

# Who really killed 'Uthman?

**Work file:** who\_really\_killed\_uthman.pdf  
**Project:** Answering-Ansar.org Articles

## Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
0.0.2	14.11.2002	Answering-Ansar.org	Chapter 5 added.	
0.0.1	04.08.2002	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

## Contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. IDENTIFYING ‘UTHMAN’S KILLERS</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 HADHRATH AYESHA’S LEAD ROLE IN KILLING ‘UTHMAN	5
2.2 AYESHA’S RETHINK ABOUT ‘ UTHMAN AFTER HIS DEATH	5
2.3 SAHABA HAD HIGHLIGHTED AYESHA’S SHIFT IN POLICY ON UTHMAN	7
2.4 TALHA AND ZUBAYR’S LEAD ROLE IN KILLING ‘UTHMAN	8
2.5 SAHABA THAT PARTICIPATED IN BADR ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE KILLING OF ‘UTHMAN	11
2.6 THE MUHAJIR, ANSAR AND OTHER FAITHFUL LIVING IN MADINA KILLED UTHMAN	12
2.7 THE BELIEVERS MURDERED ‘UTHMAN	13
2.8 ‘UTHMAN WAS KILLED BY HIS OWN GOVERNORS / MILITARY MEN	13
2.9 WHY DID THE SAHABA NOT AID THE BELEAGUERED ‘UTHMAN?	13
2.10 WHY DID ‘UTHMAN NOT DEFEND HIMSELF?	14
2.11 DID IMAMS HASAN AND HUSAYN (AS) PROTECT ‘UTHMAN?	15
2.12 LIST OF ‘UTHMAN’S MURDERERS AND AN INVITATION TO TRUTH	17
<b>3. IDENTIFYING THE USUAL SUSPECTS</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1 ANALYZING THE ISNAD CONCERNING THE IBN SABA REPORT	19
3.2 AN APPEAL TO LOGIC	21
3.2.1. THE SAHABA WROTE TO PEOPLE INCITING THEM TO RISE UP AGAINST ‘UTHMAN	21
3.3 SUSPECT TWO – THE EGYPTIANS	22
3.3.1. THE SAHABA AND THEIR CHILDREN COLLUDED WITH THE EGYPTIANS TO KILL ‘UTHMAN	22
3.3.2. A SAHABA THAT PLEDGED ALLEGIANCE UNDER THE TREE OF RIDHWAN COMMANDED THE EGYPTIAN REBELS	23
3.4 MU’AWIYA’S COUSIN MUHAMMAD BIN ABI HUDHIFA PLAYED A LEAD ROLE ALONGSIDE THE EGYPTIANS IN KILLING ‘UTHMAN	23
3.5 TALHA ADVISED THE EGYPTIANS DURING THE SIEGE OF ‘UTHMAN’S PALACE	23
<b>4. DID ‘UTHMAN DIE A ‘MARTYR’?</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 ‘UTHMAN’S BODY WAS UNATTENDED FOR THREE DAYS. COMPANIONS’ NOT BURYING HIM PROVES THAT THEY DID NOT DEEM HIM TO BE A MARTYR	28
4.2 SOME QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO UTHMAN’S FUNERAL	30
<b>5. VIRTUES OF UTHMAN IN SUNNI BOOKS</b>	<b>31</b>
5.1 ANSAR’S APPRAISAL OF UTHMAN	31
5.2 THE EFFORTS OF AHL’UL SUNNAH TO SLANDER RASULULLAH (S) SO AS TO ELEVATE UTHMAN	32
5.3 UTHMAN ‘HAYYA’ HAD SEX WITH HIS DEAD WIFE	32

<b>5.4</b>	<b>AHL'UL SUNNAH BELIEF THAT BY SETTING FIRE TO THE QUR'AN UTHMAN MADE A MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE DEEN</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>5.5</b>	<b>THE SALAF MADHAB DEEMS SETTING FIRE TO THE QUR'AN TO BE A 'VIRTUE' OF UTHMAN</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>5.6</b>	<b>THE PEOPLE WERE OUTRAGED BY UTHMAN'S CAMPAIGN OF QUR'AN BURNING AND THIS WAS ONE FACTOR THAT LED TO THEM KILLING HIM</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>5.7</b>	<b>THE SALAF MADHAB DEEMS IT PERMISSIBLE TO SET FIRE TO THE QUR'AN AS THIS IS THE SUNNAH OF THE UTHMAN</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5.8</b>	<b>AHL'UL SUNNAH'S APPRAISAL OF THE QUR'AN BURNING UTHMAN IS TANTAMOUNT TO KUFR</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5.9</b>	<b>THE SAHABA CONDEMNED UTHMAN AND LABELLED HIM AS 'HURAAQ AL MUSHAF'</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5.10</b>	<b>AYESHA SAID KILL 'HURAAQ AL MUSHAF'</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5.11</b>	<b>SOME AHL'UL SUNNAH HAVE ISSUED FATWAS THAT IT IS DISRESPECT TO BURN THE QUR'AN</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5.12</b>	<b>FATWA OF AHL'UL SUNNAH – ONE WHO DISRESPECTS THE QUR'AN IS A KAAFIR</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>5.13</b>	<b>UTHMAN SHALL BE CALLED TO ACCOUNT ON THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT FOR THE SIN OF BURNING THE QUR'AN</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b><u>VIRTUES OF UTHMAN IN SHI'A BOOKS</u></b>	<b>40</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>	<b>43</b>

## 1. Introduction

This is Answering-Ansar's refutation of Ansar's article on 'Uthman. The gist of its author Nasibi Abu Sulaiman is to absolve the Sahaba of any wrongdoing in the killing of 'Uthman. He has done his utmost to locate sources that protect the leading companions, for he knows too well that failure to do so, in effect raises serious questions on the Ahl'ul Sunnah's aqeedah on the justice of the Sahaba. Like his previous articles this is another feeble attempt to protect the Sahaba, and point the finger at other quarters in hope that he can convince his readers that the Shi'a are liars. Yet again Abu Sulaiman has used dishonesty, and yet again his lies shall be exposed.

## 2. Identifying 'Uthman's killers

### 2.1 Hadhrath Ayesha's lead role in killing 'Uthman

Many of the books of Ahl'ul Sunnah record that Ayesha had declared 'Uthman a Nathal that should be killed. Amongst those texts are the following:

1. Manaqib by Khawarzmi, page 117
2. Tadkhirath al Khawwas page 38
3. Asadul Ghaba Volume 3 page 14, "Dhikr Jamal"
4. Al Istiab Volume 2 page 185
5. Al Nahaya Volume 5 page 80
6. Qamus page 500 "lughut Nathal" by Firozabadi
7. Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 117 "Dhikr Jamal"
8. Sharh Nahjul Balagha Ibn al Hadeed Volume 2 page 122
9. Shaykh Mudheera page 163

Interestingly Abu Sulaiman seeks to deny that Ayesha had ever used such language against 'Uthman by deviously quoting as follows:

Ansar.org states:

This story was narrated by Nasr bin Muzahim. Al-Aqeeli says about Nasr bin Muzahim, "He tends to be a Shi'a, and his narrations are filled with confusions and mistakes." [Al-Du'afa by Al-Aqeeli, vol.4, p.300, #. 1899]. Al-Thahabi says about him, "A hardcore Rafidhi (Shi'a), and his narrations are not taken as authentic. Abu Khaythamah said, 'He was a liar.' Abu Hatim said, 'Weak narrator, and is not taken as an argument.' Al-Darqutni said, 'His narrations are weak.' " [Al-Mizan by Al-Thahabi, vol.4, p.253, #. 9046]. "Al-Jowzani said, 'Nasr was a fake person and far away from truth.' Salih bin Muhamed said, 'Nasr bin Muzahim narrated ugly stories from unreliable narrators.' Al-Hafudh Abi Al-Fath Muhamed bin Al-Hussain said, 'Nasr bin Muzahim goes excess in his denomination.'" [Tareekh Baghdad by Al-Baghdadi, vol.13, p.283].

We should point out that Abu Sulaiman fails to cite WHICH TEXT contains the name of Nasr bin Muzahim! Ayesha's takfeer against 'Uthman is not just restricted to Nasr bin Muzahim the classical Sunni scholars who have narrated from various chains! Sahaba had even reminded Ayesha of her takfeer against 'Uthman (as we shall prove later)!

Ibn Atheer in Nahaya page 80 Volume 5 and Ibn Mansur in Lisan al Arab Volume 11 Chapter "Lughuth Nathal" page 670 both record that:

**"Nathal is one who has a long beard and Ayesha said kill this Nathal, by Nathal she was referring to 'Uthman".**

Lisan al Arab by Ibn Mansur Volume 11 Chapter "Lughuth Nathal" page 670

### 2.2 Ayesha's rethink about ' Uthman after his death

Abu Sulaiman tries to negate Ayesha's opposition to 'Uthman by citing the following texts:

Ansar.org states:

True and authentic stories show that Ayesha was in pain for the murder of 'Uthman and she also prayed against his killers. Masrooq – a trustworthy Tabi'ei – said that Ayesha said, "You left him (to die) just like the dirt-clear cloth, and you came closer to kill him as a sheep is slaughtered." Then Masrooq told her, "This is the result of your work. You encouraged people to rebel against him." Ayesha answered, "By the One who believers believe in and the disbelievers disbelieve in, I did not write them a single word." Al-A'amash said, "It is to be known that words were written in her name (and she did not know about it)." [Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah, by Ibn Katheer, vol. 7, p. 204, with authentic chain of narrators]. Ahmed narrates that Ayesha said (regarding the murder of 'Uthman), "I wish I was forgotten. And about what happened to 'Uthman, by Allah, I never wanted anything bad to happen to him unless it happened to me too. So if I wanted him to be killed, then I shall be killed too." [Virtues of the Companions, by Ahmed, vol. 1, p. 462, with authentic chain of narrators]. Talaq bin Hushan asked Ayesha, "How was 'Uthman, the Commander of the Faithful, killed?" Ayesha answered, "He was killed as an innocent man. May Allah curse his killers." [Al-Tareekh Al-Kabeer by Al-Bukhari, vol. 4, p. 358]

We are not interested in Ayesha's alleged claims of denials AFTER the event – what is important is to see the position that she had taken whilst 'Uthman was alive.

Hadhrath Ayesha's new position towards 'Uthman was NOT based on her pain towards the slain / innocent Khalifa, it was due to her hatred of Imam 'Ali (as). Ayesha had NOT envisaged that 'Uthman would be succeeded by 'Ali (as) and hence had no hesitation in inciting people against him.

al-Baladhuri, in Ansab al-Ashraf Part 1, Volume 4 page 74 narrates that:

**When the situation became extremely grave, 'Uthman ordered Marwan Ibn al-Hakam and Abdurahman Ibn Attab Ibn Usayd to try to persuade Ayesha to stop campaigning against him. They went to her while she was preparing to leave for pilgrimage, and they told her: "We pray that you stay in Medina, and that Allah may save this man ('Uthman) through you." Ayesha said: "I have prepared my means of transportation and vowed to perform the pilgrimage. By God, I shall not honor your request... I wish he ('Uthman) was in one of my sacks so that I could carry him. I would then throw him into the sea."**

It is clear that 'Uthman deemed Ayesha as a key figure in the opposition to 'Uthman which is why we had wanted Marwan to approach her and stop her acts of incitement. If Ayesha was innocent of the charges then why did she want to throw 'Uthman into the sea?

Her long-term plan was to have her relative Talha succeed 'Uthman after his death. Tabari records that whilst 'Uthman was besieged when Ibn Abbas met Ayesha as she was making her way to perform Hajj. Ayesha wanted Ibn Abbas to turn against 'Uthman and she appealed to him stating:

**"Ibn Abbas, I entreat you by God: abandon this man, sow doubt about him among the people, for you have been given a sharp tongue. Their powers of discernment have been clarified, the beacon light is raised high to guide them, and (the Caliph's associates) have milked the lands that once abounded in good things. I have seen Talha b. Ubaydullah take possession of the keys to the public treasuries and**

storehouses. **If he becomes Caliph, he will follow in the path of his paternal cousin Abu Bakr".**

**According to (Ibn Abbas): I said, "O Mother (of the Believers), if some evil were to befall that man [namely, ], the people would seek asylum only in with our companion [namely, "Ali]. She replied, "Be quiet! I have no desire to defy or quarrel with you".**

History of Tabari [English translation] Volume 15 pages 289-239

When Hadhrath 'Uthman was killed Ayesha who was making her way to Hajj announced that her tent be pitched, she then declared:

**"I believe that 'Uthman shall bring ill luck on the people (Ummayyads) just as Abu Sufyan brought ill luck on the people on the Day of Badr".**

al Baladhuri, Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5 page 91

Ayesha's actions against 'Uthman were as follows:

1. She incited people by declaring 'Uthman to be a kaafir who should be killed.
2. When the rebels closed in on 'Uthman, she left for the Hajj and refused to intervene and save 'Uthman's life.
3. She encouraged Ibn Abbas to move against 'Uthman, and made it clear that Talha would be a worthy successor when 'Uthman dies.
4. When 'Uthman died Ayesha said 'Uthman brought bad luck to the Banu Ummayya.

Whilst 'Uthman was 'Alive Ayesha was his bitter opponent, she wanted people to overthrow him and indicated to Ibn Abbas that Talha was the man who could lead the people after 'Uthman. The indication that Hadhrath 'Ali (as) would succeed had clearly angered Ayesha who brought the conversation to an abrupt end.

