

At the Threshold

I am now before a man's biography, which the fancies played a great role to distort. The mercenary pens deviated from the way of rightfulness and threw a thick cover over the truth, exactly like what they did to every clear and shiny truth, just to defame and distort this great personality.

I am before a man, whose biography left prominent lines in history. He was one of the mujahidin, who stood in the first front. He was one of those, who supported the true principles and supported the prophets and the guides of the humanity.

A man, who supported the straight belief while all the hearts turned aside from him and all the eyes, looked askance at him. Those hearts and eyes scattered grudge, quivered with serious enmity, warned of resistance and disobedience to put out this fresh burning torch—some hands stretched to do away with this (new prophet), whose light had cured the sore-eyes.

But this strong fort (Abu Talib) stood up to them towering, showing his powerfulness and challenging their reckless will. Then they turned back empty-handed. The grudge increased in the hearts against this supporter but it was as the grudge of the horses against the bridles.

A man, who watered Islam when it was a seed in a barren land, guarded it against the wind when it was soft and tender and then took care of it when it was young. It grew and became strong. The light spread from it. No enemy could achieve an aim until the loyal guard of this flowing spring left to the better world and until the flowing spring dried.

He was a man, who had a standing in Islam and left a fine impression and an eternal virtue. But the fancies wanted the eyes to be away from him or to look at him with a wrongful look. They tried their best to fabricate lies against him in order to distort the truth and to cover the virtue.

The age of the caliphate elapsed and it was full of the virtues of Abu Talib; the great man of Islam. The age recorded the exploits of this man and the benevolent hands of him to give him some of his due.

Then the age of monarchy and tyranny came. This illegal authority would not last except by defaming the hero of Islam; Imam Ali, because the tyrants had extorted the legal right of Ali and his sons and so

the biography of his father was one side among others. The authority tried the best to destroy thinking that it might destroy the personality of Imam Ali and attempting to turn the people's attention away from the matter of extorting his right of the caliphate.

The rulers began to hire those of the filthy consciences and the opportunist hearts, who didn't know a meaning of a virtue nor an end of vice. They would sell their consciences, break the covenants and promises, change the truth into falsehood, show the falsehood as true, and sell their religion for a stolen dinar or an extorted property just to achieve their low intents, to satisfy their filthy consciences and to obtain the contentment of the rulers.

Such people would not be able to live except under the darkness because the bat wouldn't fly during the brightness of the daylight. They wished the night to be so long so that the stage would be free for them alone.

The fancies played the role, changed the course of history, and wanted to overthrow the present situation so they exploited the mercenaries to fabricate traditions according to the wishes of the rulers until fabricating traditions became salable in the market of the state at those days. Many fabricators, whose hearts were full of aftermaths of the pre-Islamic age, began their attempts to destroy the religion in order to satisfy the rulers.

This black market was based upon three things; hiding the virtues of Imam Ali, fabricating traditions against him and turning the Quranic verses concerning him to the others and turning the verses concerning the others to him and thirdly ascribing fabricated virtues to the other companions.

The (merchant) Mo'awiya¹ encouraged this market to work for the benefit of him. It was the cornerstone of his rule. He followed every means to strengthen his rule especially when he saw the people believe whatever he fabricated for their faith was flickering and the religion did not reach farther than their tongues. Their old party spirit did not accept the new religion yet, the fancies were still ready in the chests, the personal hopes prepared to leap and the gold of Mo'awiya reigned in the hearts.

Those of the black aims and bad fancies followed this way because they found that it satisfied their greed.

The opportunist Mo'awiya found them as a tractable mount so he put those heavy loads upon their backs. They obeyed whatever he wanted and when he didn't want, they themselves tried to flatter him.

He wrote to his governors, (We will never forgive anyone, who narrates something about the virtue of Abu Turab or any of his family).²

The orators hurried to respond. They began to curse Ali (as) on every minbar throughout the state. They declared their quittance from him and began to defame him and his family. The minbars, upon which Imam Ali was cursed, were more than seventy thousand ones.

