own "Agenda".

Let's see what he writes in commentary of verse [3:28]

2.4 Ibn Taymiyyah's commentary on verse [3:28]

Let's see the verse once again:

الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِنْ دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ لَا يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ
فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلَّا أَنْ يَمُنَ بِفِعْلِهِ ذَلِكَ
وَيَحْذَرِكُمْ اللَّهُ نَفْسَهُ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تَقَاهُ
الْمَصِيرَ

[Yusufali 3:28] Let not the believers Take for friends or helpers Unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allah: except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them. But Allah cautions you (To remember) Himself; for the final goal is to Allah.

Here is the commentary by Ibn Taymiyyah:

The verse (3:28) is not only an exception but also a restricted exception. Not only is it forbidden to be used against Muslims but it also does not give permission to lie to others. What it means is that if you oppose certain behaviours and you are in a situation where condemnation would endanger Islam or Muslim community you can keep silent but you must avoid lying.

1. *Ibn Taymiyyah, Minhaj, Vol. 1 p. 213*

2. *Ibn Kathir, Tafseer of verse 3:28*

2.5 Conclusion of Ibn Taymiyyah's Fatwa / (Innovations)

In the above Fatwa, Ibn Taymiyyah introduced 2 conditions/ (innovations) at his own in the Islamic Sharia. They are:

1. Taqiyyah can only be done in the presence of Kafirs, it cannot be practised before a cruel Muslim king.
2. One cannot lie (while one is practising Taqiyyah) i.e. one can maintain silence, but should not lie.

2.6 Our Response

It is pure conjecture on the part of Ibn Taymiyyah to suggest that lying is prohibited under Taqiyyah or that it can only be practised against the Kuffar. There is not even a single proof for these innovations from the sources of Shari'ah:

1. There is not a single verse of the Qur'an that prescribes these conditions.
2. There is not even a single saying or practice of Rasul (s), that stipulates these conditions.
3. Not even a single Sahabi understood Taqiyyah along with these conditions (they practised contrary to these conditions, as we will show shortly later on. Insha-Allah).
4. No Ahle-Sunnah Alim from the early centuries added these conditions in Taqiyyah.

We invite the Nasabis to prove the innovations of Ibn Taymiyyah from the above 4 sources.

Contrary to Ibn Taymiyyah's claim, all of these sources are refuting his assertion.

2.7 The Qur'an refutes Ibn Taymiyyah

[Yusufali 16:106] Any one who, after accepting faith in Allah, utters Unbelief, - except under compulsion, his heart remaining firm in Faith - but such as open their breast to Unbelief, on them is Wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty.

As you see, the Qur'an states "uttering unbelief". This does not mean keeping silent. Uttering means either saying or acting something in contrary to belief. What lie is bigger than uttering unbelief?

The onus is on the Nasibis to show us these 2 conditions/(innovations) of Ibn Taymiyyah from the Quran.

2.8 The Sunnah of Rasul Allah (s) refuting Ibn Taymiyyah

To understand the Sunnah of Rasul Allah (s), let us cite his words. We read in Sahih al Bukhari, v4, p45 publishers Uthmania, Egypt that Abu al-Darda' said he heard the Prophet (s) state:

"(Verily) we smile for some people, while our hearts curse (those same people)."

Narrated in Sahih al Bukhari, v4, p44, publishers Uthmania, Egypt that the Prophet (s) said:

"O `Ayesha, the worst of people in the sight of Allah (SWT) are those that are avoided by others due to their extreme impudence".

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

So, here Rasul Allah (s) himself practised Taqiyyah in front of the so called Sahaba (i.e. Muslims). Moreover, he also "Ordeed" Aisha (and others) to practice Taqiyyah (i.e. Diplomacy) in such situations.

Again the onus is on the Nasabis to provide evidence from the Sunnah of Rasul Allah (s) for the conditions / innovations of Ibn Taymiyyah.

On our part we shall highlight the actions of some Sahaba, and prove how they practised Taqiyyah, by lying in front of Muslims.

2.9 Talha and Zubair Vs. Ibne Taymiyyah

Both Talha and Zubair took oath of alligence (Bayya) at the hand of Maula Ali[as].

But afterwards they broke the Bayya and ran away to Makka and joined Aisha where they instigated a movement against Maula 'Ali(as).

Now when Shi'as object to breaking of their Bayya, and label them Baghi, then do you know how Nasabis (especially Sipaa Sahaba Nasabis) defend Talha and Zubair?

These Nasabis claim that both Talha and Zubair were compelled to make bayya, but they did not do it with their hears, so they cannot be labelled as Baghis.

Just look at the book "Barat-e-Uthman", which has been published on web by Sipaa Sahab site.
 <http://www.kr-hcy.com>

The Nasibi Sipaa Sahaba author writes:

Sipaa e Sahaba assert

The first ones, who gave the oath of allegiance at the hands of Ali (after the murder of Uthman),

were the killers of Uthman. Then some of Ahle-Madina (natives of city Madina) gave oath of allegiance at their own will, and some of them gave it under the pressure of Uthman's killers.

So, when Hadhrat Talha and Zubair came to Makka after escaping from Madina and started collecting army against Ali, then someone asked them:

"Both of you have already given oath of allegiance at the hands of Ali".

Upon this, they replied: "We gave oath of allegiance in a state that swords were hanging over our necks".

 [Baraath Uthman, Page 50, by Zafar Ahmad Uthmani](#)

[Note: It is incorrect. According to authentic traditions, Talha and Zubair were the first who gave Bayya upon the hands of Maula Ali (as) willingly, while hoping that they also get some share in power. But when they saw no favour by Maula Ali (as), then they turned against him and ran away to Makka.

And when in Makka people asked them about their oaths, it was then that they fabricated this excuse in order to defend themselves]

Need we to comment any more?

Why don't Nasabis pass the fatwa of Ibn Taymiyyah on Talha and Zubair (all those Ahle-Madina, who gave Bayya to Ali under the pressure of Uthman's killers)?

And if Nasabis still claim that Taqiyyah of Talha and Zubair was justified, then they have to tell us:

1. Do the Nasabis think that Maula Ali (as) was (naudobillah) a Kaffir?
2. One is simply lying. But one is lying after swearing i.e. (swearing for being faithful while taking the Bayya)

Why didn't Ibne Taymiyyah pass his Fatwa on Talha and Zubair and deem them Munafiqeen before declaring Shi'as, Munafiq for doing Taqiyyah before Cruel Muslim Kings?

Or is it that Ibne Taymiyyah thought that (nauda'billah), Imam Ali (as) was a kaffir Ruler?

Ibn Taymiyyah had attested that in Taqiyyah, one can maintain silence but cannot lie, whilst his beloved Talha and Zubair lied before Maula Ali (as) having giving their pledge of loyalty to him.

2.10 Why did Umar practice taqiyya before his subjects - were they kaafirs?

Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English version, vol 9, p212: {Between Traditions 9.281 and 9.282}:

(21) CHAPTER. If a judge has to witness in favor of a litigant when he is a judge or he had it before he became a judge (can he pass a judgment in his favor accordingly

or should he refer the case to another judge before whom he would bear witness?). And the judge Shuraih said to a person who sought his witness, "Go to the ruler so that I may bear witness (before him) for you." And 'Ikrima said, "Umar said to 'Abdur-Rahman bin 'Auf, 'If I saw a man committing illegal sexual intercourse or theft, and you were the ruler (what would you do)?'. 'Abdur-Rahman said, 'I would regard your witness as equal to the witness of any other man among the Muslims. 'Umar said, 'You have said the truth.' 'Umar added: If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Quran extra (verses), I would have written the Verse al-Rajm (stoning to death of married adulterers) with my own hands.

These Nasibi attack the Shi'a for their practising in the presence of Muslims which is hypocrisy. We say that this is permissible if it means protecting oneself from hardship. The Nasibi shall no doubt reject such a notion, so we present this reference before them. Why was Umar the brave Khalifa practising taqiyya? Not only does this reference demonstrate that Umar ascribed to tahreef of the Qur'an, he also practised taqiyya, by not putting things right stating *'If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Quran extra (verses)'*.

This reference points to the fact that Umar had a kufr belief and was seeking to hide this from the people by practising taqiyya. In Minhajj al Nasibi claim that the Shi'a practise taqiyya as and when they feel like, it has nothing to do with fear, then could they kindly explain why their khalifa was practising taqiyya from the people? What fear would the powerful khalifa have, that would force him to practise taqiyya, or as Minhajj al Nasibi would deem it calculated deception?

2.11 Was Muawiyyah a Kaffir Ruler? [Ibn Taymiyyah vs. Muawiyyah]

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

Ibn 'Umar said, "I went to Hafsa while water was dribbling from her twined braids. I said, 'The condition of the people is as you see, and no authority has been given to me.

'Hafsa said, (to me), 'Go to them, and as they (i.e. the people) are waiting for you, and I am afraid your absence from them will produce division amongst them.' " So Hafsa did not leave Ibn 'Umar till we went to them. When the people differed, Muawiya addressed the people saying, "If anybody wants to say anything in this matter of the Caliphate, he should show up and not conceal himself, for we are more rightful to be a Caliph than he and his father." On that, Habib bin Masalama said (to Ibn 'Umar), "Why don't you reply to him (i.e. Muawiya)?" 'Abdullah bin 'Umar said, "I untied my garment that was going round my back and legs while I was sitting and was about to say, 'He who fought against you and against your father for the sake of Islam, is more rightful to be a Caliph,' but I was afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed, and my statement might be interpreted not as I intended. (So I kept quiet) remembering what Allah has prepared in the Gardens of Paradise (for those who are patient and prefer the Hereafter to this worldly life)." Habib said, "You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."