### **2.3 Sahaba had highlighted Ayesha's shift in policy on Uthman**

The change in circumstances in Ayesha's portrayal of 'Uthman from a kaafir to victim occurred when Imam 'Ali (as) had attained power. Hadhrath 'Ali (as) had openly questioned Ayesha's motives in the correspondence that we had cited earlier, and her new policy of regret had not gone unnoticed. She may well have denied this later, but the fact is Sahaba were fully aware that Ayesha WAS responsible for 'Uthman's killing and they pointed this out to her.

In Tareekh Kamil Volume 3 page 100 Ibn Atheer records that:

**"Ubayd bin Abi Salma who was a maternal relative of Ayesha met her as she was making her way to Madina. Ubayd said "'Uthman has been killed and the people were without an Imam for eight days" to which Ayesha asked "What did they do next?". Ubayd said "The people approached "Ali and gave him bayya". Ayesha then said 'Take me back! Take me back to Makka". She then turned her face towards Makka and said, 'Verily 'Uthman was murdered innocently, and By Allah, I shall avenge his blood'. Ubayd then said 'You are now calling 'Uthman innocent, even though it was you who said 'Kill Nathal, this Jew".**

Imam "Ali (as) wrote a letter to Ayesha as recorded in Seerath al Halabiyya Volume 3 page 356:

**"You have acted in opposition to Allah (swt) and his Rasul (s) by leaving your home, you have made demands for those things that you have no right. You claim to wish to reform the Ummah, tell me, what role do women have in reforming the Ummah and participating in battles? You claim that you wish to avenge 'Uthman's murder**

**despite the fact that he is a man from Banu Ummayya and you are a woman from Banu Taym. If we look in to the matter it was only yesterday that you had said 'Kill Nathal May Allah (swt) kill him because he has become a kaafir'.**

In al Tabaqat al Kubra Volume 3 page 82 we read that:

**"Musruq said to Ayesha, 'Uthman died because of you, you wrote to people and incited them against him".**

In Iqd al Fareed page Volume 2 page 210 we learn that:

**"Marwan approached Ayesha and said 'Uthman died because of you, you wrote to people and incited them against him".**

Also in Iqd al Fareed on Volume 2 page 219 we read that:

**"Mugheera bin Shuba approached Ayesha and she said to him, 'In Jamal some of the arrows that were fired, nearly pierced my skin.' Mugheera replied 'If only an arrow had killed you, that would have acted as repentance for the fact that you had incited the people to kill 'Uthman".**

## **2.4 Talha and Zubayr's lead role in killing 'Uthman**

The following classical Sunni scholars have attested to the lead role of Talha and Zubayr against 'Uthman:

1. Al Istiab Volume 3 page 213 Dhikr Talha
2. Layneen fi Tafseel Shaykhain page 280 "Dhikr Muthaen "Ali"
3. Al Jabir al Taweel Dhikr Jamal
4. Sharh Ibn al Hadeed Volume 2 page 768 and 649
5. Al Bidayah wa al Nihayah Volume 7 page 248 Dhikr Jamal
6. Al Imama wa al Siyasa page 59, 60, 65 Dhikr Jamal
7. Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 220 Dhikr Kathal 'Uthman
8. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 4 page 34 Part 9
9. Fusul al Muhimma page 79 Dhikr Jamal
10. Maarif page 100 Dhikr Talha
11. Mutalib al Saul page 117 Dhikr Jamal
12. Nur al Absar page 91 Dhikr Jamal

As part of his denial that Talha killed 'Uthman, Abu Sulaiman quotes as follows:

Ansar.org states:

Al-Darqutni narrated, "'Uthman entered the mosque and saw Talha sitting on the east side of the mosque. 'Uthman said, 'O' Talha!' Talha answered, 'Yes!' 'Uthman said, 'Do you know that the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him said, 'Anyone who would buy this piece of land to add it to the mosque?' and I

bought it with my own money?" Talha answered, "O' Allah, I do know." ... 'Uthman said again, "I call you by the grace of Allah, do you know that I supported the army of Al-Esrah just like a hundred men?" Talha answered, "O' Allah! I do know." Then Talha said, "O' Allah! I know nothing of 'Uthman except that he is an innocent man!" [Mawaqif Al-Sahabah fi Al-Fitnah, vol. 2, p. 24]

The same Abu Sulaiman also mentions later that Marwan was one of those individuals that had sought to protect 'Uthman when he was besieged. Clearly if anyone was to know who played a role in killing 'Uthman it would have been him. So whom did Marwan blame for killing 'Uthman? We read in Al Bidayah wa al Nihayah Volume 7 page 248 Dhikr Jamal:

**"Talha was killed in the battle of Jamal by the arrow of Marwan, who then told Aban-bin-Uthman that I have taken the revenge for the blood of 'Uthman"**

It is written in Riyadh al Nadira Volume 4 page 34, Part 9 that Marwan after killing Talha declared that there was no longer any need to avenge the slaying of 'Uthman.

The classical works of Ahl'ul Sunnah record from Yahya Ibn Sa'id:

**Marwan Ibn al-Hakam who was in the ranks of Talha, when he saw Talha retreating (when his army was being defeated in the battlefield). As he and the Banu Ummaya recognised him as the killer of Uthman, he shot an arrow at him and severely wounded him. He then said to Aban, the son of Uthman, that: "I have spared you from one of your father's murderers." Talha was taken to a ruined house in Basra where he died.**

You can find this reference in the following texts:

1. Tabaqat, by Ibn Sa'ad, v3, part 1, p159
2. al-Isabah, by Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, v3, pp 532-533
3. Tarikh Ibn al-Athir, v3, p244
4. Usdul Ghabah, v3, pp 87-88
5. al-Isti'ab, Ibn Abd al-Barr, v2, p766

Marwan was the Son in Law of 'Uthman, he stood alongside Hadhrath Ayesha and Talha at Jamal. When it became clear that defeat was inevitable Marwan killed Talha by his arrow and later said I killed him (Talha) as a revenge for 'Uthman's murder. These reports prove that even the Umayyad leaders such as Marwan who (along side with Talha) was fighting against Imam Ali, knew that Talha and Zubayr were the killers of Uthman.

It is little wonder that even Talha's son admitted the role of his father in killing 'Uthman. In al Imama wal Siyasa page 60 we read that:

**"Someone asked Muhammad bin Talha who killed 'Uthman? He replied that "one third of his death was attributable to Ayesha and one third was due to my father Talha".**

Also in Iqd al Fareed Volume 2 page 218 and al Imama wal Siyasa page 45 we are told that:

**"Sad ibn Abi Waqqas was asked 'who killed 'Uthman? Sad replied, 'the sword was lifted by Ayesha and it was sharpened by Talha".**

Ansar.org states:

Authentic narrations show that Talha and Al-Zubayr were anguished for the death of 'Uthman. They even tried to defend him; Abi Habeebah said, "Al-Zubayr sent me to 'Uthman to deliver a message while he was surrounded. I entered upon 'Uthman in a clear day and he was sitting on a chair. Al-Hasan bin 'Ali, Abu Hurayrah, Abdullah bin Omar, and Abdullah bin Al-Zubayr were all present too. I said, "Al-Zubayr bin Al-Awam had sent me to you. He sends you his greetings and says, 'I am under my allegiance to you. I did not change my allegiance nor did I break it. If you wish, I will join you and be one of your men, and if you wish, I will stay too. The tribe of Umro bin Owf had promised me to be under my command, and they would carry out what I order them.' When 'Uthman heard the message, he said, 'Allahu Akbar! Thanks are due to Allah for He who had saved my brother. Send him my greetings and tell him, "If you joined me, then you will be one of my men, but I like you to stay where you are at now...."' When Abu Hurayrah heard the message, he said, "Do you want me to tell you what my ears heard from the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him?" They answered, "Yes!" Abu Hurayrah said, "I bear witness that the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him said, 'When I am gone, afflictions and troubles will occur.' So we asked, 'How could we save ourselves from that O' Messenger of Allah?' He answered, 'Adhere to the faithful man and his party,' and he pointed towards 'Uthman bin Affan." The people who were present at 'Uthman's house stood up and said, 'Now we see clearly. Give us the permission to wage Jihad!' 'Uthman answered, 'I order whoever gave allegiance to me not to fight.'" [Virtues of the Companions, Ahmed bin Hanbal, vol. 1, p. 511, with authentic chain of narrators].

This is indeed a very amusing quote. How exactly could Zubayr had sent his son when he was in fact leading the opposition to 'Uthman? Abdullah ibn Zubayr may well have been in the Palace, but it was of his own accord for Zubayr was co-ordinating opposition to 'Uthman outside the Palace. As proof let us hear the testimony of one of they key witnesses to 'Uthman's murder:

We read in Iqd al Fareed page 220 that after 'Uthman's murder, 'Uthman's wife wrote a letter to Mu'awiya bin Hind, a portion of which we cite below:

**"From Nayla-bint-e-Farasa to Mu'awiya bin Abi Sufyan. I was present at the time when 'Uthman was murdered and I shall narrate the event to you. People of Madina surrounded 'Uthman's house and they started guarding the door with their weapons. For fifty nights they did not let anything enter the house. It was Muhammad bin Abu Bakr, Ammar Yasir, Talha and Zubayr that gave the order to the people to kill 'Uthman".**

In a murder trial, eyewitness testimony to the murder is given the greatest credence, in this case, 'Uthman's wife was a direct eyewitness to the whole thing. She said that Sahaba (residents living in Madina) gave the orders that killed 'Uthman. She had clearly identified Talha and Zubayr as playing a key role in killing 'Uthman. Does it make sense that outside Zubayr is drawing up plans to kill 'Uthman whilst at the same time he sends his son to protect the khalifa? The role of Zubayr was known to all.

We read in Fusul al Muhimma page 79 Dhikr Jamal and Mutalib al Saul page 117 Dhikr Jamal that:

**“Ali asked Zubayr about the reasons that made him fight against him, to which Zubayr stated, “I want to fight to avenge the murder of ‘Uthman”. Imam ‘Ali replied, “If you have justice in your heart, you would realize that it was you and your friends that murdered ‘Uthman”.**

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah al Zuhri also records a similar conversation between Imam ‘Ali (as) and Zubayr prior to the battle of Jamal:

**“Ali said: ‘Zubayr, do you fight me for the blood of Uthman after you killed him? May God give the most hostile to Uthman among us the consequence that that very person dislikes’. (taken from Tarikh al-Tabari, Arabic version, Events of year 36 AH Volume 4, p905)**

These references make it clear that Imam ‘Ali (as) deemed Zubayr to be the killer of Uthman. Perhaps Abu Sulaiman could explain why Zubayr did not deny Imam ‘Ali (as)’s claim, if he was indeed innocent? Why his silence over what was such a serious charge?

Abu Sulaiman had posed the following question:

Ansar.org states:

No one disagrees that Talha and Al-Zubayr were among the first people who sought justice for the blood of ‘Uthman. They solely marched for this reason. Then how come they would encourage the killing of ‘Uthman and surround him and yet fight against their own partners in the crime?

It would be perhaps more apt for Abu Sulaiman to answer this. The fact is both individuals played a lead role in killing ‘Uthman, if this is an incorrect claim then why did Marwan kill Talha for the death of ‘Uthman?. The fact is like Ayesha the matter had switched in to a desire to overthrow Imam ‘Ali (as). Alhamdulillah Imam ‘Ali (as) exposed their behavior.

In Al Istiab Volume 3 page 213 “Dhikr Talha” and “Layneen fi Tafseel Shaykhain page 280 “Dhikr Muthaen “Ali”, one of Imam ‘Ali (as)’s speeches is recorded in which he declared:

**“Talha, Zubayr and Ayesha ask the right for something which they themselves abandoned. And ask to revenge the blood, which they themselves shed. They were responsible for the killing of ‘Uthman, to which I was not a party, but now they deny it. I am not a party to ‘Uthman’s killing, and the only culprit party to pay for the killing of ‘Uthman is this rebel group. They made their oath of allegiance to me and then broke it”.**

From the above-mentioned statement of Imam ‘Ali (as), it is obvious that Talha, Zubayr and Ayesha were the real killers of ‘Uthman. He openly questioned their motives.

## **2.5 Sahaba that participated in Badr also participated in the killing of ‘Uthman**

Ansar.org states:

Ibn Abi Sheibah narrated that Ibn Sireen said, “Zaid bin Thabit

entered upon 'Uthman and said, 'Here are the Ansars at the door.' And the Ansars said, 'If you wish for us to be Ansar [helpers] to Allah twice.' 'Uthman said, 'No fighting.' " [Al-Musnaf, vol.8, Book of Afflictions, p.682, with authentic narrators]

Note that no Ansar is mentioned by name just a general comment is cited. How many Ansar? – these crucial facts are totally devoid from this narration so it means nothing. For the benefit of Abu Sulaiman allow us to expand on the true position of the Ansar at the time of 'Uthman's death.