The public responded to the orators and believed them. You may estimate how many men sitting before each minbar of those seventy thousands and how many women and children were behind each one of those men, who certainly would listen to his sayings as he listened to the orator's sayings. Their flesh would grow with those fabrications and their blood would flow in the veins with them.

Then Mo'awiya wrote to his governors: (Don't accept any witness of the followers of Ali or his family)³ to tighten the grip around the Shia, to disgrace them and to let them be liable to the oppressions of their enemies and to being a target for their arrows. Then Mo'awiya assigned great gifts and high positions for whomever narrated traditions ascribing virtues to Othman and his companions.

Once again, he wrote to his governors, (Criticizing Othman increased and spread in every country and every side. When this book reaches you, invite people to narrate traditions talking about the virtues of the companions and the first caliphs. Do not let any tradition narrated by any Muslim about the virtues of Abu Turab unless you fabricate same virtues to be, ascribed to the companions. This will make me delighted and will refute the virtues of Abu Turab and will be harder to them (the Shia) than to mention the virtues and favors of Othman).⁴

As soon as the book reached the hearings, the imaginations flew to invent news and to create traditions, some of which ascribed untrue virtues to the companions, the others defamed Ali (as), and this was the main aim of the fabricated traditions.

We are not in need of saying or referring to the value of this muchness of traditions whether those that ascribed untrue virtues to the companions or those that defamed Ali (as). They were full of excessiveness, ridiculous ignorance, deadly grudge, and malicious enmity. Neither these traditions nor those had any value and they would not resist the hammer of criticism for a moment. They were born illegally and built upon a base of salt so as soon as moisture reached it, it melted.

But the situation of the ruling authority at that time and the decrees issued by the (merchant) Mo'awiya were the active cause of activating this market, whose goods didn't face any recession. Mo'awiya looked forward to gain great (material) benefits from this market at the expense of the religious and moral principles. Those fabricated traditions were lectured from upon the minbars and were given to the teachers to be learnt by the children, who memorized them as they memorized the verses of the holy Quran or better.

Hence those traditions became more spreading, more current and more effective and on the other side the profit would be more inclusive that each of the factory keeper, the exporter and the importer would get his share according to the commercial language. So the creator of the tradition, the speaker, the teacher and whoever surrounded them would share in the profit.

The (great merchant) Mo'awiya wrote to his governors throughout the state: (See if it is proved that someone loves Ali then you are to remove his name from the register of the treasury and to omit his livelihood).⁵

He wasn't satisfied with this severe pursuit, flagrant challenge and this economical war until he wrote another book saying: (You are to torture whomever you accuse of supporting those people (Ali and his family) and to tear down his house).[6](#)

Thus, he pressed the blockade much more than before. He threatened every one showing a bit of love to this man and his family. Merely showing a bit of affection to these people by anyone would make that one face a bitter war. He would never be forgiven. He would be liable to every kind of aggression. His name would be omitted from the register of the divan. He would be prevented from his livelihood. He would not be equal to the other people. He had no right of option. He did not have to think with his mind. He would have to be unfree puppet driven without will or thinking. He would live without dignity or sense of honor, surrounded with danger, waiting for torture or for his house to be demolished upon his head at any moment.

Mo'awiya would not be satisfied with issuing those unjust orders, which killed the social justice, but he chose the ones, who would carry out those unjust orders. He appointed his illegitimate brother Ziyad bin Abeeh[7](#) as the governor of Iraq to increase the pressure against the Shia because Ziyad knew them well for he had been near them before the grudge reigned in his heart.[8](#)

Mo'awiya used every means to sell and buy these goods. He was that opportunist dealer, who did not leave any opportunity unless he would exploit it for his private interest selfishly.

Bribes, gifts, and positions were insignificant prices to buy with them many consciences put forward in that black market! Therefore, it was easy for him to conclude a deal every day to buy a conscience, to sell a covenant and to do away with a belief.