So we see here:

Mu'awiya proclaimed his superiority to the Khilafath.

Ibn Umar disagreed and wished to highlight the truth openly before the people.

Ibn Umar chose not to challenge the claim as he was "afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed

Habib commented to Ibn Umar "You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."

Ibn Umar's silence to prevent bloodshed and Habib's confirmation that he had adopted this stance to protect himself is clear proof that Ibn Umar was practising taqiyya. Would Sipaa-e-Sahaba now declare Muawiyyah a Kaffir Ruler?

2.12 Ulama of Ahle-Sunnah vs. Ibn Taymiyyah (Fatwa of Imam Nawawi)

Now let us quote just one fatwa of Imam Nawawi, which again exposes the innovation of Ibn Taymiyyah in Taqiyyah (although there are a lot more):

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

Sharh Muslim Nawawi, Volume 2, Page 106-266, Published Luknow

Need we to comment any more?

2.13 Ibn Tamiyya vs. Imam Zuhri

Modern day Sunni scholar Professor Tahir ul Qadri in his book the Ghadir Declaration p 78 records this tradition Ibne Athir in Asadul Ghabah fi Marifat as-Sahaba, (1:572, 573):

It is narrated by the Zuhri that Ibn junayd ibn amr bin mozir said "I heard the prophet said whoso delibreatly lied about me will go to hell straightaway. i have heard myself or may i grow deaf in both ears. the prophet returned from hajatal widah and addresses the people,. He said while holding Ali's hand; one who has me as his guardian has Him (Ali) as his guardian. O'Allah befriend him who befriends him (Ali) and be his enemy who is his (Ali's) enemy.

Ubaidullah said: I said to Zuhri; dont say these things in Syria, otherwise you will hear so much against Ali that your ears will get soar. (in reply) Zuhri said; By God! there are so many qualities of Ali that are save with me that if i wrote them, i may be murdered

Comment

Zuhri was practising taqiyya from whom? Christians / jews? Clearly not, why would they kill him if he narrated the virtues of Ali? Clearly Zuhri's silence was because he feared the Nasibis of Syria, here is a major Sunni scholar practising taqiyya before muslims. So was Zuhri a kaafir?

2.14 Shah Waliyullah vs Ibn Taymiyya

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Shaykh Muhammad Kareem in famous book "Mawaaj Kauthar" page 63

notes:

"On one occasion a scholar called Muhammad Fakhir Abadi Deh;avi came and parayed at Jamia Masjid, wherein he recited the words 'Ameen' loudly The was the first time that had happened in Dehli, the people could not stand this and they surrounded him. He said 'This is pointless, go and summon the biggest scholar in this city. The people summoned Hujjuthul Shah Waliyullah, he said that hadith have proven that you can recite Ameen loudly, the people that gathered then became silent. When the only remaining person were Muhammad Fakhir and Shah Waliyullah, Muahammad Fakhir stressed 'When will you open up?' He said 'Had I opened uo who would have saved you today?'"

Comment

One can see that the Shah wouldn't read Namaz openly before the people through taqiyya.

2.15 Maulana Sayyid Nazeer Husayn vs Ibn Taymiyya

Shaykh Muhammad Kareem in 'Mawaaj al Kauthar' page 29 referred to Sayyid Nazeer Husayn as the Crown of the Wahaby Ulema, he then records a letter of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, wherein he referred to Sayyid Nazeer Husayn:

"He would not perform Rafa Yadaan in Salat, despite him knowing that it was Sunnah. I said 'It id unfortunate that an act that you know to be good , according to people's views you don't practice.. He (Maulan Nazeer Husayn) visited me when I said this, he got up and went to the Jamia Masid for Asr prayers, he began to read Rafa Yadaan from that time, people opposed him but the truth shall always remain the truth".

Comment

This is clear evidence that this Wahaby was also practising taqiyya.

Sunni scholar Shaykh Muhammad Salaudeen in Islamee Tareekai Qur'an aur Sunnath mai page 72 referred to such scholars as following:

"What is interesting is that some religious schools are opposed to the practise of taqiyya but on a practical basis they happily embraced taqiyya."

3. Innovations in Taqiyyah by Mufti of Sipaa Sahaba

In the first chapter of our present article, we already introduced the recently published book by Sipaa Sahaba Website kr-hcy.com.

This is an alleged "Manazara" between Shi'a Alim "Hussaini Sahib" with "Mufti Khalid Mehmood" of Sipaa Sahaba in Cape Town, South Africa. We don't have resources of confirming if this alleged "Manazara" took place or not.

But we very much doubt the occurrence of such debate. Sipaa Sahaba site has claimed that the Shi'a Manazir "Hussaini Sahib", is an Ayatullah. While during the debate we see that "Hussaini Sahib" even don't know that "Tehdib-ul-Ahkam" is among "Kutb-e-Arba'a" or not (i.e. The 4 books of Ahadith, which are most famous among Shi'as).

But it's very interesting to see the innovations and "Historical Facts", that Mufti Sahib claimed during this debate. [Actually Mufti Khalid collected almost all the different innovations, which were introduced by Nasabis during the past centuries]

So, let's begin with Allah's help.

3.1 What is actual Shi'a doctrine of Taqiyyah?

During the debate, Mufti Khalid made a lot of false accusations about the Shi'a Taqiyyah. He didn't even know what's actual Shi'a doctrine of Taqiyyah is. In fact, for centuries, Nasabis have made it their mission to propagate false propaganda against the Shi'a of Maula 'Ali (as), namely they deem taqiyya deception and lying before others.

So, it is necessary at this point that we offer our actual point of view about Taqiyyah (which is in line with all the Ahadith). People can only criticise our position when they know what our position is, not the position as presented by the followers of Mu'awiya.

For us, Taqiyyah means "Diplomacy" i.e. taking different steps according to the different situations, and we must be sure that these steps are the best in order to save the interest of community and Islam.

Shaykh Muhammad Ridha al-Mudhaffar in his book, "Aqa'id al-Imamiyah," wrote that:

Rules of Taqiyyah

Taqiyya should conform to specific rules vis-a-vis the situation wherein eminent danger is present; these rules, listed in many books of Fiqh (Jurisprudence), along with the severity of the danger determine the validity, or lack of, al-Taqiyya itself.

Taqiyyah should be abandoned in certain Conditions

It is not mandatory to practice it (al-Taqiyya) at all times; on the contrary, it is permissible, and sometimes necessary, to abandon it (al-Taqiyya) altogether; as in the case where revealing the truth will further the cause of the religion, and provide a direct service to Islam; and (when the revealing of the truth is such that it constitutes) a jihad (striving) for (Islam's) sake; (verily,) in such a situation, wealth and life should be forsaken.

Abandoning Taqiyyah becomes obligatory, when innocent people are killed

Furthermore, Taqiyya is prohibited in instances wherein the killing of innocent people and the spread of corruption will result; and in cases wherein the marring of the religion will result, and/or a significant harm will befall the Muslims, either by leading them astray or corrupting and oppressing them.

Abandoning Taqiyyah becomes obligatory when one can spread the message of Islam

Either way, al-Taqiyya, as the Shi'a uphold it, does not make of the Shi'a a secret cooperative that seeks to destroy and corrupt, as the enemies (of the Shi'a) wish to present them; (these critics launch their verbal attacks) without really heeding the subject (of Taqiyya); and (without even) laboring to understand our own opinion on the matter (of al-Taqiyya). Nor does it (al-Taqiyya) mandate that the religion and its injunctions become a secret of secrets that cannot be disclosed to those who do not subscribe to its teachings.

How so, when the books of the Imamiyah (the Shi'a) that deal with the (subjects of) Fiqh, Kalam, and beliefs are in abundant supply, and have exceeded the limits (of publications) expected from any nation professing its beliefs."

Now, if the Shi'a Aqida of Taqiyyah is clear, we can move to Mufti Sahib's innovations.

3.2 Mufti Khalid's claim that Taqiyyah is Haram for God Appointed People like Prophets and Imams

Mufti Khalid's states that there are 2 type of people:

1. "Steadfast People", which are directly appointed by Allah like prophets. And Allah has made it "Haram" upon them to practice Taqiyyah.
2. "Permitted People", which are ordinary people, and Allah gave permission to these people to practice Taqiyyah in need.

For the above division, Mufti Khalid presented the following verse of Quran as proof:

اللَّهُ وَيَخْشَوْنَهُ وَلَا يَخْشَوْنَ الَّذِينَ يُبَلِّغُونَ رِسَالَاتِ
حَسِبًا أَحَدًا إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَكَفَىٰ بِاللَّهِ

[Yusufali 33:39] (It is the practice of those) who preach the Messages of Allah, and fear Him, and fear none but Allah.

He claimed that since Prophets and Imams have no fear that's why they don't practice Taqiyyah. Please see the following image from his book "Taqiyyah Na Kijiyeh" (Never practice Taqiyyah).

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 23](#)

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 24](#)

[Note: From the above division of people into 2 groups, Mufti Khalid wants to criticize Maula Ali (as) and our other Aima (as) querying how they practised taqiyyah if they were really appointed by Allah (swt)]

But there are so many flaws in Mufti Khalid's claim. Let's examine them one by one.