We read in al Istiab Volume 4 page 48, Dhikr Abu al Hasan Mazani

**"Abu Al Hasan Mazani was a companion of Prophet Muhammad (s), and he was one of the companions present in "Aqba" and Badr". Zaid bin Thabit, on the day of 'Uthman's murder said to the Ansar from Madina that, "Shall we become the helpers of Allah for a second time?". He (Mazani) replied, "No! By Allah we won't follow your lead, for if we do, we will be counted amongst those who on the Day of Judgement shall proclaim that our leaders misguided us".**

Note here this Sahaba refuses to side with 'Uthman – he did not deem him to be a victim, on the contrary he made it clear that to side with him would lead to punishment on the day of Judgment for following a misguided Imam. Also of note is that Zaid is addressing the Ansar and Abu al Hasan Mazani replies on their behalf – the fact that no other Ansar opposed his comment supports the notion that the Ansar had taken a lead role in opposing 'Uthman. Perhaps Abu Sulaiman could answer this question for us:

*'If all the Sahaba are indeed like stars, and following them would take us to salvation, then can we not also appreciate and support the claim advanced by Mazani against 'Uthman?'*

## **2.6 The Muhajir, Ansar and other faithful living in Madina killed Uthman**

We read in Iqd al Fareed page 215

"The leaders of the group who killed 'Uthman were Abdur Rahman bin Adees, Hakeem-bin-Jaleeh and Abdullah-bin-Fadeek. They came to Madina and with both, the Ansar and Muhajireen, surrounded the house of 'Uthman, they finally stormed it and killed him".

We read in Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd page 68-71 that:

**"The companions of Prophet Muhammad (s) stopped helping 'Uthman although they never imagined that he would be murdered, those that surrounded 'Uthman's house, threw dirt at other's faces, as a means of repulsing people away".**

Of relevance is the fact that we also learn in Tabaqat Volume 3 page 68 that Yazeed's forces ransacked Madina to avenge the murder of 'Uthman. If the Egyptians were involved in the murder then the people of Madina were even more culpable, which is why Abu Sulaiman's Imam Yazeed deemed it necessary to attack Madina.

We read in Sharh Ibn al Hadeed page 164 that:

**"The companions and non-companions, who were present in Medina, wrote letters to others saying If you want to participate in Jihad, come to Madina, for the Khalifa is destroying Islam. Hence the Khalifa must be removed".**

We read in Tareekh al Waqidi page 306:

Ibn Umar said By Allah; we have two grudges in relation to 'Uthman's murder. One against those who didn't help him and the second against those that killed him.

Note: 'Umar's son's testimony is very important. He identifies two groups of culprit's deserters and killers and from the earlier references it is clear that the Sahaba fit in both categories. This quote highlights Ibn Umar's opinion that those who did not support and protect Uthman are sinful in the same way as those that killed him were sinful.

## 2.7 The believers murdered 'Uthman

We find in from Al Tabaqat Al Kubra

**'Uthman raised both his hands and prayed, "O Allah, your momins (faithful) killed me".**

In a case, the victim's testimony is very important and crucial. Uthman made it clear that he was being killed by momin (Muslim).

## 2.8 'Uthman was killed by his own Governors / Military men

The evidence for this fact is from the following books of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Al Milal wa al Nihal Volume 1 Page 12.
2. Al Tabaqat Al Kubra Vole 3 Page 82, Dhikr 'Uthman.
3. Al Istiab, Chapter Dhikr Abu Tufail.

We read in Al Milal wa al Nihal Volume 1 Page 12.

**"These people were the governors and generals of his armies: The governor of Syria was Mu'awiya ibn Sufyan, The Governor of Hijaz province in Kufa was Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqaas, Basra's Governor was Abdullah bin Amir and the General was Waleed bin Uqba, Abdullah bin Sarh was the Governor of Egypt. These governors failed to aid 'Uthman, he was left 'Uthman helpless, and in consequence was murdered in his house".**

The above mentioned figures are great Sahaba in the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah wa al Jamaah. One needs to also appreciate that Basra, Kufa and Egypt housed large armies, and the killers of 'Uthman came from this same area. Were the governors of these areas so naive that they had no idea that hordes of men were making a march towards the Khalifa in order to kill him? Was it not their duty to notify the Khalifa and quash the machinations of these individuals?

If the Governors did not try to protect 'Uthman then they are at fault. If 'Uthman refused to accept any help for the governors, then 'Uthman committed suicide, and this cannot constitute martyrdom.

## 2.9 Why did the Sahaba not aid the beleaguered 'Uthman?

Followers of Mu'awiya have given all sorts of proofs for 'Uthman's murder, we leave it to those with open minds to decide whether 'Uthman is to be blamed or the companions, for if 'Uthman asked the companions for help and they did not help him, its their fault. Excuses that Nasibis commonly offer namely that they were on Hajj, or they never envisaged matters getting so out of hand are nothing but lies. We have proved with many references that the Sahaba killed 'Uthman. Hadhrath Ayesha even issued a decree to this effect. To suggest that they were unable to help him or that they had left to go elsewhere, still makes them a party to this crime, for if someone sets fire to someone's home and as then leaves the scene, he still remains guilty for starting the fire.

Suyuti narrates from Zuhri in Tarikh ul Khulafa (English translation page 161-162):

**"I asked said to Said ibn al Mussayab 'Can you tell me how the killing of Uthman was? What people were up to and what he was up to? And why did the companions of Muhammad, may Allah bless him and grant him peace fail to help him? Ibn al Massayab said, Uthman was killed unjustly, whoever killed him was wrong and whoever failed to help him is free of blame'. I said 'How was that?'. He said, 'When Uthman was appointed, a group of the Companions disliked his appointment, because Uthman used to love his people. He ruled people for twelve years. He used to appoint people from Bani Umayyah who had not kept company with the Prophet, may Allah bless him and grant him peace. His Amirs used to produce matters which the Companions of Muhammad; may Allah bless him and grant him peace, would repudiate. 'Uthman used to ask people to have good will for them and he would not remove them"**

## 2.10 Why did 'Uthman not defend himself?

Ansar.org states:

Salamah bin Abdulrahman said that Abu Qutadah Al-Ansari along with another man from Al-Ansar entered upon 'Uthman while he was surrounded. Abu Qutadah asked for the permission to go to Hajj, and 'Uthman gave them the permission. The two men asked, "What should we do if these people attacked you?" 'Uthman answered, "Be with the majority." The two men asked again, "What if the majority was with these people?" 'Uthman answered, "Stay with the majority, wherever it is." Then the two men left 'Uthman's room, and when they were about to leave the house, they saw Al-Hasan bin 'Ali entering. So they followed Al-Hasan wanting to know what Al-Hasan wanted. When Al-Hasan entered upon 'Uthman, he said, "O' Commander of the Faithful! I am under your command, so order me as you wish." 'Uthman answered, "My dear brother's son! Go back, and stay in your home until Allah carries out His order. I do not need the shedding of blood." [Musnad Ahmed, Virtues of the Companions, #753] Ibn Abi Sheibah narrated in his Musnad that Abdullah bin Al-Zubayr said, "I said to 'Uthman at those days, 'Come out and fight them! Allah had given victory to people with less than your men, and I swear by Allah that it is lawful to fight them.' But 'Uthman refused." [Musnaf Abi Sheibah, vol.8, Book of Affliction]. In another version of the same story, Abdullah bin Al-Zubayr said, "Allah have made it lawful for you to fight them!" and 'Uthman answered, "No, by Allah I will never fight them." [Tabaqat Ibn Sa'ad, vol.3, p.70]. Also in Tabaqat Ibn Sa'ad, "And the son of Omar wore his shield twice at that day and held his sword. However, 'Uthman ordered him to leave the house for fear of being killed." [Ibid]Al-Khayyat narrated that Abu Hurayrah said to 'Uthman, "Today, to be killed with you is a nice thing." But 'Uthman answered him, "I order you to leave the house!" [Tareekh Khaleefah Al-Khayyat, p.147, with authentic narrators]. Ibn Abi Sheibah narrated that Ibn Sireen said, "Zaid bin Thabit entered upon 'Uthman and said, 'Here are the Ansars at the door.' And the Ansars said, 'If you wish for us to be Ansar [helpers] to Allah twice.' 'Uthman said, 'No fighting.'" [Al-Musnaf, vol.8, Book of Afflictions, p.682, with authentic narrators]

If we are to accept all of these traditions then we are to believe that the Sahaba had been offered assistance and protection from his evil opponents, but his response was to:

- Return to their homes
- Not fight / cause bloodshed

Whilst Gandhi would have been proud of this type of pacifism, it is clear that if we are indeed to accept this, then it means 'Uthman rejected pledges of support by the Sahaba. If so, why? Islam tells us to protect our livelihood and ourselves by any means possible, failure to do so constitutes suicide, which is a sin. If 'Uthman stopped the companions from helping him, then it was suicide on his part. Protecting oneself is a must, that is why Prophet Muhammad (s) left Mecca for Medina, this being the case why did 'Uthman fail to adopt any steps to protect his life?

Let us think of the facts, we are talking about an individual who:

- has many sons,
- is from a very strong/ powerful family
- has many servants and soldiers to protect him,
- is also incidentally the Caliph, of all the Muslims and who commands authority over the faithful
- has a governor in all the provinces each of whom have large armies that can come at anytime.

Hadhrath 'Uthman was fortunate enough to have all these cards stacked in his favor. Despite this, then why did he not try to protect himself? After all it was not a sudden thing, the siege of 'Uthman's residence went on for many days. He was kept under house arrest for fifty days and then killed in broad daylight, only two options remain:

Either:

he committed suicide; or:

Those present in Madina, (Sahaba, Tabieen etc) were blameworthy, for having failed to assist him in his hour of need.

## 2.11 Did Imams Hasan and Husayn (as) protect 'Uthman?

We the Shi'a do not believe that our Imams had been sent to protect 'Uthman, in fact Tabari tells us that Imam 'Ali (as) had distanced himself from 'Uthman – he wanted nothing further to do with him.

As evidence we have the testimony of Imam 'Ali (as) in his response to one of Mu'awiya's letters prior to the Battle of Sifeen. We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah's authority work Akhbar al Taweel page 173 that Imam Ali (as) wrote to Mu'awiya stating:

**"...Khaulani has brought your letter to me. You have written that I deserted Uthman and incited people against him. I did no such thing, when the people became dissatisfied with the Khalifa some withdrew support to him, while others killed him, while I remained confined to my home and kept myself aloof from his affairs".**

This being the case why would he have sent his sons to protect a man that he no longer wanted anything to do with!

Ansar.org states:

Jabbir bin Abdullah said, "‘Ali sent a letter to ‘Uthman saying, ‘I have 500 men, so give me the permission to defend you from these people, otherwise things would happen that they would kill you.’ ‘Uthman answered, ‘May Allah reward you for your good intentions, but I do not want blood to be shed for my cause.’"  
[Tareekh Damascus, p.403], ‘

If Imam ‘Ali (as) had 500 men on standby then can Abu Sulaiman kindly explain why Imam ‘Ali (as) only sent his sons to protect frail ‘Uthman? Think about logically, your friend’s house has been surrounded by hundreds of angry men demanding his blood. Something needs to be done, your friend needs to be protected. You have access to 500 men to protect your friend, rather than do so you felt that two shall suffice to fight off the mob, does this make sense?

Ansar.org states:

Moreover, the sons of ‘Ali and the sons of the Companions participated in the defense of ‘Uthman. Muhamed bin Sireen said, "‘Al-Hasan, Al-Hussain, Ibn Omar, Ibn Al-Zubayr, and Marwan rushed to the house of ‘Uthman raising their swords. ‘Uthman told them. ‘I order you to go back home, put your swords in their shields, and stay at home.’" [Tareekh Khaleefah Al-Khayyat, p.174]Kunanah, the slave of Safiyah, said, "I witnessed the murder of ‘Uthman. Four young men from Quraysh were taken out from ‘Uthman’s house. These young men were covered by blood, and they were defending ‘Uthman may Allah be pleased at him; Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali, Abdullah bin Al-Zubayr, Muhamed bin Hatib, and Marwan bin Hakam." [A’asr Al-Khilafah Al-Rashidah by Akram Diya’a Al-Umari, p.390. Al-Umari said that the hadeeth was narrated in Al-Estia’ab with a good authentication]

In this tradition Imam Hasan (as) and Marwan are alleged to have protected ‘Uthman. This conflicts with history due to the fact that when Mu’awiya rebelled against Imam ‘Ali (as) he was accusing Imam ‘Ali (as) of having a hand in the murder. Marwan was one of the key advisers of Mu’awiya and toed the same propaganda line.

Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah Muhammad bin Yahya Ibn Bakr in Tamheed page 181 had quoted the fact that Marwan had accused Imam ‘Ali (as) of killing Uthman stating:

**“If you ‘Ali had not struck the murdered man openly, you surely struck him in secret”.**

How could Nasibis such as Marwan have sustained such a lie when as Abu Sulaiman would like us believe that Imam Hasan (as) was standing with him so as to protect ‘Uthman? If this was true then there is no way that Marwan would have been able to mislead supporters into believing Imam ‘Ali (as) had a hand in ‘Uthman’s killing!

Ansar.org states:

Al-Masoudi, the Shi’a historian, narrates in his book Murooj Al-Thahab, "When ‘Ali was told that they [the rebels] wanted to kill him [‘Uthman], he sent his two sons Al-Hasan and Al-Hussain along with his slaves with weapons to ‘Uthman to support him. ‘Ali ordered them to defend ‘Uthman. Al-Zubayr sent his son Abdullah, Talha sent his son Muhamed, and the vast majority of

the Companions' sons were sent by their fathers. They prevented the rebels from entering the house." [Murooj Al-Thahab, vol.2, p.344]

Only a Nasibi has the type of distorted logic to suggest that an individual that praises Ahl'ul bayt (as) is Shi'a. It might be difficult for a Nasibi (who in previous writings had extolled his Imam Yazeed) to understand this but actual Sunnis also have love for Imam 'Ali (as). Al Masudi is a recognized Sunni scholar, this is an established fact, Abu Sulaiman is either ignorant or intentionally lying, judging from his exploits in previous articles the latter seems to be the more stronger option!

