

54. About "Ijma" again Mistakes

The writer says that in order to invalidate the authority of Abu Bakr the Shia subjected the 'Ijma' to the participation of an infallible Imam. It was a reality that any 'Ijma' or referendum could lose authenticity, if the Imam did not participate in it. If 'Ijma' is their ground why was Ali absent in that 'Ijma'? There were many besides Ali who did not know of such an 'Ijma' at all. The Imam was not referred to; he was not asked at all; his opinion was never sought; in fact, it was kept an arcanum from him.

Then what referendum or "Ijma" was it !?! This is a trick, misleading the public under the name of 'Ijma'. The result is always deceiving because the Ijma is deceiving. In truth, in reality, in fact, can the writer tell us that Abu Bakr reached power on the strength of public opinion – Ijma? If so, why was it that in the Ijma many were not present? Ali's opinion was not important? Was he not one among Muslims; was it not important what he said? His opinion was never sought.

So, this was not an 'Ijma'. Let them seek for some other name. This 'Ijma' with a design preplanned and a malefic motive worked out into long concealed implacability.

Acrimony was from its very foundation, and from the very beginning it was invalid, vague, void, and null nothing beyond a show. But the name still stood 'Ijma'. The Prophet's (S) corpse was still fresh in the ground. It was only Ali (as) busy and occupied in his funeral, and they in their plan and feigned 'Ijma'. It originated, as we said earlier, in order to save face. The Prophet (S) died.

They left his side and hurried to Saqifa. Abu Bakr was declared there as caliph. None knew except some who held contradicting motives adversary intentions and inimical designs. To this the writer has given the name of 'Ijma'. The course of Islam was changed while the body of the Prophet (S) still on the ground was not yet buried. People were astonished.

Force was used and terror was applied in order to silence them and obtain their acceptance. They conceived of plan in order to give them legitimacy. They decided to brand it with the mark of 'Ijma'.

A saying from the Prophet (S) too imputed; "My nation does not gather over wrong nor go astray." If this

was the ground of legitimacy, then what was the legitimacy for Omar, Othman, Mawiyah and several others becoming caliphs? Why was the Ijma not practicable there or why did they not resort to it? No answer.

Important Point

The writer goes so far as to say that the Shia belief or Shi'ism took its form gradually on the ladder of events. That it was product of accidents and a manufacture of episodes is completely untrue. We reiterate that the Shia belief or Shi'ism is rooted in Islam. As the Book said so it is; as the Prophet demonstrated so it is. A great scholar, Aban Bin Taqlab, of the Sunni thought, was asked as to what a Shia and Shi'ism is.

He replied: "A Shia is he who follows Ali (as). If for instance all the companions or associates of the Prophet (S) happened to agree over an issue and Ali happened to differ from it, or the whole Nation agreed over a thing and Imam Ja'far Sadiq's word differed with it, a Shia would obey the Imam's word."

The authority is the word of the Imam, although 'Ijma' might have preceded it. The Imam is immune from sin and the Shia depends on the Imam and act by his guidance. The oldest Sunni sources have confirmed the truth of Shi'ism.

Source URL:

<https://www.al-islam.org/explanation-belief-mahdism-shia-imamia-lutfullah-safi-golpaygani/54-about-ijma-again-mistakes#comment-0>