3.3 Maula Ali (as) vs. "Fear of Life"

The literal minds of Nasabis never understood the Islmaic concept of Taqiyyah. They

understand only one thing that Shi'a practice Taqiyyah on account of fear of their lives. But there is a whole philosophy behind this, which Nasabis can never discover, due to their disease of literalism.

There is a huge difference between the following 2 cases of "**Fear Of Life**":

1. Fear of life, while one loves this world. Such kind of person literally fears every tyrant, who can take away his life.
2. Fear of life, for the sake of Allah. That means to save the life, when giving it away like "Fools" is not bringing any benefit to Islam. Such a person only fears Allah in real sense and not afraid of tyrant King/Ruler.

We believe that Maula Ali (as) never practiced Taqiyyah while he was afraid of Umar Ibn Khattab or all those who were in habit of running away from battlefields. No, certainly not. But he practiced Taqiyyah, while it was not in the interest of Islam to start fighting, in order to get his "Right" back. (We will discuss upon it in detail in next chapter. Insha-Allah).

3.4 Not a single "Momin" is allowed to have "Fear of Life" in literal Sense

Similarly, our Aqeeda is this that not even a single "Momin" is allowed to do Taqiyyah due to fear of his life in literal sense. It is Haram.

i.e. we practice Taqiyyah, when our lives are in danger, while we believe that our lives are "Ammanah" of Allah (swt), who doesn't want us to give away our lives like FOOLS. It is like "SUICIDE", which is Haram.

But Allah (swt) orders us that in situations, where giving away one's life is bringing no benefit to Islam and becoming a cause of danger of Muslim's life and property, then it's obligatory to hide the truth or to tell a lie.

And this was the practice and order of Rasul Allah (s) and as well as of other Prophets.

3.5 Musa (as) also feared for his life for the sake of Allah's Religion

If Nasabis still deny it and abuse us for fearing of our lives, then we show them the example of Hadhrat Musa (as) in Quran.

It's the same type of fear of life that Hadhrat Musa (as) felt against the Magicians of Firoon. Quran says:

حِبَالُهُمْ وَعَصِيهِمْ يَخِيلُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ قَالِ بَلْ أَلْقُوا فَإِذَا
تَسْعَى سِحْرَهُمْ أَنَهَا

فَأَوْجَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةً مُوسَى

إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْأَعْلَى قُلْنَا لَا تَخَفْ

.[Yusufali 20:66-68] He said, "Nay, throw ye first!" Then behold their ropes and their rods-so it seemed to him on account of their magic - began to be in lively motion! So Moses conceived in his mind a (sort of) fear. We said: "Fear not! for thou hast indeed the upper hand.

Now Hadhrat Musa (as) was not afraid from their magic due to a fear of losing his beloved life, but it was because he feared that his death would bring a great loss to the interests of Allah's religion. Unfortunately, the literal minds of Nasabis are unable to understand these differences of literal and figurative expressions.

We will make this point more clear later on. But at this moment, we want to ask Mufti Sahib the following questions:

- 1) If you really want to take above statement in 'Literal Sense' that Musa (as) really stepped back for the fear of his beloved Life?

If you answer is "Yes", then how can you defend your claim that no Prophet of Allah has ever feared anything else than Allah and that's why Taqiyyah was Haram upon them?

- 2) And if you say that Musa (as) stepped back only in order to save the interest of Islam, then how can you still criticize Shi'as who also do the same for the sake of religion's interests?

Mufti Sahib cannot play Double Standards i.e. to make something Halal in Sharia for Prophets, but Haram for Shi'as when they practice the same thing.

Now let's turn towards some critique of Mufti Khalid's claim.

3.6 1st Critique:

The above interpretation of Mufti Khalid is a pure conjecture (i.e. there are any 2 groups of Momineen).

Rasul Allah (s) never understood the above verse in this way and never divided the people into any such 2 groups. If Mufti Khalid is true in his claim, then he must show us any such tradition from Rasul Allah (s).

[In fact, the Shi'a Alim during whole debate demanded for any such tradition, but Mufti Khalid was unable to present it].

3.7 2nd Critique:

We would like to ask Sipah-e-Sahaba

Why Mufti Khalid takes only one part of Quran (which suits to his ideas), while neglecting/concealing other part of Quran which goes against his conjecture?

Let us present the other verses of the Quran, that Mufti Khalid has tactically neglected. Allah (swt) says in the Quran that not only prophets, but also the "Awliya Allah" have no fear.

خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ إِلَّا إِنَّ أَوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهِ لَا

[Pickthal 10:62] Lo! verily the friends of Allah are (those) on whom fear (cometh) not, nor do they grieve?

Can Mufti Khalid tell us why he neglected this verse of Quran and failed to include the Awliya Allah among the "Steadfast People"?

[Note: Mufti Khalid later claims that Ammar Yasir (r) practised Taqiyyah, because he was an ordinary person and did not come within the remit of "Steadfast People". But verse of the Quran is clear that Awliya Allah also have no fear]

3.8 The motive behind the Nasibi's selective verse application

It is due to the reason that one such alleged Wali Allah of Nasabis was weeping for the fear of his life in the cave of "Thawr".

Need we to tell you more about this alleged Wali Allah? It's the same alleged Wali Allah who fled from the battle field of Uhad (along with many more such alleged Awliya Allah), and Allah revealed the following verse:

عَلَىٰ أَحَدٍ وَالرَّسُولُ يَدْعُوكُمْ إِذْ تُصْعِدُونَ وَلَا تَلْوُونَ
يَغْمٌ لِّكَيْلًا تَحْزَنُوا عَلَىٰ مَا فِي أَخْرَاكُمْ فَأَتَابَكُمْ غَمًّا
وَاللَّهُ خَيْرٌ يِمَّا تَعْمَلُونَ فَاتَّكُمُ وَلَا مَا أَصَابَكُمْ

[Yusufali 3:153] Behold! ye were climbing up the high ground, without even casting a side glance at any one, and the Messenger in your rear was calling you back.

The texts of history testify that in Uhad the vast bulk of the Sahaba fled the battlefield leaving Rasul (s) wounded. Umar was of those that abandoned Rasul (s) and sat dejected declaring that there was no need to fight as Rasul (s) was dead. See:

1. *Siratun Nabi*, by Allamah Shibli Numani, English translation by M. Tayyib Bakhsh Budayuni, Volume 2 page 66-67 (Kazi Publications, Lahore - First edition)

2. *The History of al Tabari*, Volume 6 page 122 - English translation by M.V. MacDonald (State University of New York Press)

Similarly 'Uthman fled so far that Rasul (s) mocked him stating 'the distance you fled was far'. He returned to Rasul (s) after three days (The History of al Tabari, Volume 6 page 127).

Although Allah forgave the people for fleeing from Uhad, nevertheless He took a promise from people that they will never flee again from battlefield and never let Rasul (s) alone there.

إِذَا لَقِيتُمُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا زَحَفًا فَلَا يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا
الْأَدْبَارَ تَوَلَّوْهُمْ

لَقَاتِلْ أَوْ مُتَحِيزًا وَمَنْ يُوَلِّهِمْ يَوْمَئِذٍ دُبْرَهُ إِلَّا مُتَحَرِّفًا
وَمَا وَاهُ جَهَنَّمَ وَيُسُّ إِلَى فِتْنَةٍ فَقَدْ بَاءَ بِغَضَبٍ مِنَ اللَّهِ
الْمَصِيرِ

[Yusufali 8:15-16] O ye who believe! when ye meet the Unbelievers in hostile array, never turn your backs to them. If any do turn his back to them on such a day - unless it be in a stratagem of war, or to retreat to a troop (of his own)- he draws on himself the wrath of Allah, and his abode is Hell,- an evil refuge (indeed)!

But what happened? Did these alleged Awliya Allah keep their promise?

No, they again fled away for the fear of their lives at Hunain (in 9th Hijri), leaving Rasul (s) again alone.

مَوَاطِنَ كَثِيرَةٍ وَيَوْمَ حُنَيْنٍ إِذْ لَقَدَ نَصَرَكُمُ اللَّهُ فِي
تُغْنِي عَنْكُمْ شَيْئًا وَضَاقَتْ أَعْيُنُكُمْ كَثْرَتِكُمْ فَلَمْ
وَلَيْتُمْ مَدِيرِينَ عَلَيْكُمْ الْأَرْضُ يَمَا رَحِبَتْ ثُمَّ

[Yusufali 9:25] Assuredly Allah did help you in many battle-fields and on the day of Hunain: Behold! your great numbers elated you, but they availed you naught: the land, for all that it is wide, did constrain you, and ye turned back in retreat].

The books of Ahl'ul Sunnah clearly state that in the battle of Hunayn, in which ten thousand companions (including all those who had done bay'ah under the tree) had participated, all of them fled away except four who remained steadfast, three of them were from the Prophet's clan, Banu Hashim ('Ali ibn Abi Talib, 'Abbas ibn 'Abdul Muttalib and Abu Sufyan ibn al Harith ibn 'Abdul Muttalib) and one from another clan ('Abdullah ibn Mas'ud)."