Would Imams of Ahl'ul Sunnah, past and present be heaping praise on a rafidi writer? Hanafi scholar Allamah Shibli Numani states clearly in al Faruq (English translation Volume 1 page 9 that:

**"...Masudi (died 386 Hijri) is the 'Father of History'. Islam has not produced a historian equal to him in comprehensive information and width of thought...Has all his historical works been extant, all other attempts in this direction would have been regarded as superfluous, but it is a pity that owing to the corrupted taste of the Muslim nations most of his books are not extant now. Occidental research has, after considerable scrutiny and labor, been able to discover two of his books, namely Muruj-ud-Dhahab and Kitab al Tanbih wal-Ashraf. The former has been printed in Egypt".**

Even if for arguments sake we were to accept that Imam Hasan (as) and Imam Hussain (as) were in 'Uthman's quarters, then we would argue that their presence would have only been to protect women and children inside, not 'Uthman. It is a religious duty to ensure that women and children are not harmed. If Imam 'Ali (as) mediated to ensure that food and water was sent to 'Uthman's house, it was to ensure the well being of the women and children inside, what would be the harm in sending water and food for the children?

It is indeed amusing that Abu Sulaiman had claimed in his opening to his defense of 'Uthman:

Ansar.org states:

Every sane man would have no doubts that the killers of 'Uthman were not the Companions. The Companions, may Allah be pleased at them, did not participate in this murder, nor did they approve of it. On the contrary, the Companions defended him and stood by 'Uthman's side.

If this was indeed true as Abu Sulaiman would lead us to believe then it would in effect suggest that ALL the Sahaba stood shoulder to shoulder protecting 'Uthman from the Sabaites and Egyptians. This would suggest the presence of hundreds of thousands of Sahaba protecting 'Uthman. This being the case how is that a group of rebels were able to penetrate through these loyal defenders and kill the Khalifa? If we are to accept the traditions that Abu Sulaiman had cited not more than 5 individuals are mentioned, clearly this does not constitute all the Sahaba so where were they? Why were they not defending 'Uthman as Abu Sulaiman claims?

## 2.12 List of 'Uthman's Murderers and an Invitation to Truth

Following is the list of people who are involved in the murder of 'Uthman.

1. Ayesha

2. Talha and Zubayr
3. Abdur Rahman-ibn-Adees
4. Abu Lahan Mazani
5. People of Medina
6. Ansar of Madina
7. Muhajireen of Madina.
8. Momineen and Muslimeen
9. Children of companions

This is the harsh reality. The works of Ahl'ul Sunnah have identified these assailants for their hand in 'Uthman's killing whether by word or actions they were his killers. Sadly this contradicts the majority view that all the Sahaba are just, whoever of them you follow will be guided – hence Abu Sulaiman seeks to gloss over these facts and identifies other killers of 'Uthman.

### 3. Identifying the usual suspects

Ansar.org states:

However, the people who rebelled against 'Uthman are of two kinds:a. The followers of Abdullah bin Saba'a the Jew. Ibn Saba'a tried to misguide Muslims. He travelled to Hijaz, Basrah, Kufah, until he was expelled from Al-Sham. Then he got into Egypt. He lived there and established the doctrine of Raja'ah. He claimed that the successor to the Prophet peace be upon him was 'Ali. Lots of people in Egypt were misguided because of him. Then Ibn Saba'a sent his missionaries to different parts of the Islamic world. He also wrote secret letters to some people to collaborate on killing 'Uthman, and they are the second kind.

This is the favorite bogey man figure for the Ahl'ul Sunnah. In a murder case, the testimony of the affected is very important, 'Uthman himself claimed in Al Tabaqat Al Kubra that he was murdered by Momineen, and Nayla, the wife of 'Uthman told us who these Momineen are, and she stated these Momineen were from Madina, including Ansar, Muhajireen, Talha and Zubayr. Moreover, the testimony of neighbors and others is crucial in a murder case. In 'Uthman's murder case, people had testified that Amr bin Aas, Ayesha, Talha, Zubayr and people from both Muhajireen and Ansar murdered him. Neither Uthman nor Naila blamed Ibn Saba for inciting hatred that led to his overthrow. Their testimonies seem to be mysteriously devoid of Ibn Saba. Such a lack of witness testimony is comprehensive proof that this is a lie that Ibn Saba has been produced as a means of diverting attention away from the true killers of 'Uthman.

#### 3.1 Analyzing the isnad concerning the Ibn Saba report

Whilst Nasibi have sought to blame Ibn Saba and his followers for his murder, to date no research has proved the identity of Ibn Saba. If the Nasibi will point out the existence of the name of Ibn Saba from Sunni / Shi'a sources, the onus is on Abu Sulaiman to produce a full authentic chain setting out that Ibn Saba existed and his activities against 'Uthman that led to his killing. Worthy of note is that Abu Sulaiman simply makes a comment without even citing a reference, why? Simple for he knows that the moment he mentions the Ibn Saba of Sunni texts who led the rebellion against 'Uthman then the chain of narrators will be proven as fraudulent or non-existent.

We challenge Nasibi Abu Sulaiman to verify his claim. Show us with a complete isnad from the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah the evil machinations of Ibn Saba who in his own words:

1. Traveled to Hijaz, Basrah, Kufah, until he was expelled from Al-Sham.
2. Arrived in Egypt preaching the doctrine of Raja'ah.
3. Claimed that the successor to the Prophet peace be upon him was 'Ali. Lots of people in Egypt were misguided because of him.
4. Sent his missionaries to different parts of the Islamic world. He also wrote secret letters to some people to collaborate on killing 'Uthman, and they are the second kind.

The fact is the sole individual that quotes the role of Ibn Saba against 'Uthman in the manner that Abu Sulaiman had cited is Tabari. Nasibi such as Ibn Kathir of course grasped on to this and quoted these same references blindly. Unfortunately for Abu Sulaiman the basis of this argument falls apart when we examine the chain of narrators that Tabari had used. Let us delve into the report:

**"It was was transmitted to me in writing by al-Sari-Shuhayb-Sayf-Atiyah-Yazid al-Faqasi: Abdallah b. Saba, was a Jew from San'a, and his mother was a black woman. He converted to Islam in the time of 'Uthman, then roamed about the lands of the Muslims attempting to lead them into error. He began in the Hijaz and then [worked] successively in Basrah, Kufah, and Syria. He was unable to work his will upon a single one of the Syrians; they drove him out and he came to Egypt. He settled among the Egyptians, saying to them among other things, "How strange it is that some people claim that Jesus will return [to the earth], while denying that Muhammad will return, Now Almighty God has said, 'He who has ordained the Qur'an for thee shall surely restore thee to a place of return'. Now Muhammad is more worthy than Jesus to return... This gained the approval [of his listeners] and so he fabricated for them [the notion of] the Return [raj'ah] and they discussed it amongst themselves. Later on (Ibn Saba) said to them, Verily there have been a thousand Prophets (nabi); every Prophet has an executor (wasi) and "Ali was the executor of Muhammad". He continued, "Muhammad is the seal of prophets and 'Ali is the seal of executors". Then after that he said, "Who commits a greater wrong than a man who has not carried out the testament of the Messenger of God, who has attacked the executor of the Messenger of God, and who has usurped power over the Community?" Then he told them "Verily 'Uthman has taken it without right, while this one [that is "Ali] is the executor of the Messenger of God. Therefore champion this cause and set it going. Begin by censuring your governors. Proclaiming publicly the commanding of good and the forbidding of evil and you will win over the people. Summon them to this cause.**

**Then he dispersed his agents and wrote to those whom he had corrupted in the garrison towns. They returned his correspondence and secretly preached their notions [to others].**

(Taken from History of Tabari [English translation] Volume 15 page 145-147).

The first name in this chain of narrators is al Sari. At some points Tabari refers to him as Sari at others he cites him as Sari bin Yahbee. Dhahabi in Meezan al Itidal Volume 2 pages 117-118 (Egypt edition) states:

**"He has been mentioned as Sari, some have cited him as Sari bin Yahbee. He was born 57 years before Tabari, no one other than him was known by the name Sari".**

Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, Ibn Hajr Asqalani states Ihsan al Meezan makes no reference on the authority of Sari. In his other work Tadheeb al Itidal Volume 3 page 459 whilst discussing narrators that Tabari used, he states:

**"Sari bin Ismail Hamdani was a resident of Ibn Aam, Ibn Jareer and others narrated hadith from him...there are some that deem Sari to be a liar and did not narrate traditions from him, Umar bin 'Ali stated 'I had never heard Abdul Rahman cite anything on the authority of Sari bin Ismail. Saleh bin Ahmad bin Hanbal cites on the authority of his father that his [Sari's] testimony is unreliable. Ibn Moeen, Ibn Hatim, Jauzjani, Abu Daud, Nasai, Ibn Adi and Ibn Hajjan stated that Sari was unreliable, Ibn Jareer took narrations from him". (Tafseel Tadheeb al Itidal Volume 3 pages 459-460).**

Another individual whom Tabari narrated this tradition from is Sayf bin Umar. Dhahabi citing the comments of Allamah Jarrah states:

**"Abu Daud stated that his narrations bear no vale, Ibn Habban had declared him to be a Zindeeq (transgressor), Ibn Adi states his normal hadith were false" (Meezan al Itidal Volume 2 pages 205-206, printed in Egypt)**

### 3.2 An appeal to logic

Rather than jump onto the Shi'a attacking band wagon we would urge the Ahl'ul Sunnah to use some logic. If Ibn Saba was indeed that powerful, why didn't 'Uthman curb his power? Why didn't 'Uthman try to get Ibn Saba arrested? The texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah are clear that Ibn Saba misled Abu Dharr who became his advocate. 'Uthman took a very tough line against Abu Dharr, by sending him into exile, where he died - so why not apprehend the ringleader and banish him in a similar fashion? Does it make sense that 'Uthman had allowed Ibn Saba to roam freely through the Islamic State where he took the opportunity to cook up dissension against the Khalifa. One should not forget that Ibn Saba's presence was under 'Uthman's Nasibi cousin Mu'awiya. Is it believable that the nefarious activities were happening under the nose of Mu'awiya and he was just allowing it to continue? If Mu'awiya had the determination to arrest and deport Abu Dharr, why did he leave Ibn Saba alone? The fact is the activities concerning whipping up opposition to 'Uthman, was the same as that committed by the Sahaba. 'Uthman was not killed by Ibn-Saba, nor did he hatch any conspiracies. Try and deny it they might, but the fact is the Sahaba killed 'Uthman with the lead perpetrators being none other than Ayesha, Talha, Zubayr and Amr bin Aas. We had cited early that Uthman's wife have eyewitness testimony where she had implicated the Sahaba of Madina in raising the calls to kill Uthman. If Ibn Saba and his supporters were the murders of 'Uthman, then how is it that Nayla fails to mention his name in the events that led to the death of her husband? To suggest that the Sabaites (early Shi'a) were involved in this act is nothing but lies spread by the followers of Mu'awiya. These three key characters, who were involved in the murder of 'Uthman are not "family of Ibn Saba", rather they are the relatives of Abu Bakr, Ayesha being his daughter, and the other two being his sons-in-law and Alhamdulillah none of them were Shi'as. Despite their actions these same individuals proceeded to incite dissension and go to war against Imam 'Ali (as) demanding vengeance for blood that had themselves shed!

What sort of justice is Abu Sulaiman portraying? A legal system that allows the actual killers to go free preferring to place the problems at the door of a fictitious bogey man? To suggest a lone Jew was able to mislead the people including the prominent Sahaba Abu Dharr to such an extent that they were hypnotized into believing his cause and were able to create a revolution so powerful that no one could stop not even the Islamic army is ridiculous. Was Ibn Saba a super power that was able to single handedly defy a Khalifa - who had the victories of Iran and Iraq to his belt, so much so that Ibn Saba could mount opposition and have 'Uthman killed in broad daylight with no one saying a word against him? It is the duty of any Government to maintain a strict vigil on all / any deviant elements in society, but 'Uthman did not perform this duty, he simply allowed Ibn Saba, the Jew, to run havoc in his reign. What happened to Ibn-Saba for the murder of 'Uthman? Was he swallowed by earth or he did he ascend in to the clouds? He did not get killed in either Jamal war or Siffeen war. Even during the reign of Mu'awiya, he wasn't killed. Ibn-Saba is a fictional character, which was cooked up to hide the real culprits of 'Uthman's murder. It is a tactical ploy to hide the fact that the true killers of Uthman were the Sahaba.

#### 3.2.1. The Sahaba wrote to people inciting them to rise up against 'Uthman

On Ibn Saba's activities, Abu Sulaiman claims that:

Ansar.org states:

He also wrote secret letters to some people to collaborate on killing 'Uthman, and they are the second kind.

The fact is the Sahaba had written letters inciting uprising against 'Uthman. We read in al Imama wa al Siyasa, page 64, that when Talha and Ayesha reached Basra, a man approached Talha and said:

**"O Talha, Do you recognize this letter?" Talha answered, "Yes" to which the man**

**said' "Don't you feel ashamed that only a few days earlier, you wrote letters to us inciting us to kill 'Uthman and now you ask to revenge his blood?"**

Baladhuri in Ansab al Ashraf Volume 2 pages 229-230 similarly records that upon his arrival in Basra demanding vengeance for 'Uthman, Abdullah bin Hakim al Tamimi produced by Talha inciting opposition to 'Uthman that Talha acknowledged that he had written.

In Iqd al Farid, Page 218, Volume 6, it is written that Marwan told Ayesha that **"'Uthman was killed on account of your letters**

Talha and Ayesha were not the only individuals to write letters, rather the Sahaba living in Madina had become disillusioned with Uthman and encouraged those Sahaba in other provinces to come to Madina and oppose Uthman. As proof we present al Tabari, English version, v15, p184 who narrates on the authority of Ibn Ishaq:

**"When the people saw what Uthman was doing, the companions of the Prophet in Medina wrote to other companions who were scattered throughout the frontier provinces: "You have gone forth but to struggle in the path of Almighty God, for the sake of Muhammad's religion. In your absence the religion of Muhammad has been corrupted and forsaken. So come back to reestablish Muhammad's religion." Thus, they came from every direction until they killed the Caliph (Uthman)".**

So Companions wrote the letters and the murder was committed by companions. If followers of Mu'awiya claim that fake letters were sent, then why did the Sahaba not distance themselves from their contents? Why did they not set the record straight and deny their authorship? Does their silence clearly not prove their acceptance of the claim that had been put to them?

### **3.3 Suspect two – the Egyptians**

A revolution of this scale requires planning strategy and widespread support. Are we really going to believe a band of rebels were able to organize themselves in such a way as to mount armed opposition to the Khalifa by entering Madina and taking control of the city under the noses of the Banu Umayyada leadership and all the Sahaba who as Abu Sulaiman would like us to believe were standing beside 'Uthman supporting him? So much strength / opposition by a rabble of misfits? No revolution to overthrow a leader is based on the activities of a handful of individuals in a region it requires grass root support at all levels. A movement to topple any leader of a State requires:

1. Widespread support
2. The support of the local population
3. Support of influential figures to give the movement some credibility

This movement could never have been achieved without the support of prominent Sahaba whose voices carried influence and would never have been achieved without the tacit support of the Sahaba living in Madina. Rebellions of this scale can only be achieved when support exists in the city where a leader resides. This is common sense. An individual living in Beirut may be opposed to King Fahad in Madina. Mass opposition and overthrow can only be achieved if these same individuals can convince those living in Riyadh to join them in the struggle. Similarly whilst we have no doubt that the aggrieved Egyptians rebelled against 'Uthman, you can NOT eliminate the fact that amongst this group were the sons of the Sahaba and Sahaba who were giving their tactical support to the movement.

#### **3.3.1. The Sahaba and their children colluded with the Egyptians to kill 'Uthman**

We read in Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 385, Dhikr Fadail 'Uthman:

**"When the Egyptian forces landed at "Ghafa" and began to talk ill of 'Uthman**

**'Uthman, 'Uthman got to know about it and climbed on the pulpit and said, "O Sahaba of Prophet Muhammad (s), May Allah curse you for bad mouthing me. You advertised my shortcomings and concealed my virtues. You have also provoked people against me.**

We read in al Bidayah Volume 7 page 170 Chapter Dhik Qathal 'Uthman:

**In Egypt, a group was formed by the children of the Sahaba that would to incite people to rise up against 'Uthman. Their leader was Muhammad bin-Abu Bakr, son of Abu Bakr the Khalifa, Muhammad bin Abi Hudhifa was the second in command, he was the cousin of Mu'awiya.**

### **3.3.2. A Sahaba that pledged allegiance under the tree of Ridhwan commanded the Egyptian rebels**

**"Sahaba of Prophet Muhammad (s), Abdur-Rahman-bin-Adlees was present at the time of "Hudabia" peace treaty, and he was also present at the "allegiance under the tree", "Allegiance of Rizwan", and he was the commander of the group that came from Egypt and surrounded the house of 'Uthman and killed him".**

This comment has been taken from the following four books of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Al Istiab Volume 2 page 203 Dhikr Abdul Rahman Ibn Adlees
2. Asadul Ghaybah Volume 3 page 444 Dhikr Ibn Adlees
3. Al Isaba fi Marifathul Sahaba Volume 2 page 403
4. Muruj al Dhahab Volume 2 page 352 Dhikr 'Uthman

We learn in Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 7 page 179 Dhikr Maqathil 'Uthman:

**"After killing 'Uthman his murderers tried to remove his head and 'Uthman's daughter and two wives began to scream and shout and beat their faces. Abdul Rahman Ibn Adlees said 'leave 'Uthman in this state and they left him.**

### **3.4 Mu'awiya's cousin Muhammad bin Abi Hudhifa played a lead role alongside the Egyptians in killing 'Uthman**

We read in al Istiab Volume page 322 Dhikr Muhammad bin Abi Hudhifa:

**"The lead figure in inciting people against 'Uthman was Muhammad bin Abi Hudhifa, 'Uthman raised him for many years after his father had died. When people began to oppose 'Uthman, Muhammad incited the Egyptians, and this worsened the situation".**

We read in Asadul Ghaybah Volume 5 page 87 and Al Isaba fi Marifathul Sahaba Chapter "Dhikr Muhammad bin Abi Hudhifa":

**"The individual that was most responsible for inciting people against 'Uthman was Muhammad bin Abi Hudhifa, he was the son of Mu'awiya's maternal uncle".**

### **3.5 Talha advised the Egyptians during the siege of 'Uthman's palace**

Whilst the Egyptians had surrounded 'Uthman's home, the presence of prominent Sahaba on the ground is what gave their opposition momentum. Talha was present outside 'Uthman's residence during the siege.

**Qays bin Abi Hadhim al Baj'ali narrates that a man had visited Talha during the siege and requested that he intervene to prevent the death of 'Uthman. Talha**

**replied "No by Allah, not until the Banu Ummayya surrender the right on their own accord".** (Tareekh Damishq, by Ibn Asakr, Chapter "'Uthman" page 407)

Not only was Talha present at the time of the siege he was co-operating with one of the leaders of the Egyptian rebels Ibn Udays.

Tabari narrates from Abdullah bin Ayyash:

"I entered 'Uthman's presence and talked with him for an hour. He said, Come Ibn Ayyah, and he took me by the hand and had me listen to what the people at his door were saying. We heard some say, "What are you waiting for" while others were saying "Wait perhaps he will repent". While the two of us were standing there, Talha bin Ubaydullah passed by; he stopped and said "Where is Ibn Udays?" He was told, "He is over there". Ibn Udays came over to (Talha) and whispered something to him, then he went back to his comrades, "Do not let anyone go in to see this man or leave his house".

**'Uthman said to me, "These are Talha bin Ubaydullah's orders". He continued: "Oh God protect me from Talha b. Ubaydullah, for he has incited all these people against me".**

(Taken from History of Tabari, English translation Volume 15 page 199)

So this narration's makes it absolutely clear that Talha was they key adviser to one of the Egyptian leaders – to the extent that they were heeding his advice on how to act. Interesting is also 'Uthman's admission that the presence of the people at 'Uthman door was due to Talha's incitement – he placed the blame squarely on the shoulders of Talha. Whose opinion should we give greater credence to, Abu Sulaiman's or that of the victim 'Uthman?

Talha was the key figure guiding the Egyptians, he had ensured that all methods, no matter how extreme were used to pressure Uthman into abdicating his post, this included the action of cutting off water to Uthman. Naturally this fact is deeply embarrassing to 'Abu Sulaiman who states confidently:

Ansar.org states:

"It is an obvious lie that Talha and Al-Zubair surrounded Uthman and prevented him from reaching to water. Where is the authentic attribution? And what reference did Al-Tijani rely on? I challenge him to bring to light one single authentic reference about that!"

The only thing that is 'obvious' is the fact that Abu Sulaiman failed to do some homework before making such a claim! Had he done he would have steered away from such a challenge. For the purposes of his humiliation, allow us to present this fact from Tarikh al-Tabari, English version, Volume 15, pages 180-181

**"Abdurrahman Ibn al-Aswad said: "I constantly saw Ali avoiding (Uthman) and not acting as he formerly had. However, I know that he spoke with Talha when Uthman was under siege, to the effect that water skins should be taken to him. Ali was extremely upset (from Talha) about that until finally water skins were allowed to reach Uthman"**

So 'Abu Sulaiman in light of this reference could you answer these questions:

1. If Talha had nothing to do with this action, then why did Imam 'Ali (as) approach Talha directly requesting that water be sent out to Uthman?

2. Could Imam 'Ali (as) not have approached one of the Egyptians, if they were responsible?
3. If Talha had no association with this cruel act, then why was Imam 'Ali (as) angry with him?
4. If Talha had no association with the rebels then how is it that water was allowed to reach Uthman AFTER Imam 'Ali (as) remonstrated with Talha?

## 4. Did 'Uthman die a 'martyr'?

Ansar.org states:

However, 'Uthman feared affliction, so he prevented the Companions from defending him, and he knew that he would be killed unjustly as the Prophet peace be upon him informed him. Abdullah bin Omar may Allah be pleased at him narrated from the Prophet peace be upon him that the Prophet said, "And this man –'Uthman- (in the affliction) would be killed unjustly." [Sunan Al-Turmithi, Book of Virtues, #3708, look also Saheeh Al-Turmithi # 2924] Al-Bukhari narrated in his Saheeh that Abu Mousa Al-Ash'ari narrated that the Prophet peace be upon him said, "Let him ('Uthman) in, and give him the glad tidings of entering Paradise after a calamity that befalls him." [Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Book of the Virtues of the Companions, Chapter the Virtues of 'Uthman bin Affan # 3492]... "When 'Uthman was about to enter upon the Prophet peace be upon him, the Prophet peace be upon him asked Abu Mousa Al-Ash'ari, "Go open the door for him and give him the glad tidings of entering heaven after an affliction that befalls him." So Abu Mousa opened the door and it was 'Uthman, and he told 'Uthman what the Prophet peace be upon him had just said. 'Uthman said, "O' Allah! Grant me patience." [Sunan Al-Turmithi, hadeeth # 3710, Saheeh Al-Bukhari # 3492] Ahmed also narrated in his book that the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him mentioned a great affliction. Then a masked man in a piece of clothe passed by. The Prophet peace be upon him said, "This man – the masked man – will be on the true side (in that affliction)." Ka'ab bin Ojrah ran fast and caught the masked man from behind and said, "Is this the man you are talking about O' Messenger of Allah?" The Prophet peace be upon him answered, "Yes." And that man was 'Uthman bin Affan. [Virtues of the Companions, by Ahmed, vol. 1, p. 450, with an authentic chain of narrators]. And after all this, does Al-Tijani think that 'Uthman's Ijtihads were false? And they were the reasons for the rebellion?

Abu Sulaiman had sought to prove from these narration's that in the uprising against 'Uthman he:

- was treading the right path
- exercised correct ijtihaad
- would be a martyr.

One needs to recognize that nothing happens in this world without a cause, this is human nature. Events in the world are preceded by causes – people react to causes in different ways. The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah past and present have analyzed the events that led up to the killing of 'Uthman, and many have been highly critical of his actions and have admitted that it was his decisions that led to rebellion and his murder. They have made it clear that opposition was based upon his incorrect ijtihaad's.

In connection with the murder of 'Uthman, the prophecy of Hadhrath Umar is indeed worthy of note. Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah, al Muhaddith Shah Waliyullah Dehlavi states that when Umar was asked why he did not appoint 'Uthman as his successor he replied:

**“If I make him the Khalifa he shall thrust the Bani Abi Moit to rule over the people, and they shall oppress the people. The result will be that the people will rise against him and kill him”.** (Izalatul Khifa Volume 1 page 618).

So according to Umar’s own observation ‘Uthman’s appointment of Banu Mo’it (Banu Ummaya Clan) over the people would lead to their oppressing the people, that would lead to revolt and ‘Uthman’s murder. This clearly proves that Umar had not heard of these hadith traditions pertaining to the supreme merits of ‘Uthman, if he had then why was he able to see such faults in ‘Uthman that would lead to revolt against him and his death. Umar did not deem opposition against ‘Uthman as unlawful, rather he said it was a reaction to oppression by ‘Uthman’s family and THIS was the pivotal factor that would lead to his death.

Umar’s prediction was right and many leading Sahaba opposed ‘Uthman, some abandoned him, some opposed him vocally others joined the Egyptians in the movement against him and lay siege to his home.

Modern Egyptian Sunni academic Taha Hussain in al Fitnahth’ul Kubra (Urdu translation) page 259 testifies to this fact stating:

**“Historians have recorded in the events of 34 Hijri that the treatment meted against the people by ‘Uthman worse its worst. The Sahaba having observed but no one save a small number of Sahaba such as Zayd bin Thabit, Abu Usayd Sai’idi, Kalb bin Malice and Ahsan bin Thabit stopped anyone nor offered and form of defense. The Sahaba in Madina wrote to fellow Sahaba spread in different regions stating “Come to Madina and see how the Khilafath is getting worse. You have left your homes so as to participate in jihad, when jihad is behind you. Return to Madina for the sake of safety and for the preservation of religion. Power has become the greatest threat to religion”.**

So we learn:

1. People were being maltreated during ‘Uthman’s reign. This completely tallies up with ‘Uthman’s prediction.
2. The Sahaba wrote the their fellow comrades spread throughout the region on Jihad campaigns, and told them to return and address the issue of Khailfath as power was overtaking the deen. This jihad was SUPERIOR to fighting infidels.