Tarikh al Khamis, vol 2. p. 113 As Sirah al Halabiyah. vol. 3. p 255

Let's also see the testimony of Abu Qatada about Hunain, which is noted by Imam Bukhari in his Sahih. Abu Qatada says:

"The Muslims took to flight. I was also among them. Suddenly I saw Umar ibn Khattab among those who were running away. I asked him: 'What has happened?' He said: 'It is the order of Allah.'"

Sahih Bukhari Vol. 3, p. 45.

For the centuries we are asking Nasabis to tell us if their Hero Umar Ibn Khattab received a revelation from Allah (swt) for his statement [i.e. **It is the order of Allah.**']. And up till now Nasabis haven't replied us that from where Umar came to know the order of Allah for fleeing.

Indeed, such fear of your lives and saving them by running from battlefields, never came under the definition of Taqiyyah by Maula Ali (as).

By Allah, the Taqiyyah of Maula Ali (as) never included this fleeing from battlefields, on account of fear of his life. But our Maula was one, who claimed that he didn't fear if "Death" attacks him, or he attacks the "Death".

3.9 Third Critique:

Can Mufti Khalid tell us why he neglected the following verse and excluded the Momineen from group of "Steadfast People"?

الْهُدَىٰ آمَنَّا بِهِ فَمَنْ يُؤْمِنُ بِرَبِّهِ فَلَا وَآنَا لَمَّا سَمِعْنَا
رَهَقًا يَخَافُ بَخْسًا وَلَا

[Yusufali 72:13] 'And as for us, since we have listened to the Guidance, we have accepted it: and any who believes in his Lord has no fear, either of a short (account) or of any injustice.

In fact, the hero personalities of Nasabis ran so many times from battlefields that they had to deny the above clear verse of Quran and to say that one can still be a Momin if one is coward and fears for his life.

Need we to comment any more?

3.10 Did any Prophet ever practice Taqiyyah?

On page 49 of this book, Mufti Khalid Mehmood challenges Shi'a to show him if any other Prophet ever practiced Taqiyyah.

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 49](#)

It's very strange that the Nasibi is rejecting the notion that Rasul Allah (s) or other prophets practised Taqiyyah, while it is reported in Bukhari, Muslim and each and every Sunni book on the life of Prophet Muhammad (s), that Rasul Allah (s) practised Taqiyyah. In fact, Islam started via the practice of Taqiyyah.

So, on the request of Mufti Khalid, we are notifying him and all other Nasabis when our Rasul (s) and other prophets practised Taqiyyah.

3.11 Reply One - Prophet Muhammad (s) practised Taqiyyah during the first 3 years of his mission and he preached secretly

This is a fact that can be found in all and all the classical works of Ahl'ul Sunnah/Shi'a or non Muslim Scholars.

At this point, let us analyse the verse of the Qur'an that the Mufti Sahib, advanced against us.

أَنْزَلْنَا مِنَ الْبَيِّنَاتِ وَالْهُدَىٰ مِنْ إِنْ الَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ مَا
فِي الْكِتَابِ أُولَئِكَ يَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّهُ بَعْدَ مَا بَيَّنَّاهُ لِلنَّاسِ
اللَّاعِنُونَ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ

[Yusufali 2:159] Those who conceal the clear (Signs) We have sent down, and the Guidance, after We have made it clear for the people in the Book,-on them shall be Allah's curse, and the curse of those entitled to curse,

Mufti Sahib, if you have courage then try to paste this verse of Quran upon Rasul Allah (s) first.

3.12 Reply Two - Rasulallah (s) practised taqiyya before the newly converted Sahaba

We read in Sahih al Bukhari, Book of Knowledge Volume 1, Book 3, Number 128:
Narrated Aswad:

Ibn Az-Zubair said to me, "Aisha used to tell you secretly a number of things. What did she tell you about the Ka'ba?" I replied, "She told me that once the Prophet said, 'O 'Aisha! Had not your people been still close to the pre-Islamic period of ignorance (infidelity)! I would have dismantled the Ka'ba and would have made two doors in it; one for entrance and the other for exit.'" Later on Ibn Az-Zubair did the same.

Comment

Was it incumbent on Rasulallah (s) to redesign the Ka'aba, yes or no? If it was not then why did Rasulallah (s) say **"Had not your people been still close to the pre-Islamic period of ignorance (infidelity)! I would have dismantled the Ka'ba and would have made two doors in it"**. If it was compulsory then why did Rasulallah(s) fail to carry out this religious duty on account of his fear of the reaction by the newly converted Sahaba? If this silence is not proof of taqiyya then what is?

In his commentary of the above hadith (destruction of the Ka'aba) Allamah Badr'adeen A'ini in his commentary of Sahih al Bukhari Umdah thul Qari Volume 1 page 615, Bab al Ilm makes an interesting comment:

"Ibn Bathil said the following principle is established from the above hadith, if a good act is carried out, but the fear of Fitnah and anger from the people shall lead to opposition, then the decision to order such a pious act should be abandoned."

In other words this Sunni scholar is saying that one can practise taqiyya / remain silent on an order, if such an order incites Fitnah. The tradition in al Bukhari clearly demonstrates that Rasulallah (s) preferred practising taqiyya to implemeting an act that would cause opposition from the Sahaba.

3.13 Reply Three - Nasibi themselves claim that Ibrahim (as) practised Taqiyyah and told a lie

It is interesting that Nasabis themselves have been claiming since centuries that Hadhrat Ibrahim (as) practised Taqiyyah and told a lie several times.

Let us quote from Nasibi beloved Tafsir of Ibn Kathir, which is present online here:

 [Tafseer of Ibn Kathir](#)

Tafseer of Ibn Kathir

How Ibrahim broke the Idols

Then Ibrahim swore an oath, which some of his people heard, to plot against their idols, i.e., to break them and destroy them after they had gone away and turned their backs, when they went out to their festival. They had a festival which they would go out to celebrate. Abu Ishaq reported from Abu Al-Ahwas from `Abdullah [Ibn Mas`ud], "When the people of Ibrahim went out to celebrate their festival, they passed by him and said, `O Ibrahim, are you not coming out with us' **He said, `I am sick.' [While he was not actually sick]**' It was only the day before that he had said,

(And by Allah, I shall plot a plan for your idols after you have gone away and turned your backs.) and some of the people had heard him.

(So he broke them to pieces,) means, he smashed them all, except for the biggest idol. This is like the Ayah,

(Then he turned upon them, striking (them) with (his) right hand) [37:93].

(that they might turn to it.) It was said that he put a hammer in the hands of the biggest idol so that the people would think that it had become jealous on its own account and objected to these smaller idols being worshipped alongside it, so it had broken them.

(They said: "Who has done this to our gods He must indeed be one of the wrongdoers.") When they came back and saw what Ibrahim had done to their idols, humiliating them and lowering their status, proving that they were not divine and that those who worshipped them were fools,

(They said: "Who has done this to our gods He must indeed be one of the wrongdoers.") because of this action of his.

(They said: "We heard a young man talking against them, who is called Ibrahim.") Those who had heard him swearing to plot against them said, we heard a young man talking about them, and they said that he was called Ibrahim.

(They said: "Then bring him before the eyes of the people...") meaning, in front of a large audience so that all the people could be present. This was Ibrahim's ultimate purpose, so that he could tell this great gathering about the extent of their ignorance and how foolish they were to worship idols which could not defend themselves from harm or help themselves, so how could they ask them for help

(They said: "Are you the one who has done this to our gods, O Ibrahim" **He said: "Nay, this one, the biggest of them did it..."**) referring to the one he had left alone and had not broken.

We hope that Mufti Sahib is now able to see when Prophets practiced Taqiyyah. We invite him to exclude Ibrahim (as) also from the list of "Steadfast People" as he did in case of Ammar Yasir (ra.).

Let's see if Mufti Sahib takes this challenge or not.

[Moreover, let us remind our readers about the Fatwa/(Bida'a) of Ibn Taymiyyah, where he claimed that in Taqiyyah one can remain silent but cannot tell a lie.

It's a challenge to supporters of Ibn Taymiyyah to try to paste his Fatwa upon Hadhrat Ibrahim (as), if they are "Truthful"]

Nasabis deem it permissible to even send their wives to other tyrants, when they are in fear of their lives

On one hand, Mufti Sahib is claiming that Prophets (as) feared none except Allah (swt) and they never practiced Taqiyyah.

But on the other hand, the beloved hero of Mufti Sahib, whose name is Abu Huraira, is claiming that Prophets feared so much of their lives that they even used to declare their own "Wives" as "Sisters", in order to save their lives.

Even worse, bleoved narrator of Nasabis is claiming that Prophets of Allah even used to send their "Wives" to tyrant Kings, while they feared their lives. (Naudobillah).

Following Nasibi tradition is reported by Abu Huraira, and is authenticated by both Hadith Masters, Imam Bukhari and Imam Muslim.