Taha Hussain also adds these important points:

**“I am led to believe that in Madina itself were people who were aiding and siding with the rebels, they called them, encouraged them and told them of the aims of the Sahaba. They had told them that there was peace and tranquility in Madina but when the palace was besieged they sided with the rebels”**

al Fitnahth’ul Kubra (Urdu translation) page 259

Umar’s opinion that if ‘Uthman was made the Khalifa he would thrust Banu Mo’it over the people who would oppress the Muslims that would lead to opposition came true. The Sahaba sickened by the events deemed ‘Uthman leadership to be tyrannical which is why they deemed his remaining in power to be a threat to the religion. Their writing to the Mujahideen to abandon Jihad and focus their attention on Madina as a means of preserving / protecting the deen is clear proof that ‘Uthman did not die as an oppressed martyr rather his incorrect policies / ijthahds that the Sahaba deemed to be a threat to the religion.

Ansar.org states:

Al-Hakim narrated in Al-Mustadrak and Ahmed narrated in Al-Fada’el that Abu Hurayrah asked for permission to talk in front of

'Uthman when 'Uthman was surrounded. 'Uthman gave him the permission. Then Abu Hurayrah stood up, praised Allah, and said, "I heard the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him saying, 'After I am gone, you will suffer afflictions and differences.' One of the men asked the Prophet peace be upon him, 'What we ought to do then O' Messenger of Allah?' The Prophet peace be upon him answered, 'Stay close to the faithful man and his companions.' And the Prophet peace be upon him meant 'Uthman." [Virtues of the Companions, By Ahmed bin Hanbal, vol. 1, p. 451, with an authentic chain of narrators]

First and foremost if this hadith is indeed true how is it that a prominent wife of the Prophet (s) had never heard of it? She did not claim that 'Uthman would be killed unjustly, on the contrary she said that he should be killed because he had become a kaafir! The Sahaba likewise played a pivotal role in opposing 'Uthman and killing him – if this hadith was indeed true then how is it that the Sahaba still insisted on opposing, oppressing and killing 'Uthman? We have proven in our previous chapters and of course having cited the extracts of Taha Hussain's work that many of the Sahaba were opposed to 'Uthman. If the Sahaba were aware of this hadith does it seem believable that they would have continued in their opposition and sided with the rebels? Worthy of note is the fact that Baladhuri in Ansab al Ashraf Volume 5 page 76 notes that, when the Sahaba Mujammi bin Jarriya al Awsi passed by Talha (during the siege), Talha asked how 'Uthman was, Mujammi replied "I think that you will kill him". Talha replied:

**"If he should be killed, he is neither an angel brought close (to Allah) nor a Prophet (sent by him)".**

It is clear here from Talha's statement that he had no regrets should 'Uthman die, for he did not have an esteemed rank in the eyes of Allah (swt). Could Talha make such a comment if he was aware that Rasulallah (s) said he would die a martyr that would attain paradise?

Worthy of note are the words in this alleged hadith 'Stay close to the faithful man and his companions.' One of these companions as admitted by Abu Sulaiman was Marwan. How could Rasulallah(s) have told his followers to stay close to Marwan when Rasulallah (s) had condemned, cursed and abandoned him? It is illogical to even entertain the thought that Rasulallah (s) would ask the Sahaba to support at the time of opposition that individual who he had condemned and banished from Madina for life.

#### **4.1 'Uthman's body was unattended for three days. Companions' not burying him proves that they did not deem him to be a martyr**

This fact can be found in the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 7 Page 190.
2. Al Istiab Page 80, Dhikr 'Uthman.
3. Hayaat ul Haywaan Volume 1 Page 78, Chapter Al Awaz.
4. Tareekh-wa-Awdeh Manqul-az-Tashdeed Al Mutaan Page 220.
5. Sharh Muqassid Volume 2 Page 295, 2.

We read in Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya Volume 7 Page 190:

**'Uthman's body remained unattended for three days after his murder, the Sahaba did not bury him.**

We read in Al Istiab Page 80, Dhikr 'Uthman.

**“Three days after the murder, 'Uthman's body remained unattended near rubbish, and the Sahaba did not bury him.**

We read in Hayaat ul Haywaan Volume 1 Page 78, Chapter Al Awaz.

**“Body of 'Uthman remained unburied for three days”.**

All these narration's show that after his murder, 'Uthman's body remained unattended for three days, neither did anyone take measures to bury him nor was his funeral read. If 'Uthman was innocent and martyr as these hadith would lead us to believe, then could someone be so kind as to explain why NONE of the Sahaba felt it necessary to bury this martyr? Clearly the attitude at that time was that the Sahaba were so resentful of 'Uthman that they did not even deem him to be worthy of a decent burial.

No doubt advocates such as Abu Sulaiman will offer the customary excuse that the Sahaba were frightened and had taken to seeking refuge in their homes, and the murderers were so powerful that they were not allowing anyone to get near 'Uthman's corpse. Such excuses are as weak as Abu Sulaiman's articles! The fact is it is obligatory to bury a Muslim after performing the obligatory funeral rituals. So advocates of Mu'awiya would have to decide between one of these three options. Did the Sahaba:

1. Not deem 'Uthman to be worthy of a burial?
2. Fail to perform an obligatory act, thus making them all sinners?
3. Adopt taqiyya fearing for their lives? So if companions can perform Taqiya, then does this not prove that all Muslims can do so in times of danger?

Some will assert that the Sahaba did not bury 'Uthman as they were helpless and to abandon an obligatory act when helpless does not constitute a sin. To those content with such an excuse let us look at the reality on the ground. There is no evidence to suggesting Madina was attacked by the marauding armies of Alexander the great, forcing people to practice taqiyya in their homes and leave 'Uthman's body unattended! The advocates of the Sahaba will need to make a hard choice, the Sahaba had either committed a sin by failing to bury 'Uthman, or they adopted taqiyya, now its up to the followers of Mu'awiya to decide which option they want to believe in.

The harsh fact is that the Sahaba were disaffected with 'Uthman and cared little about burying him. Is it believable that every single Sahaba in Madina adopted taqiyya and left 'Uthman's body to the forces and nature?

Some state that the Sahaba did not envisage that 'Uthman would be killed, but such a notion is absurd! When Ayesha issued a decree that 'Uthman be murdered, then clearly the words of the influential wife of Rasulullah (s) would not just fall on deaf ears!

According to Nayla the wife of 'Uthman, their house remained surrounded for fifty days. Clearly the seriousness of the situation would have dawned on all. To suggest that the Egyptians and Bedouins had become so powerful that they had in fact imposed a curfew over the residents of Madina prohibiting people from leaving or entering (this included the Governors armies from other provinces) under these conditions is simply not plausible. Abu Sulaiman cites traditions that would suggest only four or five had entered 'Uthman's residents in order to protect him. The fact that they could enter proves that there was no curfew and the Sahaba could see 'Uthman as and when they please. This being the case could Abu Sulaiman enlighten his faithful as to why only a handful of Sahaba felt that Khalifa was worthy of protection? If Madina was full of Sahaba why did they not come to the aid of the stranded khalifa?

## **4.2 Some questions in relation to Uthman's funeral**

Could Ansar be so kind as to answer the following questions (we would like to see answers from authentic texts accompanied by a complete Sahih isnad):

1. Who conducted the ghusl of the slain khalifa?
2. Which individuals participated in the Funeral prayers?
3. Which Sahaba had the 'honor' of leading the funeral prayers?
4. What was the total number of people that participated in the funeral prayer
5. Where were these momentous prayers conducted?

## 5. Virtues of Uthman in Sunni books

We shall now seek to raise some questions and list the lid on the high status afforded to Hadhrath Uthman in the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah.

### 5.1 Ansar's appraisal of Uthman

Ansar.org states:

Uthman bin Affan, the man of two lights, his wives were Ruqayyah and Umm Kalthum, the two daughters of the Prophet peace be upon him, and the brother-in-law of Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased at him.

It is indeed amusing that Nasibi's whether they be Salafi or Deobandi have an aqeedah that Rasulullah (s) was not created from Nur (Light) – as Nur is not the composition of a human being and Rasulullah (s) was human like us. At the same time they give Uthman the title "Dhur Nurayn" possessor of two lights – how can this be when no human can constitute Nur?

We also have some questions for Ansar on this very topic:

1. If Uthman was indeed "the possessor of two lights" by the same token can we also deem Abu Lahab to be Abu Nurayn? After all his sons (in Sunni traditions) married Hadhrath Ruqayya and Umm Kalsoom?
2. Do you accept that this honor gives Abu Lahab a superior virtue over the rest of the Ummah?
3. Can you produce even a single reference with a complete Sahih chain where Rasulullah (s) had referred to either of these daughters as Nur?

Ansar.org states:

He prepared the army of Al-Essrah, and bought the will of Romah and made it free for Muslims.

Preparing armies can in no way be deemed to be a mark of superiority, since lands were also conquered under the leadership of Nasibi Banu Umayya Khalifas such as Waleed!

Whilst Abu Sulaiman seems to think that the conquest of Rome in some way benefited the Muslims, Rasulullah (s) made it clear that this conquest would lead to bad feelings, hatred and oppression of the poor. This is clearly established in Sahih Muslim Book 042, Number 7067:

**'Abdullah b. 'Amr b. al-As reported that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: How would you be, O people when Persia and Rome would be conquered for you? 'Abd at-Rahman b Auf said: We would say as Allah has commanded us and we would express our gratitude to Allah Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: Nothing else besides it? You would (in fact) vie with one another, then you would feel jealous, then your relations would be estranged and then you will bear enmity against one another or something to the same effect. Then you would go to the poor emigrants and would make some the masters of the others.**

## 5.2 The efforts of Ahl'ul Sunnah to slander Rasulallah (s) so as to elevate Uthman

We read in Sahih al Muslim Bab Fadail Uthman - Book 031, Number 5907:

**A'isha, the wife of Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him), and Uthman both reported that Abu Bakr sought permission from Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) for entrance (in his apartment) as he had been lying on his bed covered with the bed-sheet of A'isha, and he gave permission to Abu Bakr in that very state and he, having his need fulfilled, went back. Then Umar sought permission and it was given to him in that very state and, after having his need fulfilled, he went back. And 'Uthman reported: Then I sought permission from him and he got up and said to A'isha: Wrap yourself well with your cloth, then I got my need fulfilled and came back. And A'isha said: Allah's Messenger, why is it that I did not see you feeling any anxiety in case of dressing properly in the presence of Abu Bakr and 'Umar (Allah be pleased with them) as you showed in case of 'Uthman. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: Verily Uthman is a person who is very modest and I was afraid that if I permitted him to enter in this very state he would not inform me of his need.**

Whilst the filth of this narration is there for all to see we (namely that Rasulallah (s) and his wife are lying together in bed improperly clothed) we would like to pose a simple question to those who blindly quote this tradition as proof of Uthman's high rank:

*Abu Bakr was the father in law of Rasulallah (s). Now according to this narration Rasulallah (s) was conversing with his father in law (who merits respect) in a disrespectful manner. When Uthman entered the room he remembered 'hayya' (shyness). Can you believe that ANY individual would act in such a manner? A manner in which when his wife's father enters his home, he fails to clothe himself properly and remains in bed with his wife? We don't believe that any individual (no matter how progressive his ideology is) with the slightest self-respect / dignity would act in such a manner, what does Abu Sulayman think?*

## 5.3 Uthman 'hayya' had sex with his dead wife

We read in Sahih al Bukhari, Volume 2, Book 23, Number 374, on the authority of Anas bin Malik:

**We were (in the funeral procession) of one of the daughters of the Prophet and he was sitting by the side of the grave. I saw his eyes shedding tears. He said, "Is there anyone among you who did not have sexual relations with his wife last night?" Abu Talha replied in the affirmative. And so the Prophet told him to get down in the grave. And so he got down in her grave.**

Ibn Hajr Asqalani in Fathul Bari, commenting on this very hadith sought to defend Uthman stating:

**"In this tradition, there is no indication that Uthman has sex with his wife after or before she had died, and Allah (swt) knows best"**

Whilst most Uthman supporters would feel satisfied with this reply preferring not to comment any further, we feel that this matter merits closure scrutiny so that we get to the truth.

Now we read in Sahih al Bukhari Hadith No. 76, Vo. 5 that when Imam 'Ali (as) wanted to marry the daughter of Abu Jahl, Rasulallah (s) voiced his displeasure, making it clear that a daughter of Rasulallah (s) CANNOT marry a man with other wives.

Whilst we deem this tradition (and similar ones) to be lies that have been coined to degrade Ahl'ul bayt (as) we are entitled to cite it since the Ahl'ul Sunnah aqeedah is that all the hadith in

al Bukhari are Sahih, hence we place this before the Nasibi.