Sahih Muslim, Book 030, Number 5848:

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying Prophet Ibrahim (peace be upon him) never told a lie but only thrice: two times for the sake of Allah (for example, his words):" I am sick," and his words:" But it was the big one amongst them which has done that" and because of Sara (his wife). He had come in a land inhabited by haughty and cruel men along with Sara. She was very good-looking amongst the people, so he said to her: If these were to know that you are my wife they would snatch you away from me, so if they ask you tell that you are my sister and in fact you are my sister in Islam, and I do not know of any other Muslim in this land besides I and you. And when they entered that land the tyrants came to see her and said to him (the king): 'there comes to your land a woman,

whom you alone deserve to possess, so he (the kings sent someone (towards her) and she was brought and Ibrahim (peace be upon him) stood in prayer, and when she visited him (the tyrant king came) he could help but stretch his hand towards her and his hand was tied up. He said: Supplicate Allah so that He may release my hand and I will do no harm to you. She did that and the man repeated (the same highhandedness) and his hand was again tied up more tightly than on the first occasion and he said to her like that and she again did that (supplicated), but he repeated (the same highhandedness and his hands were tied up more tightly than on the previous occasion). He then again said: Supplicate your Lord so that He may set my hand free; by. Allah I shall do no harm to you. She did and his hand was freed. Then he called the person who had brought her and said to him: You have brought to me the satan and you have not brought to me a human being, so turn them out from my land, and he gave Hajira as a gift to her. She returned (along with Hajira) and when Ibrahim (peace be upon him) saw her, he said: How have you returned? She said: With full safety (have I returned). Allah held the hand of that debauch and he gave me a maid-servant. Abu Hiaraira said: O sons of the rain of the sky, she is your mother.

Tehrif in Sahih Bukhari

Now let us see the English translation of same above Hadith from Sahih Bukhari, which is done by Saudi paid Alim "Mohsin Khan".

*Volume 7, Book 62, Number 21:
Narrated Abu Huraira:*

The Prophet said: Abraham did not tell lies except three. (One of them was) when Abraham passed by a tyrant and (his wife) Sara was accompanying him (Abu Huraira then mentioned the whole narration and said:) (The tyrant) gave her Hajar. Sara said, "Allah saved me from the hands of the Kafir (i.e. infidel) and gave me Hajar to serve me." (Abu Huraira added:) That (Hajar) is your mother, O Banu Ma'-As-Sama' (i.e., the Arabs).

Need we to comment any more on this Tehrif?

3.14 Reply Four - The Ahl'ul Sunnah Ulema have acknowledged that fear of tyranny entitles Prophets to indulge in Kufr (i.e. practise taqiyya)

We read in Sharh Aqaid Nafsi: page 98 wherein Allamah Sa'dadeen Taftazani wrote a commentary of the Aqaid of Najeemudeen Umar bin Muhammad Nafsi, in his discussion on the perfection of Prophet's he states:

"It's prohibited to to attribute minor and great sins to Prophets, it is permitted for Prophets to recite kufr in a state of taqiyya".

In his commentary of the comments of Nafsi, Page 43, Taftazani states:

"Some have disallowed [the notion] that Prophets can practise taqiyya, Faadhil Khyaal asked [rhetorically] how can such individuals practise taqiyya when they have to remove fear? In some circumstances this is the order of Allah (swt)".

We have cited the opinion of the Shamsadeen Ahmed bin Musa Khyaal that its permissible for Prophets to indulge in open kufr in a state of taqiyya.

3.15 Reply Five - According to Imam of Ahlul Sunnah Radhi, Prophet Ibrahim (as) recited Kufr in a state of Taqiyya

We read in Tafseer Kabeer volume 4 p77:

When at night Ibrahim saw the stars and said this is my lord. These words are Kufr and the question arises, how a Prophet would recite such Kufr... The order on Ibrahim was propagation (Dawah), this was an opportunity to do Dawah and the temporarily recited this Kufr. His words at that time were the word said in duress. This proves at a time of necessity it is permissible to recite kufr since the Quran confirmed when one's heart is firm he can openly recite kufr when danger is clear reciting kufr is permissible.

3.16 Reply Six - Allamah Suyuti also said a Prophet can commit kufr (in a state of taqiyya) by prostrating to other than Allah under duress

We read in Tafseer Durre Manthur Volume 5 p124:

When the Egyptians popularised that Musa killed a man, Musa (as) Pharoah issued an order to 'find Musa, and kill him as he has murdered one of our people'. As this decision was made, a man came and told Musa- "Its become famous amongst the want to kill you, you should leave I one giving you good advice" Musa prayed towards Allah (swt) seeking protection from the tyrants tyranny and then departed. On route he saw a King riding on a horse with a spear. When Musa saw him he came forward and prostrated before him through fear. The King said 'don not prostrate before me, I shall point you in direction of Midian and he did just that"

3.17 Why Ammar Yasir did "Taqiyyah" and why his parents didn't?

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 23](#)

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 24](#)

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 25](#)

In these pages, Nasibi Mufti claims that Ammar Yasir had a 2nd grade level of Iman as compared to his parents, while he practised Taqiyyah while his parents didn't and became the first Shaheed of Islam. During the debate, he has repeated this question, "If Taqiyyah becomes obligatory at times of need, then why didn't Ammar Yasir's parents practice it?"

3.18 Reply

What can we say to this Nasibi's level of intelligence. At that point of time the Quran was revealing and there was no explicit order present to what to do in such situation. Hence the people had no Divine Law to know what to do if one confronts such situation.

Ammar Yasir (ra) was the first who said bad words under this situation. Then he came to Rasul Allah (s) in order to ask the "Hukm" in such situations.

And Rasul (s) ordered him to do the same if he confronts the same situation again. Only after this revealed the verse of Quran, permitting the practice of Taqiyyah under such situation.

Mufti Sahib again used his conjecture at this point and claimed that action of Ammar's parents

was better and they were in "Steadfast People", while Ammar (ra) didn't fear Allah so much and had a second grade of Iman.

It is indeed unfortunate that these Nasabis are prepared to insult a prominent Sahaba of Rasulullah (s), to attain the objective of defaming the Shi'a. One can only imagine the number of fatwas that would have rebounded against us if we were to deem their Imams such as Mu'awiya as having a lower level of Eman. Worthy of note is the complete lack of Qur'anic / Hadith evidence to back his attack on Ammar's faith. The simplest means to attack this Batil Qiyas is to cite the words of Rasulullah (s) on the Eman of Ammar.

We read this hadith in Sunan ibn Majah Volume 1 page 82, Chapter on the Excellences of Ammar ibn Yasir as narrated by Ibn Hani:

Ammar has been brimmed with Eman (faith) up to the uppermost of bones (i.e. elbows, shoulders and ankles).

Rasulullah (s) has graded the Eman of Ammar to be of such a high level it covers every part of his anatomy i.e. it is complete, and yet this Nasabi Mullah has sought to grade Ammar's Eman as being of a low level. Whose words should we give greater credence to Rasulullah (s) or to this Nasabi Mullah?

3.19 Did Rasul Allah (s) discouraged Taqiyyah [Permission vs. Order]?

Nasabis are always on introducing new things in Islamic Sharia, in order to make false claims against Shi'as.

On such example is Mufti Sahib's claim that although Rasul Allah (s) "Permitted" Taqiyyah, but he never "Ordered" it and always discouraged it.

Secondly, he claims that even in cases, where "Taqiyyah" is permitted and someone abstain from doing it, then he becomes among "Steadfast" people and have more rewards. As an example he says that Parents of Ammar Yasir had more "Rewards" than him, while Ammar practised Taqiyyah and they didn't.

3.20 Our Reply:

Surely, this is a Bida'a, which is introduced by Mufti Sahib, at his own, and there is no such saying of Prophet Muhammad (s), in which he discouraged people for doing Taqiyyah in times of need.

In Madhab of Ahle-Bayya, there can be different situations of Taqiyyah:

1. A situation, in which it becomes "Obligatory" to do Taqiyyah.
2. A situation, in which it becomes "Obligatory" to abandon Taqiyyah

An example of first type of situation is as under:

It is narrated by al-Ghazzali in his book, "Ihya `Uloom al-Din," that:

Safeguarding of a Muslim's life is a mandatory obligation that should be observed; and that LYING is permissible when the shedding of a Muslim's blood is at stake.

Similarly, Hadhrat Ammar Yasir came to Rasul Allah (s), in order to know the "Shari Hukum" in such situations. Upon his question, Rasul Allah (s) clearly "Ordered" him to do the same again (i.e. To do Taqiyyah and even use the abusive language for Rasul (s) and Allah, if he forced to do so).

If really abstaining from Taqiyyah in such a situation is more "Virtuous Act", then Rasul Allah (s) would have made it clear to Hadhrat Ammar and would have told him CLEARLY that what his parents did, was more virtuous than what he did.

But nay, instead of discouraging him to do Taqiyyah, he is encouraging and ordering him to do it again and again in same situations.

3.21 One more Incident of "Taqiyyah"

Similarly, a Sahabi Hajaj Ibn `Aalat wanted to take his wealth from Makka. And for this, he had to do use abusive language for Rasul Allah (s).

It is narrated in al-Sirah al-Halabiyah, v3, p61, that:

After the conquest of the city of Khaybar by the Muslims, the Prophet (s) was approached by Hajaj Ibn `Aalat and told: "O Prophet of Allah: I have in Makka some excess wealth and some relatives, and I would like to have them back; am I excused if I bad-mouth you (to escape persecution)?" The Prophet (s) excused him and said: "Say whatever you have to say."

Can Mufti Sahib tell us that why didn't Rasul Allah (s) discouraged him to do Taqiyyah in this case. Instead of discouraging him, Rasul Allah (s) is encouraging him by permitting to say whatever Kuffar wanted him to say.

In case of Hadhrat Ammar (ra), Mufti Sahib made a lame excuse that he was weeping and Rasul (s) wanted to keep his heart, that's why he didn't told him the whole truth. But we are interested to know what excuse does have Mufti Sahib in this case.