We would like to expand on this point in greater depth by citing the analysis of these traditions by modern day Hanafi scholar Mufti Ghulam Rasul:

**“Harith bin Abi Salma narrates from Husayn bin ‘Ali that ‘Ali intended to marry Ghuwar the daughter of Abu Jahl. When Rasulullah (s) received this information he said ‘No one has the right to marry the daughter of Allah’s enemy whilst still married to the daughter of the Prophet of Allah (swt).”**

[Khasais al Kubra Volume 2 page 255]

**Al-Miswar bin Makhrama narrates that he heard Rasulullah (s) say on the pulpit:**

**‘Hashim bin Mugheera’s son approached me and asked that I give permission for ‘Ali to marry his son (Abu Jahil’s) daughter Ghuwar. I will not allow this, I will not allow this. Fatima is part of my body, whoever doubts this fact, doubts me. Whoever causes her pain, cause me pain” [Tirmidhi Volume 2 page 359; Khasais al Kubra Volume 2 page 255; al Mustadrak al Hakim Volume 3 page 159; Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 188.**

**In another narration Al-Miswar bin Makhrama: states Rasulullah (s) said:**

**‘I am not going to declare forbidden what is lawful and make lawful what is forbidden, but, by Allah, the daughter of Allah's Messenger and the daughter of the enemy of Allah can never be combined at one place’.**

[Our note, although Mufti Ghulam Rasul (s) fails to cite the reference these words can be located in Sahih Muslim Kitab Al-Fada'il Al-Sahabah Book 031, Number 6001]

**From Al-Miswar bin Makhrama’s first narration we learn that Rasulullah (s) prevented ‘Ali from marrying whilst he was married to Sayyida Fatima. From the second narration it is clear that Rasulullah (s) saying ‘I am not going to declare forbidden what is lawful and make lawful what is forbidden’ – meant that it was haraam for ‘Ali to marry against whilst Fatima was wife. By stating ‘I am not going to declare forbidden what is lawful and make lawful what is forbidden’, in effect means that he (s) does not act in contravention to Allah (swt).**

In connection with this Allamah Nawawi (d. 676 Hijri) said in Sharh Muslim Volume 2 page 290:

**‘By his saying ‘I am not going to declare forbidden what is lawful and make lawful what is forbidden’, Rasulullah (s) was making it clear that he (s) does not contradict Allah (swt), and he (s) cannot remain silent if a matter is haraam, and on the issue of Nikah, and the combining of both the daughter of Rasulullah (s) and the enemy of Rasulullah (s) in marriage was a matter that was decided by Allah (swt) namely such a combination was haraam’.**

Now if we analyse both the traditions we see from the first that it was haraam for ‘Ali to marry another woman whilst he was married to Fatima. The second hadith makes it clear that Rasulullah (s) never says anything that contradicts an order of Allah (swt), it was Allah’s order that Rasulullah’s daughter and the daughter of Rasulullah’s enemy are not to be combined in marriage...in connection with this Mullah ‘Ali Qari stated:

**‘Shaykh Abu ‘Ali Subkee stated in Sharh Talkhees:**

**‘for a man to marry again whilst married to a daughter of Rasulullah is haraam, as this pains Rasulullah (s) and to cause pain to Rasulullah (s) is haraam [Mirqaat Volume 11 page 375]’.**

Furthermore Mullah 'Ali Qari wrote:

**'It is haraam to pain Rasulullah (s) in all circumstances, even if the pain is caused by participating in a mubah (permissible) action' [Mirqaat Volume 11 page 374]'**

**'Ali could not marry again as this would pain and hurt to Sayyida Fatima.**

Mulla 'Ali Qari also stated:

**'Ibn Daud stated that Allah (swt) made it haraam for Hadhrath 'Ali (ra) to marry during the life of Fatima, and it is Allah's order 'take whatever Rasulullah gives you and refrain that which he refrains you from doing' [Mirqaat Volume 11 page 375]'**

**From here is established that when Rasulullah (s) did not give permission it was haraam for him marry again whilst the husband of Fatima"**

[Taken from Hasab aur Nasab by Mufti Ghulam Rasul al Hanafi Parts 3 & 4 pages 154 – 156]

From these traditions and the comments of Sunni Ulema it has been established that it is haraam for man to marry again whilst he is still married to a daughter of Rasulullah (s). If Imam 'Ali could not marry again, then same rule applies to Uthman (if we accept the Ahl'ul Sunnah claim that he was married to a daughter of Rasulullah).

It is therefore proven that Uthman did not have any other wife, to do so would be haraam. If Uthman did then we challenge the followers of Mu'awiya to prove this, cite her name, the name of her father and the date when she married Uthman.

The harsh reality is Uthman had only one wife at that time, and the result is either:

On the night prior to the funeral he committed zina – if the Ahl'ul Sunnah accept this then it destroys Uthman's character,

Or:

He had sex with his deceased wife.

Now the question arises 'did Uthman commit this act whilst his wife was alive or when she had died?' If it was whilst she was alive then there would have been no reason for Rasulullah (s) to have been displeased with Uthman. In the authentic "Umdah al Qari fi Sharh Sahih al Bukhari" Volume 4 page 85, by Badr al Din Hanafi we read that:

**"Rasulullah asked the Sahaba this question 'Is there anyone among you who did not have sexual relations with his wife last night? He wanted that they not be impure. Uthman did not get down into the grave, and it is for this reason that Rasulullah (s) became displeased with Uthman".**

From this reference its clear that Rasulullah's displeasure at the time of burial on account of Uthman's failure to get climb down into his wife's grave is clear proof that Uthman had not participated in this action whilst his wife was still alive. Intercourse whilst she was alive would have been perfectly normal, and would not have been a matter that would incur the anger of Rasulullah (s). Rasulullah's displeasure clearly indicates that Uthman had slept with his wife after she had died, but before she was washed and placed into her coffin. We ask these Nasibi was Uthman - the shy rightly guided khalifa's act of sleeping with his dead wife a halaal or haraam action? We all know that still waters run deep. If it was haraam then we congratulate you for deeming a nechrophiliac to be your Khalifa. If his action was halaal, then we would urge Abu Sulaiman and his comrades to reinstate this Sunnah of Uthman and copulate with your dead wives, as a means of attaining blessing for Uthman's spirit.

Worthy of note is the fact that the Salaf Imams have gone some way towards reintroducing Hadhrath Uthman's Sunnah. Al Hafidh Jalaladin Suyuti in "al Rahmat" page 135, Chapter 133 states:

***"The great Shaykh's have through their experience proven that to have sex with a woman with a fever is more enjoyable, particularly if done so while she has a temperature". At least the Nasibi are heading in the direction of their Imam, but of course few can reach the pinnacle that Hadhrath Uthman (ra) had reached.***

Had this reference not existed in Sahih al Bukhari we would have avoided making any mention of it, but its existence in that text that Ahl'ul Sunnah deem the most authentic after the Qur'an means that we are within our rights to place it before our Nasibi opponents.

Rasulullah had stated clearly:

**"Is there anyone among you who did not have sexual relations with his wife last night?"**

This statement destroys the Fathul Bari claim that Uthman did not have sex with his wife before / after her death, for the word "Kuruf" means "intercourse".

We would strongly urge Abu Sulaiman the self-proclaimed expert on Shi'aism who enjoys placing Shi'a beliefs under the microscope, to examine his own narration's first. The Uthman that you exalt as a man of shyness and have also crowned as a rightly guided khalifa of Rasulallah (s) had sex with his dead wife. We would like to ask Abu Sulaiman, *'what right do have to attack the Shi'a when you are the defender of a madhab, whose Imam would have sex with his dead wife?'*

If this is Ahl'ul Sunnah's example of hayya then one shudders to think how they define a pervert.

#### **5.4 Ahl'ul Sunnah belief that by setting fire to the Qur'an Uthman made a major contribution towards the Deen**

For this section we shall rely on the following texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah:

1. Sahih Bukhari, Vol.6, hadith number 510
2. Al Bidayah wa al Nihaya, Volume 6 page 217 "Dhikr Uthman"
3. Al Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 68 "Khilafath Uthman"
4. Riyadh al Nadira Volume 3 page 127 "Dhikr Khilafath Uthman"
5. Mishkat al Masabih Volume 1 page 175 "Fadhail Qur'an"
6. Tafseer Qurtubi Volume 1 page 53
7. Tafseer al Itqan page 74 Part 18
8. Tafseer Rul al Ma'ani, Volume 1 page 23
9. Tafseer Gharab al Qur'an Volume 1 page 27
10. Al Maudhooath Volume 2 page 423
11. Taufa Ithna Ashari page 321 "Muthain Uthman" Part 5
12. Tahseer al Usul Volume 2 page 314 "Bab Jama al Qur'an"
13. Tareekh Khamees Volume 2 page 273 "Khilafath Uthman"

14. Tareekh Asim Kufi page 147 "Dhikr Khilafath"

15. Rauzathul Ahabab Volume 2 page 229

16. Taufa Tadhreeya page 55

Let us begin with Sahih Bukhari, Vol.6, #510

**"Narrated Anas bin Malik: Hudhaifa bin Al-Yaman came to 'Uthman at the time when the people of Sham and the people of Iraq were waging war to conquer Arminya and Adharbijan. Hudhaifa was afraid of their (the people of Sham and Iraq) differences in the recitation of the Qur'an, so he said to 'Uthman, 'O chief of the Believers! Set this people right before they differ about the Book (Qur'an), as the Jews and the Christians did before'. Then 'Uthman sent a message to Hafsa saying, 'Send us the manuscripts of the Qur'an so that we may copy the Qur'anic materials in perfect copies and return the manuscripts to you. Hafsa sent it to 'Uthman. 'Uthman then ordered Zaid bin Thabit, Abdullah bin az-Zubair, Sa'id bin Al-'As and Abdur Rahman bin Harith bin Hisham to rewrite the manuscripts in perfect copies. 'Uthman said to the three Quraishi men, 'In case you disagree with Zayd bin Thabit on any point in the Qur'an, then write it in the dialect of the Quraish, as the Qur'an was revealed in their tongue'. They did so, and when they had written many copies, 'Uthman returned the original manuscripts to Hafsa. 'Uthman sent to every Muslim province one copy of what they had copied, and ordered that all the other Qur'anic materials, whether written in fragmentary manuscripts or whole copies, be burnt"**

Is this respect for the Word of Allah (swt)? In the same way that Muslims hearts are set ablaze when they see images of Hindus setting the Qur'an on fire, there is no doubt that the Muslims of that time were just as angered when Uthman set fire to the Qur'an. To those Pakistani Nasibi groups such as Sipaa-e-Sahaba who often allege that the Shi'a ascribe to Tahreef and burn the Qur'an in private, we suggest that they look carefully at this reference. These groups are even responsible for inciting sectarian hatred, by falsely alleging that the Christians have set fire to the Qur'an so that they can terrorise the minority Pakistani Christian community. What these Nasibi Mullah's fail to point out to their followers is that your great Khalifa had no qualms about setting fire to pages of the Qur'an, and set out a campaign of collating copies and lighting them.

### **5.5 The Salaf madhab deems setting fire to the Qur'an to be a 'virtue' of Uthman**

We read in Al Sawaiq al Muhriqa page 68 "Khilafath Uthman":

**Amongst the objections raised against Uthman is one that he set fire to books that included the Qur'an. Our reply to this is that Uthman's burning these Qur'an is just one virtue that can be counted amongst many of Uthman's virtues.** Our reply to these Nasibi who loudly proclaim that the Shi'a ascribe tahreef to the Qur'an that they should clean their own house first. You are the adherents of those Salaf Imams that deem their khalifas act of burning the Qur'an to be one his virtues.

### **5.6 The people were outraged by Uthman's campaign of Qur'an burning and this was one factor that led to them killing him**

We read in al Bidaya wa al Nihaya Volume 6 page 217 "Dhikr Uthman"

**"Uthman introduced the Qur'an of his preference and then set fire to different versions that people had in their possessions".**

We read in Tareekh Asim Kufi:

**"When the Egyptians surrounded Uthman's home, he asked them 'On what grounds**

**do you dislike me?’ They said ‘It is on account of this fact, Rasulallah (s) expelled Hakim bin Aas from Madina and sent him in the direction of Taif, you violated the order of Rasulallah (s) and brought him back to Madina. And the other thing is you collated copies the Qur’an and then set them on fire”.**

These references make it clear that opposition to Uthman by the Egyptians was nothing to do with the workings of Ibn Saba, rather they were outraged by the fact Uthman had set fire to the Qur’an. This action so outraged the Muslims that they deemed it as grounds to kill him. An individual that is killed on account of his blatant disrespect of the Word of Allah (swt) cannot be regarded as a martyr.

### **5.7 The Salaf madhab deems it permissible to set fire to the Qur’an as this is the Sunnah of the Uthman**

As evidence we shall cite the following texts:

1. Fathul Bari Volume 9 page 20
2. Sharh Nawawi Volume 2 page 363
3. Haseeya Sahih al Bukhari Part 6 Dhikr Qur’an Mushaf
4. Tafseer Qurtubi Volume 1 page 54
5. Al Itqan page 203 part 72

We read in Fathul Bari:

**“Ibn Bathal stated that the traditions wherein Uthman burnt the Qur'an proves that it is permissible to set fire to books that contain the name of Allah (swt) within them. The setting on fire is respect and Abdul Razzaq copied the comments of Ahl’ul Sunnah that Allamah Tus would set on fire documents that would have the words ‘bismillah’ on them and Imam of Ahl’ul Sunnah Ardh would set fire to papers that contained the words bismillah”**

Haseeya Sahih al Bukhari

**With regards to Uthman’s setting fire to the Qur’an some have concluded that that it is permissible to set fire to any document that’s contents included references to Allah (swt).**

Sharh Nawawi:

**If the situation arises and there is a page containing reference to Allah, then it can be set alight since Uthman and the Sahaba set the Qur’an on fire”.**

Al Itqan

**“It is permissible to set ablaze pages containing the Qur’an since Uthman set on fire manuscripts that contained verses of the Qur’an”**

It is indeed amazing that in this day and age these Nasibi claim that that setting the Qur’an on fire merits the death penalty whilst they are the followers of an Imam who set scores of Qur’anic manuscripts alight! Rather than condemn Uthman, these Nasibi praise his Qur’an burning exercise and deem his actions a precedent by which his followers can also do the same!