3.22 Making Halal of Islamic Sharia Haram

We have already mentioned above that Mufti Sahib declared that "Taqiyyah" is only permitted in highly extreme cases, when one fears his life.

Mufti Sahib must see that not only "Taqiyyah" is allowed in extreme cases of "Fear of Life", but also in the above mentioned case i.e. To take the wealth back from tyrant Kings. [Please see the traditon of Hajaj Ibn `Aalat above].

Also Imam Fakhrud Din Razi states in the Tafseer of verse Qur'an, 3;28-29.

"Fifth Rule: Taqiyyah is allowed for protection of life. The question is whether it is allowed for the protection of property; possibly that too may be allowed, because the Prophet (saw) has said: `The sanctity of a-Muslim's property is like the sanctity of his blood'; and also he (saw) has said: `Whoever is killed in defence of his property, is a martyr'; and also because man greatly needs his property; if water is sold at exorbitant price, wudhu' does not remain wajib and one may pray with tayammum to avoid that small loss of property; so why should not this principle be applied here? And Allah knows better.

Instead of following his own "Conjectures", Mufti Sahib must follow the "Complete Sunnah of Rasul Allah (s)".

When we look into history, we will find that Shi'a Ulama were always busy in defining the different conditions of "Taqiyah" according to Sharia, while Nasibi's Ulama were busy in making all types of innovations in Taqiyah, and making a lot of "Halal of Islamic Sharia" to be Haram, in order to criticise Shi'a Aima (as).

3.23 Uthman Ibn Affan vs. Mufti Sahib

Mufti Sahib is proving that he is true follower of Uthman Ibn Affan. He is using same style of Conjecture (Qiyas), which Uthman Ibn Affan used to do i.e. "Abandoning the permissions of Sharia in cases of hardships is a virtuous act."

If "Permissibility" theory of Mufti Sahib in Taqiyah is correct, then what Mufti Sahib would say in case of "Permissibility" of "Qasar Prayers" when one is in journey? Does he also deem it preferable to offer full Prayer during journey?

We don't know what Mufti Sahib answers, but let us look at the same style of Qiyas, which was done by Uthman Ibn Affan:

Narrated 'Abdur Rahman bin Yazid:

We offered a four Rakat prayer at Mina behind Ibn 'Affan . 'Abdullah bin Masud was informed about it. He said sadly, "Truly to Allah we belong and truly to Him we shall return." And added, "I prayed two Rakat with Allah's Apostle at Mina and similarly with Abu Bakr and with 'Umar (during their caliphates)." He further said, "May I be lucky enough to have two of the four Rakat accepted (by Allah)."

Sahih Bukhari, Volume 2, Book 20, Number 190

Mufti Sahib must know that conjectures in such cases don't work and are Haram. Does he know the status of Prophethood? This status demands to convey the message without any doubts while it's going to become guidance for millions.

3.24 "Permissibility Theory", when one is Dying out of Hunger

In Islam, it is allowed to eat the Haram things, if one is near to die due to starvation.

Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti in his book, "al-Ashbah Wa al-Naza'ir," affirms that:

"it is acceptable (for a Muslim) to eat the meat of a dead animal at a time of great hunger (starvation to the extent that the stomach is devoid of all food); and to loosen a bite of food (for fear of choking to death) by alcohol; and to utter words of unbelief; and if one is living in an environment where evil and corruption are the pervasive norm, and permissible things (Halal) are the exception and a rarity, then one can utilize whatever is available to fulfill his needs."

Our Question to Mufti Sahib:

Can Mufti Sahib tell us, the action of which person is virtuous one

1. A person takes advantage of this permission, and eats Haram things in order to save his life.
2. A person abandons this "Permission" and keep on starvation and dies out of hunger and thirst.

According to "Permissibility Theory" of Mufti Sahib, it is virtuous act to die in state of starvation instead of eating/drinking Haram things.

Need we to comment any more?

And Allah (swt) says in Quran:

(Quran 5:87) O' those who believe, do not make unlawful the good things which Allah has made lawful for you, and do not transgress. Allah does not like transgressors.

It is indeed amazing that these Nasibi who claim to love and protect the memory of the Sahaba have the audacity to degrade the Iman of Ammar Yasir (ra) to a 2nd level on the bases of their conjectures.

3.25 Migration Issue

On page 39 and 40, Mufti Sahib presented the following verse of Quran:

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 39](#)

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 40](#)

[Yusufali 4:97] When angels take the souls of those who die in sin against their souls, they say: "In what (plight) Were ye?" They reply: "Weak and oppressed Were we in the earth." They say: "Was not the earth of Allah spacious enough for you to move yourselves away (From evil)?" Such men will find their abode in Hell,- What an evil refuge!

From this verse, Mufti Sahib comes to this conclusion that if someone dies in state of "Taqiyyah", then his abode is Hell, while their excuse that they were weak and oppressed in the earth will not benefit them, while Allah (swt) already ordered to migrate in this case.

Then he pastes this verse upon Maula Ali (as) and other Masoomeen (as) and asks why Maula Ali (as) kept on doing Taqiyyah and didn't migrate from Madina during the Caliphate of first 3 Caliphs.

Similarly he asks why other Aima (as) didn't migrate during the times of bani Umiyyah and Bani Abbas.

3.26 Our Reply

The problem of Nasabis is the same that they took the above verse out of context in order to suit it to their ideas, while neglecting all other Verses of Quran and Ahadith, which gives more details about the situations of Taqiyyah.

The above verse was revealed for hypocrites (Munafiqeen) and their excuse for co-operating Kuffar during wars [i.e. They came with Kuffar during Battle of "Badr", in order to fight Muslims]. While before this, the order already came from Allah (swt) to migrate from Makka in order to strengthen the Power of Muslims in Madina.

In any case, the Nasabis have no idea what they are talking about on this verse. The ayat begins: **"Indeed, those whom the Angels take while they are oppressing their own souls."** This ayat, then, does not even refer to believers, since a believer is not oppressing himself by sin and corrupt behaviour. The point of the verse is that these are people who were

hypocrites that chose to live amongst the polytheists, and then when they died and were asked why they chose to live amongst polytheists instead of believers, they made up the lame excuse that they were oppressed *when they were not* oppressed*, but rather were only oppressing their own selves through disbelief and hypocrisy.

There are 2 points, which must not be ignored about the above verse if one wants to come to the correct conclusion.

1. This verse is not dealing with Muslims, who are living in an Islamic State. But it is dealing with "Munafiqeen", who are living among Polytheists.
2. And Secondly, this verse is not dealing with Taqiyyah. While according to Shi'a Fiqh, it is Haram to kill or cause any damage to any Muslim brother in the state of Taqiyyah.

According to Shi'a Fiqh, in such situations,

- Either one has to abandon Taqiyyah, and refuse to follow the commands of tyrant Kings (even he be killed for this).
- Or one has to migrate from such land.

Let's see what Ibn Kathir writes in "Tafseer" of above verse:

(Verily, as for those whom the angels take (in death) while they are wronging themselves)." Ad-Dahhak stated that this Ayah was revealed about some hypocrites who did not join the Messenger of Allah but remained in Makkah and went out with the idolators for the battle of Badr. They were killed among those who were killed. Thus, this honorable Ayah was revealed about those who resided among the idolators [and supported them in killing Muslims during wars, instead of migrating to Madinah].

 [Tafseer of Ibn Kathir](#)

If this fact has become clear for our readers that this verse refers to situation, in which one is forbidden to practice Taqiyyah, then we can move forward and see another verse of Quran, which tells about some believers, who didn't migrate and practiced Taqiyyah in Makka (but were not forced to kill other Muslims).

3.27 Verse of Quran about Momineen, who lived under Taqiyyah under Taqiyyah in Makka

During the treaty of Huddabiyyah, there were several Muslims who were living under Taqiyyah in Makka and were unknown to others. This was the time when Muslims got enough power in Madinah and Kuffar didn't dare to attack Muslims.

People wanted Rasul Allah (s) to attack Makka, but he refused to attack them.

Hadhrat Umar bin Khattab was so incensed that he protested to the Holy Prophet (saw), and in later days he used to say: **I did not entertain any doubt about the prophethood of the Holy Prophet-since I accepted Islam except on that day of Hudaibiyah.**
as-Suyuti, ad-Durru 'l-manthur, vol. 6, p. 77

Replying to that group, Allah explains one of the reasons of that treaty and one of the causes why war was not waged at that time:

[Pickthal 48:25] These it was who disbelieved and debarred you from the Inviolable Place of Worship, and debarred the offering from reaching its goal. And if it had not been for believing men and believing women, whom ye know not - lest ye should tread them under foot and thus incur guilt for them unknowingly; that Allah might bring into His mercy whom He will - If (the believers and the disbelievers) had been clearly separated We verily had punished those of them who disbelieved with painful punishment.

Our readers must be able to see that Allah (swt) didn't consider these believing Muslim men and women as "Evil-Doers", nor promised dreadful punishment for them after their death [contrary to this, Allah (swt) is saying that if Muslims would do it, then they incur guilt for them unknowingly]

So, this verse shows clearly that new innovation of Mufti Sahib (i.e. Allah promised dreadful punishment for those who dies under Taqiyyah] is contrary to Quran. Mufti Sahib has only taken the verse of "Evil Doers", out of it's context.

3.28 Nasibi Fiqh even orders to not to fight/ (or migrate) in case of TYRANT MUSLIM RULER

It is very strange that a Mufti Sahib claiming such a thing (*i.e. it not allowed to do Taqiyyah whole of his life*), while according to Nasibi Fiqh, it is **ORDERED** to do Taqiyyah in front of Muslim ruler whole of your life till the time he allows you to establish Salat.

i.e. even if he stops you from hajj, zakat, or if he is a drunkard or killing innocent people [like Yazid (the drunkard) did in Karbala and Madina (in the incident of "Hara")], one is not allowed to fight with him but to remain quite (like great Sahaba of Nasabis did by not fighting against Yazid).

[Please keep in minds the difference between "**Permission**" between not raising swords and "**Order**" for not doing so]

Sahih Muslim, Book 020, Number 4570:

It has been narrated (through a different chain of transmitters) on the authority of Umm Salama (wife of the Holy Prophet) that he said: Amirs will be appointed over you, and you will find them doing good as well as bad deeds. One who hates their bad deeds is absolved from blame. One who disapproves of their bad deeds is (also) safe (so far as Divine wrath is concerned). But one who approves of their bad deeds and imitates them (is doomed). People asked: Messenger of Allah, shouldn't we fight against them? He replied: **No, as long as they say their prayer.**

So Mufti Sahib, how can you criticize Maula Ali (as), when in your own Fiqh, one is "Ordered" to not to raise Sword in case of Tyrant Muslim Ruler.

And if you still want to criticize Maula Ali (as) for not raising sword against early Khulafa, then first of all you have to show us that these early caliphs abandoned Salat (prayers).

3.29 Were Aima Masoomeen (as) ever compelled to kill other Muslims?

As already mentioned, there are some conditions which make it "obligatory" to abandon "Taqiyyah" e.g. if you are compelled to cause damage to innocent people and you do it out of fear of your own life.

But Maula Ali (as) and other Masoomeen (as) never faced such situation under the tyrant Caliphs of Bani Ummiyyah and Bani Abbas. So, it had never been "Obligatory" upon them to migrate due to this reason.

3.30 Taqiyyah of Aima Masoomeen (as) vs. Migration

As we already told, Islamic concept of Taqiyyah means "Choosing the best Option", which can benefit Islam.

And it was for sure that Maula Ali (as) and other Aima (as) were able to serve and benefit Islam in much better way by staying within Muslims, instead of migrating to non Muslim lands.

The imams couldn't migrate to a kaffir land and leave behind the muslims. Many of the imams spent many years helping the muslims and educating them. Despite the differences with Sheikhain, Maula Ali (as) was always there whenever hard times came to Islam. And even Hadhrat Umar had to say:

"Had there been not Abul Hassan (Maula Ali), I would have been perished"

This fact has even been attested by Wahabi scholar Abu'l Hasan Nadwi who stated in his work, "The life of Caliph Ali", page 202:

"Umar was often exacerbad if Ali was not available to solve an entangled problem. He often used to say: 'Umar would have been ruined if Ali was not there'"

Taken from Izalathul Khifa by Shah Waliyullah Volume 2 page 268 (on the authority of Abu Umar related from Saeed al Musayyib)

Similarly, the 5th and 6th Aima (as) set up schools and had thousands of students. All the imams educated the muslims. They had other duties to perform, they had to improve the ummah and revive it.

And our all the Aima (as) could not migrate while they had to lead their Shi'as. There was a whole "Wikalah System" for collecting Khums and then distributing it among the needy people. Even those Aima (as), who were under strict control of tyrant governments, they also succeeded to run the system of guidance and khums through their representatives.

[We cannot go into details here for what Masoomeen (as) did for Ummah. It will need couple of volumes. So, please refer to books on their Biographies]

3.31 Hadhrat Yousuf (as) in court of "Kaffir Firoon" vs. Maula Ali (as) during 3 Khulafah

As we have already stated that for us "Taqiyyah" = "Diplomacy".

So, Yousuf (as) in court of "Kaffir Firoon" = Choosing best option under those circumstances, in order to serve "Interests" of Islam.

Nasabis also accept that Yousuf (as) chose this option while he could have served the religion of Allah best in this position.

But when it comes to Maula Ali (as), then Nasibi are suggesting "Migration" and wants to make the same act Haram for him, which they allow and praise in case of Yousuf (as).

Double Standards!

3.32 Aima (as), who spent their lives under house arrest and government control

Some of Nasabis then criticise that there were Aima (as) who spent whole of their life under house arrest and government control. So, what benefit they caused in interest of Islam and why didn't they migrate?

Even these Aima Masoomeen (as) run the affairs through their representatives. They used to answer the questions in form of letters and others. In this way Shi'a Muhadditheen were able to collect a lot of Ahadith from all these Aima (as).

And as we mentioned earlier, there are several Ahadith which show that people were able to sent the right of "Prophet's near kin" (i.e. Khums) to Aima (as) through these representatives. And on the other hand, the poor and needy people were helped by Aima (as) through the money of Khums, which was brought to them by these representatives.

Secondly, all these Aima (as) who were under house arrest, come under the definition of weak and oppressed. They were so much under the check of government that it was impossible for them to migrate.

Even Allah excused such people in Quran from Migrating. The following verse is just the next verse of "Evil Doers", in which Allah threatened those Munafiqeen, who had not migrated and fought against Muslims.

الرِّجَالِ وَالنِّسَاءِ وَالْوُلْدَانِ لَا إِلَّا الْمُسْتَضْعَفِينَ مِنْ
يَهْتَدُونَ سَبِيلًا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ حِيلَةً وَلَا

[Yusufali 4:98] Except those who are (really) weak and oppressed - men, women, and children - who have no means in their power, nor (a guide-post) to their way.

In Tafsir Ibn Kathir, it is written under the commentry of this verse that:

"Al-Bukhari recorded that Abu An-Nu`man said that Hammad bin Zayd said that Ayyub narrated that Ibn Abi Mulaykah said that Ibn `Abbas commented on the verse, (Except the weak ones among men), "I and my mother were among those (weak ones) whom Allah excused."

[Tafseer of Ibn Kathir](#)

3.33 Aima (as) vs. Common Shi'as

As compared to Aima Masoomeen (as), common Shi'as got the chance of moving freely. And Masoomeen (as) encouraged them to go even in the Kuffar lands, where they can perform

religion freely.

This was the reason for Islam's view on at-ta'arrub ba'd al-hijra as reflected in many ahadith. At-ta'arrub ba'd al-hijra means leaving an environment where you could follow Islam and moving to a place where you maybe prone to not following Islam. Such a thing is counted as one of the major sins.

Abu Basir says that he heard Imam as-Sadiq (a.s.) saying: **"The major sins are seven: killing a person intentionally; associating someone or something with the Almighty Allah (shirk); wrongfully accusing a married woman of adultery; Knowingly dealing in usury; running away from the battle-field in jihad; at-ta'arrub ba'd al-hijra; causing distress to one's parents [by encroaching on their rights]; and wrongfully acquiring the property of the orphan."** Then he said, "At-ta'arrub and shirk are one and the same [in severity]."

Muhammad bin Ya'qûb al-Kulayni, al-Usûl min al-Kafi, vol. 2, p. 281

Hammad al-Sindi narrates that he asked Imam as-Sadiq (a.s.), **"I visit the cities of polytheism [i.e., of the polytheists]; and there are some among us who say that 'if you die over there, you will be raised [in the Hereafter] along with them.'" The Imam asked me, "O Hammad, when you are over there do you talk about our affair [i.e., our truth] and call [people] to it?" I replied, "Yes." The Imam asked me, "When you are in these cities, the cities of Islam, do you talk about our affair and call [people] to it?" I replied, "No." The Imam said, "If you die over there [in the land of the non-Muslims], you will be raised as an ummah by yourself, and there will be light in front of you!"**

Tafsilu Wasa'ili 'sh-Shi'a vol. 16, p. 188

3.34 Migration of "Sadaat" to different lands, in order to get rid of tyrant Rulers

We find the history of migration of Syeds, mostly in the texts Wali Allah's (Saints). e.g. "Tadhkiratul Makhdoom Jahaniya, Tadhkiratul Awliya, Safeenatul Awliya", etc. and other like-topic books. Mainly, during the Abbasid reign, it was very difficult for the Syeds to live in Iran & other Arab world. There were literally the orders to shoot them on sight. The Imams[as] themselves were specially protected or exempt from the shoot on sight order, due to the political reasons of the kingdom. This can be very well explained from the incidents of the time of Imam Raza[as] and the king of the time.

The Sada'at, migrated to South Russian states & India at the time. The descendants of Imam al-Hadi al-Naqvi[as], migrated to Bokhara (now in Uzbekistan). Many descendants of Imam Raza[as], the Rizvis went to the border areas of Kashmir & India specifically to the city of Kareeri. The descendants of Imam Ja'afar[as], the Jafferis migrated to India, to the area which is now in Pakistan called "Mohammadi Pur Madina", it is in the district of Gujrat. The descendants of Imam Zaynul Abedeen[as], the Zaidis also migrated to India originally to the areas of Lucknow and Hyderabad. Nearly all stayed at their new places, apart from Naqvis who were in Bokhara. After the great occultation of Imam Mahdi[as], the situation got worst for the Syeds in the Arab, Iranian and now Southern Russian states, which was under Iranian government.

All the Naqvi Sad'at escaping the killings had to migrate to India, to the area now in Pakistan called Uch. It is on the border of Sindh & Punjab. But, from there many then migrated back to Bokhara, even some went to Neshapur in Iran (near Mashad), and also Afghanistan.