### **5.8 Ahl’ul Sunnah’s appraisal of the Qur’an burning Uthman is tantamount to Kufr**

1. Kirmani Sharh Bukhari Volume 18 page 9

2. Tafseer Qurtubi Volume 1 page 54
3. Tafseer Arab al Qur'an Volume 1 page 27
4. Tafseer Burhan Zurkushee Volume 1 page 477
5. Lughath al Hadith page 58
6. Kuruth al Ainain page 273

We read in Tafseer Arab al Qur'an

**"Zaid bin Thabit narrates, after Uthman set fire to the Quran people said "He did a good thing, by Allah he did a good thing".**

We read in Kirmani Sharh Bukhari Volume 18 page 9

**"Many benefits were borne out of Uthman's setting fire to the Qur'an, it ensured that no differences occurred in the Ummah. Allah (swt) shall grant Uthman a high reward on account of his burning the Qur'an".**

We read in Lughut al Hadith:

**"To set fire to the Qur'an does not breach rules of etiquette, Uthman had no bad intention when he burnt the Qur'anic manuscripts, but it was a good act for which he shall be rewarded highly".**

## **5.9 The Sahaba condemned Uthman and labelled him as 'Huraaq al Mushaf'**

We read in Tafseer al Qurtubi Volume 1 page 54:

**"When the people began to oppose Uthman's corrupt policies and voice their objections, and it was said to the people 'Be careful in regards to Uthman, fear Allah do not call Uthman 'Huraaq al Mushaf'**

## **5.10 Ayesha said kill 'Huraaq al Mushaf'**

Kirmani Sharh Bukhari Volume 18 page 9 it is stated clearly:

**"Ayesha was opposed to Uthman's burning of the Qur'an and she said kill this 'Huraaq al Mushaf' (one who burns the Qur'an)".**

## **5.11 Some Ahl'ul Sunnah have issued fatwas that it is disrespect to burn the Qur'an**

Mulla 'Ali Qari states in Mirqaat Sharh Mishkat Volume 5 page 29 Bab Fadhail ai Qur'an:

**"Some Sunni Ulema have stated that to wash [the Qur'an], or throw into a cave or bury it in mud is a better option than burning it, as this act constitutes disrespect".**

We read in Tafseer al Itqan page 203 part 74:

**"In his teachings Qadhi Husayn stated confidently that it is not permissible to burn the Qur'an, since the act of burning contradicts manners and etiquette".**

We appeal to those with open minds to contemplate the seriousness of Uthman's actions. To discard, shred and burn anything of respect is extremely disrespectful, if for example I was to say 'I shall set fire to this Maulana's beard' such a comment would be disrespectful, it is indeed unfortunate that Uthman's gave less respect to the Word of Allah (swt) than the Ahl'ul Sunnah do to a Maulana's beard. These Nasibi claim that the Shi'a are kaafir because they disrespect

the Sahaba, and yet a personality that disrespects the Qur'an by burning is elevated in their madhab to the rank of a rightly guided khalifa.

### **5.12 Fatwa of Ahl'ul Sunnah – one who disrespects the Qur'an is a kaafir**

Qadhi Iyad in ash Shifa page 441 (English translation by Aisha Bewley) states:

**“Know that anyone who treats the Qur'an or a copy of the Qur'an or any part of it flippantly, or curses it or denies it, even to the extent of a letter or an ayat of it, or call any or all of it a lie or calls anything that it clearly states, or any of its judgements or reports, a lie or affirms anything it denies or denies anything it affirms with full knowledge of that or doubts any of it, he is an unbeliever by the consensus of the people of knowledge”.**

We have proven from the texts of Ahl'ul Sunnah that one who disrespects the Qur'an is a kaafir, the Sunni Ulema have themselves acknowledged that burning the Qur'an constitutes disrespect. With this in mind the Ahl'ul Sunnah should be more honest and decide on what their views should be about Huraaq al Quran, Uthman ibn al Affan. By burning the Qur'an Uthman disrespected the Word of Allah (swt) and Hadhrath Ayesha deemed such a man to be a kaafir.

### **5.13 Uthman shall be called to account on the Day of Judgement for the sin of burning the Qur'an**

We read in Ahl'ul Sunnah leading work Kanz al Ummal Volume 6 page 46 hadith number 820:

**“Ans bin Malik narrates that Rasulallah said on the Day of Judgement three things shall complaint before Allah (swt): (1) The Qur'an (2) The Mosque (3) The family of the Prophet. The Qur'an shall state 'Allah the people set fire to me. The mosque shall state 'I was left in a state of disrepair'. The family of the Prophet shall state 'O Allah, we were expelled from our homes, terrorised and killed'.**

## 6. Virtues of Uthman in Shi'a books

Ansar.org states:

In the end, let me mention some of the virtues of 'Uthman from Shi'a books. Abu Al-Fath Al-Arb'Ali – a major Shi'a scholar – mentions in his book Kashf Al-Ghummah the story of the marriage of 'Ali to Fatima and how 'Uthman helped 'Ali in his marriage. 'Ali said, "Then the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him told me, 'Abu Al-Hasan! Go now and sell your armor and come back with its value so I may prepare what is good for you and Fatima.' So I went and sold my armor to 'Uthman bin Affan for 400 Darhams. When the money was in my hand and the armor was in his hands, 'Uthman said to me, 'Abu Al-Hasan! Don't you need the armor more than I do and don't you need the money more than I do?' I answered with a yes. So he said, 'Then take back the armor. It is a gift from me to you.' So I took back the armor and the money and went to the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him. I handed the armor and the money over to the Messenger of Allah peace be upon him and I told him what happened between 'Uthman and me. The Prophet then asked Allah goodness for 'Uthman." [Kashf Al-Ghummah, by Al-Arb'Ali, vol. 1, p. 368 under the subtitle of "A Chapter in his marriage to Fatima alayha Al-salam"]

First and foremost we should inform our readers that Arbali is not considered a major Shi'a scholar. Kashf al-Ghummah is the only book that he authored - on the Ahl'ul bayt (as), in which he gathered the Sunni traditions that prove the righteousness of Ahl'ul bayt (as) and their virtues. Looking at the reference cited - What exactly is Abu Sulaiman seeking to prove by citing this narration? Does the hadith guarantee that 'Uthman is in Paradise / that all his sins have been forgiven? All it states is that Rasulullah asked Allah goodness for 'Uthman." The du'a was in the context of his deed it does not guarantee his entry into Heaven! Allah (swt) not only granted goodness to Iblis he elevated him to Paradise. Clearly this reward was for his deeds 'at that given time'. Did Allah's blessings on him guarantee him Paradise whatever he did in the future? Clearly not, his actions 'after' in effect negated his good deeds and he incurred the wrath of Allah (swt). This is where we differ with Ahl'ul Sunnah – if Rasulullah (s) praises a person that does NOT guarantee his entry into Heaven, success is dependent on the END result. We shall cite an example:

A pupil enters year nine at school, he is very bright. His initial results prove that he has adhered to his teachers' teaching methodology and he is top of the class. His teacher praises him in quarterly school reports, praising him and hoping he gains entry into a good college. By year 10, the pupil begins to mix with disruptive students his grades fall by the time of his final exams his results are poor. The teachers' initial hopes have not been sustained because of a change in the pupils attitude his exam results are poor he has failed to gain entry into a good college. The hope was success BUT this was not achieved due to the END result the change in attitude / affected success and subsequent entry into a good college.

Ansar.org states:

Another story narrated by Al-Arb'Ali, "Then some people from Iraq entered upon him (Al-Imam Zayn Al-Abideen 'Ali bin Al-Hussain) and said some bad things about Abu Bakr, Umar, and 'Uthman. When they were done, 'Ali bin Al-Hussain told them, 'Tell me, Are you the (Muhajirs, those who were expelled from

their homes and their property, while seeking Grace from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure, and aiding Allah and His Messenger: such are indeed the sincere ones)? They answered, 'No!' Then 'Ali bin Al-Hussain said, 'So, are you (those who, before them, had homes (in Medina) and had adopted the Faith, show their affection to such as came to them for refuge, and entertain no desire in their hearts for things given to the (latter), but give them preference over themselves, even though poverty was their (own lot))?' They answered, 'No!' 'Ali bin Al-Hussain said, 'Therefore, you disassociated yourselves from being one of these two groups and I bear witness that you are not the ones (who came after them say: "Our Lord! Forgive us, and our brethren who came before us into the Faith, and leave not, in our hearts, rancor (or sense of injury) against those who have believed. Our Lord! Thou art indeed Full of Kindness, Most Merciful.") Get out of here, may Allah curse you!" [Ibid, vol. 2, p. 291, under the subtitle of "Virtues of Al-Imam Zayn Al-Abideen"] And after all these evidences from Sunni and Shi'a books, does Al-Tijani dare to claim that Allah had guided him to slander the Companions?

The alleged Shi'a tradition cited by Arbali has actually been copied from Ahl'ul Sunnah texts without any Isnad. This report can be located in Tafsir al-Qurtubi under his commentary of verse 59:10. A Sunni narrated source automatically means that we can reject and the fact that it has no Isnad that we can examine also makes it weak in the eyes of Ahl'ul Sunnah also.

No Shi'a book of traditions records this event. The only source is Arbali who fails to cite which Shi'a text he cited from and if he did also failed to record the isnad. Even if for arguments sake this was indeed in authentic Shi'a sources we can STILL analyse it.

Rather than just blindly cut and paste we would argue that it is essential to understand the context in which the Imam (as) was speaking. This was a period when the Imams were being persecuted; the males of the Imam's household had been wiped by the sixth Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Yazeed ibn Mu'awiyah [see our article on Imam Husayn (as)].

Ahl'ul bayt (as) were being viewed with suspicion by the Nasibi Government of the time and yet they were fully aware of the respect the Imam (as) had amongst the ordinary folk. It was therefore essential to seek an excuse by which the Imam (as) could be imprisoned / or worse executed. By this era the State machinery had in effect propagated the concept of the justice of the Sahaba.

Any views that went against this would have no doubt been viewed as views that contravened State Religion – and this would have been grounds to have people apprehended and punished. No doubt the Imam's views of the first three khalifas were very critical, but it also needs to be pointed out that like all regimes the State had also sent spies to listen in on the Imam's speeches and ascertain his views so that grounds for arrest could be made against him.

The Imam (as) was of course fully aware of this. With this background in mind, let us examine this narration, we are told that "some people from Iraq entered upon him". The narration fails to identify the names of these individuals. Who were they? Were they Sunni / Shi'a / Nasibi / Undercover State Officials seeking to learn of the Imam's views?

In the absence of this fact there is no way that Abu Sulaiman can conclude that he was talking to Shi'a from Kufa they were "some people" had they been Shi'a the tradition would have mentioned this. The Imam of course was fully aware of the evil machinations that the State machinery had against him, and the sudden appearance of people from Kufa who immediately wanted to know his views on the three khalifa's automatically points to the fact that these were

State Officials seeking to collate evidence with which they could harm him.

Faced with this situation the Imam (as) adopted taqiyya, to counter their efforts, had he (as) made his actual views known to these individuals he would have been arrested and worse killed. If Nasibi are going to claim that taqiyya is haraam, we should point out that according to Ahl'ul Sunnah aqeedah it is legitimate when one needs to protect oneself from harm. Imam of Ahl'ul Sunnah Fakhraddin Razi stated:

**“For a momin, taqiya is allowed till the day of Judgement. And this is the right act, for the reason that using self-control to defend oneself against a hardship is a necessity”.**

Similarly it is Hanafi aqeedah that under duress it is permissible to curse Rasulullah (s) (“Usul Al Shashi”, Chapter “Al Dheema” page 114). If Ahl'ul Sunnah deem cursing Rasulullah (s) as permissible if it means protecting one's life, then by the same token it was perfectly legitimate for Imam Zaynul Abdideen (as) to praise the three khalifa's as it was a means of protecting his life. We are sure that Ansar.org are aware of our Imam's actual views of these three individuals, as contained within our primary texts – these Sahih narration's in effect further prove that Imam Zaynul Abideen must have adopted taqiyya in this circumstance (if this incident is indeed authentic).

## 7. Conclusion

The followers of Mu'awiya have offered a vast array of excuses to protect the Sahaba but the fact is they are weak and untenable.

The Ulema of Ahl'ul Sunnah had no regrets / hesitation in narrating the fact that the Sahaba were those that took the lead role in uprising and killing 'Uthman. The Sahaba incited opposition to him, the Sahaba cornered him and they killed him.

It is ironic that the Sahaba that 'Uthman had appointed in the provinces also turned their back on him when he most needed their support! Since Ansar and their fellow Nasibi brethren have a habit of playing the ijtihad card whenever it comes to defending the actions of the Sahaba – how about here? Can killing Uthman, not be deemed a mistake in ijtihad on the part of the just Sahaba?

We should stress to our Sunni brothers and sisters that if you do indeed hate the killers of 'Uthman, then you should have the courage and conviction to blame ALL his killers that includes Hadhrath Ayesha, Talha and Zubayr. It was the presence of these key figures that gave opposition to 'Uthman some credibility since here stood famous Sahaba opposing 'Uthman, and the wife of the Prophet issuing takfeer against him.

Little wonder is it that other Sahaba joined the anti 'Uthman platform including Sahaba that participated in Badr. Despite this fact, the followers of Mu'awiya with Abu Sulaiman at the modern day helm rather than identify the 'real' murderers of 'Uthman have instead sought to hide their guilt by bringing another name into the hat, namely Ibn Saba. We pray that if 'Uthman was indeed wrongly killed, may Allah (swt) never forgive his assailants as well as those that have sought to cover their identities from the ignorant masses. **(Ameen)**.