This migration out of India was in the mission of Tableegh. The situation at the time was slightly better for them to travel back in to Iranian estates.

4. Maula Ali[as] Vs. Taqiyyah

On page 40 (and on many other places), Mufti Sahib criticized Maula Ali (as) for not raising against Sheikhain for his right of Caliphate and Fadak.

 [Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 40](#)

Since Nasabis have been using this objection since centuries, therefore let us see if it was really in the interests of Islam if Maula Ali (as) would have started the war against Sheikhain at that stage.

4.1 Why Maula 'Ali (as) didn't raise "Dhulfiqar" against Sheikhain?

This has been a very common Nasibi argument, and is tactically used by the followers of Mu'awiya to mock the Shi'a. We should point out to these people Nasibi that Imam 'Ali (as)'s decision not to take physical action was not because due to his practising taqiyya (through fear of life) and neither was it because he loved the three khalifas. His decision was based on the following reasons as we have set out:

4.2 Reply One - It was Abu Bakr's duty to return what was not his, not Imam Ali to demand it

Simple example. A man has a son and bequeaths his property to him he does openly in the presence of witnesses, (that include his uncle). If when the father dies his uncle seizes the property and claims it as his, places guard to guard the property. In such circumstances the uncle is the usurper the son is the aggrieved party. In such circumstances it is incumbent on the Uncle to RETURN the property to his nephew, not on the nephew to use force to take it back. When the uncle is in the wrong the onus is on him to put things right not the son to fight for his right.

4.3 Reply Two - Imam 'Ali did not want to cause open division and bloodshed

These Nasibi need to look at the situation at THAT particular time when Abu Bakr seized power. Allah (swt) declared clearly that Madina and its surrounding locality was FULL of munafiq (Surah Munafiqoon); Rasul (s) has stated that the sign of a munafiq is hatred of Imam 'Ali hence Madina was full of Imam 'Ali 's opponents who were looking for the excuse to harm him. Abu Bakr had full control of the State machinery, he was in power / had the army at his disposal etc had he risen at that time he along with the Shi'a would have been wiped out, on the excuse that it was right to do so to quell sedition.

Don't forget we read in Tabari that Umar was prepared to set alight the house of Sayyida Fatima because men in her home had gathered in opposition to Abu Bakr. If Umar was so ruthless to not even care for the life of Sayyida Fatima[as] then he would have had no hesitation in killing her husband and her supporters.

In this time, Imam 'Ali had to think what was best for his followers, any opposition would have caused loss of life. Any action at this time would have caused major dissension and bloodshed, and Rasul (s) said:

"Your position to me is like the position of Aaron to Moses, except that there shall be no Prophet after me"

1. Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English version, Traditions 5.56 and 5.700

2. *Sahih Muslim, Arabic, section of virtues of Ali, v4, pp 1870-71*
3. *Sunan Ibn Majah, p12*
4. *Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v1, p174*
5. *al-Khas'is, by al-Nisa'i, pp 15-16*
6. *Mushkil al-Athar, by al-Tahawi, v2, p309*

The analogy that Prophet (PBUH) mentioned in the above tradition, seems to be a reality after his demise. Most of companions (except few) became disloyal to Ali (AS) after the death of Prophet (PBUH), turned against him, and preferred some other people to him. The majority of people disobeyed Ali (AS), as their forefathers disobeyed Haroon (AS). They did not take lessons from Quran and the history, and thus the history repeated over and over again. The repetition of the history of the Children of Israel for Muslims is confirmed by Prophet (s).

Sahih al-Bukhari Hadith: 9.422

Narrated Abu Sa'id al-Khudri:

The Prophet said, "You will follow the ways of those nations who were before you, span by span and cubit by cubit (i.e., inch by inch) so much so that even if they entered a hole of a mastigure (lizard), you would follow them." We said, "O Allah's Apostle! (Do you mean) the Jews and the Christians?" He said, "Whom else?"

Think for a while... Why would the Prophet (PBUH&HF) compare his companions to the Jews and the Christians, knowing full well that the Jews and the Christians have mutilated and perverted the religion of Allah (SWT)?

Because Allah (SWT) had told him (PBUH&HF) that your companions will turn back, except the select few.

Now if we analyse the Quran; we read that Prophet Musa (A.S.) became extremely upset when he heard that Bani Israel started worshipping an idol of calf. He came back from "Miqaat" and grabbed Haroon (as) by his hair and pulled his beard. Harun (A.S.) sadly replied:

(20:94) "O son of my mother, do not seize me by my beard or my head. Truly, I feared but you should say that I caused a division among the Bani-Isra'il and did not respect my word"

In the same way that Harun did not intervene at that particular time fearing further fragmentation amongst the Ummah, Imam Ali also did not act since he did not want the Ummah to be at each others throats and munafiqs to exploit the situation and destroy Islam through internal deception.

4.4 Reply Three -The wider situation meant it would have been disastrous to act

On a wider scale look at the situation at the time. We had munafiqs in Madina, and worse the threat of attack from the neighbouring Christian Byzantine Empire. This was a very real danger since in 10 Hijri, Rasul (s) led the expedition of Tabuk to counter the Byzantine threat. On top of that in the Arabian Peninsula, Musalimah had risen up and declared himself a Prophet (s) and was making preparations to attack Madina. Had Imam Ali at this stage rose up, the Ummah would have been totally fragmented, Muslims would have been fighting each other and Musalimah the liar. What better time would there have been for the Byzantines to attack than when the Muslims were divided, fighting each other AND fighting Musalimah? At that time the Ummah would have been so weak on account of internal upheaval there would have been a real risk of the Byzantines invading and destroying the Muslim Ummah. In such circumstances Imam Ali had the interests of the Deen as priority, he did not want to trigger any event that might inflict harm to the Deen and its adherents. If anything this shows the greatness of the

Imam that he was willing to sacrifice his right, if it meant a guarantee that the Deen and its adherents were protected from harm.

4.5 Reply Four - Imam Ali was following the Sunnah of Rasul (s), desisting from actions that might be exploited by non Muslims

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 428: Narrated Jabir bin 'Abdullah:

We were in a Ghazwa (Sufyan once said, in an army) and a man from the emigrants kicked an Ansari man (on the buttocks with his foot). The Ansari man said, "O the Ansar! (Help!)" and the emigrant said. "O the emigrants! (Help!) Allah's Apostle heard that and said, "What is this call for, which is characteristic of the period of ignorance?" They said, "O Allah's Apostle! A man from the emigrants kicked one of the Ansar (on the buttocks with his foot)." Allah's Apostle said, "Leave it (that call) as is a detestable thing." 'Abdullah bin Ubai heard that and said, 'Have the (the emigrants) done so? By Allah, if we return Medina, surely, the more honorable will expel therefrom the meaner." When this statement reached the Prophet. 'Umar got up an, said, "O Allah's Apostle! Let me chop off the head of this hypocrite ('Abdullah bin Ubai)!" The Prophet said "Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions." The Ansar were then more in number than the emigrants when the latter came to Medina, but later on the emigrant increased.

The reference makes it clear that a hypocrite was sitting in the midst of the Sahaba, Umar offered to have him killed, but Rasul (s) said "Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions; i.e. he (s) did not want his actions to be exploited / incorrectly interpreted by non Muslims. In the same way that Rasul (s) had spared the life of a hypocrite fearing that outside elements would exploit the situation, Imam Ali acted on the Sunnah of Rasul (s) refraining from lifting his sword as he was aware that outside elements would have picked up on this and painted a damaging image of Islam.

The true Imam thinks about consequences of actions both present and future. Imam Ali did not want to act in a manner that would be exploited by future non Muslim generations in a manner that would be detrimental to the Deen. Had Imam Ali raised his sword at that time then no doubt anti Muslim elements of that time and present would have exploited the situation to the max they would have said **'Look this is Islam, its all about power here we have the closest companions fighting not for religion but the throne of Muhammad (s)'**

This portrayal would have created a very bad image of Islam, non-Muslims would have picked up on this and exploited it, and it would have repelled people away from Islam. If Rasul (s) refrained from lifting the sword against a munafiq fearing the perception of outsiders, then Imam Ali was fully within his rights when he refrained from raising his sword against Abu Bakr, to do so was the Sunnah of Rasul (s).

5. Conclusion

We have seen that taqiyyah is part and parcel of the Islamic religion. Allah (swt) desires that His Servants come to him and worship him, but at the same time does not impose undue duress upon His Creation. We have seen from our analysis that the Holy Qu'ran and the sunnah of the Prophet (s) acknowledges this reality, making taqiyyah a part of the religion of Islam.

Even putting all of these arguments aside, logic itself dictates the permissibility of taqiyyah, for its permissibility is the logical outcome of the belief in a Kind and Merciful God. The Wahabbi enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt (as), however, do not believe in such a God. Theirs is a God who is waiting for any chance to cast His servants into the hell-fire, and who will burn a servant in the hellfire for the shortness of his beard or the length of his trousers. We call upon the reader to recognize that Allah (swt) has opened up the doors of Mercy to the believers, and does not seek to cause them hardship and distress except when absolutely necessary for the cause of justice.

The cruel and oppressive religion of Ibn Taymiyyah, Sepah-e Sahaba, and other Wahhabis not Islam, and Glory be to Allah over what they ascribe to Him.

6. Copyright

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

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