Since the aim of all that was to fight Imam Ali to extort his right and to sit on the throne, so he would direct his action towards Ali himself. He would commit everything in order to achieve his aim even incredible things. He wouldn't refrain from announcing among the people of Sham,[9](#) who didn't differentiate between the she-camel and the he-camel, that Imam Ali didn't offer prayer and that it was he, who shed Othman's blood and that they (the people of Sham) had to revenge Othman on this blood shedder.

No faith, no morals and no human qualities would make this man (Mo'awiya), who was free from all those good qualities; refrain from following his prevailing fancy. He gave free reign to his fancy and let it play its unruly role, diversify in committing abominable actions and no one to restraint, exceed in fabricating and no one to deny, exaggerate in lying and no one to prevent and pride upon un-rightfulness and no one to be angry!

If someone were impudent, he would do whatever he liked!

He called for Samara bin Jundub,[10](#) who was one of the traders of Hadith, and gave him one hundred thousand dirhams in order to fabricate a tradition showing that the following Quranic verses referred to

Ali:

And among men is he whose speech about the life of this world causes you to wonder, and he calls on Allah to witness as to what is in his heart, yet he is the most violent of adversaries. And when he turns back, he runs along in the land that he may cause mischief in it and destroy the tilth and the stock, and Allah does not love mischief-making. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 2:204-205)

And that the following verse referred to Abdur Rahman bin Muljam: [11](#)

(And among men is he who sells himself to seek the pleasure of Allah. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 2:207)

Samara might find that this price was not enough for distorting one verse so how about two verses! Mo'awiya began to bargain with him. He offered him another hundred thousand dirhams... but all that was just a price for distorting one verse. They went on bargaining until they agreed upon four hundred thousand dirhams and then Samara narrated this tradition. [12](#)

Thus with the wealth of Allah the saints of Allah were fought, with the wealth of Islam, Islam was attacked and with the wealth of the Muslims, the sanctity of their high belief was distorted.

Mo'awiya thought of hiring some people to fabricate traditions defaming Ali so he chose some of the Prophet's companions and some of their successors, who were respected by the public and had sanctity because of their companionship with the Prophet (S), in order to be believed when fabricating traditions. [13](#)

Among those, with whom he concluded a bargain, were Abu Hurayra, Amr bin al-Aass, the adulterer al-Mugheera bin Shu'ba and Orwa bin az-Zubayr. [14](#) They created odious news to defame Imam Ali (as) and to declare acquittance from him in return for bribes given to them by Mo'awiya to satisfy their greed and to encourage the others to do the same as ibn Abul Hadeed, the author of Sharh Nahjul Balagha said.

Every one of them tried his best to fabricate traditions. Az-Zuhri mentioned a tradition narrated by Orwa bin Zubayr saying: "Aa'isha (the Prophet's wife) said to me: "Once I was with the Prophet when al-Abbas and Ali came. The Prophet said: O Aa'isha, these two men will die unbelievably.""

There was another tradition narrated by him also saying that the Prophet had said to Aa'isha: "If you like to look at two men of Hell, look at these coming men." Aa'isha said: I looked and found that they were al-Abbas and Ali!" [15](#)

Amr bin al-Aass, who was Mo'awiya's friend and partner in his doings, narrated a tradition that he had heard the Prophet (S) saying: "The family of Abu Talib is not my guardians but my guardian is Allah and the good believers." [16](#)

When Abu Hurayra came to Iraq with Mo'awiya in the year of aj-jama'a¹⁷ (the unity), he came to the mosque of Kuffa and was surprised with the great crowd of people, who had come to meet him. He knelt on his knees and hit his bald head many times saying: "O people of Iraq, do you pretend that I ascribe lies to Allah and his apostle to burn myself in Hell?¹⁸ By Allah, I had heard the Prophet (S) saying: "Every prophet had a sanctum and my sanctum is in Medina; from Eer to Thour.¹⁹ Whoever corrupts in it, a curse of Allah, the angels and all the people will be upon him." And I swear by Allah that Ali had done corruption in it." When this saying reached Mo'awiya, he gifted Abu Hurayra and appointed him as the wali of Medina.

When Hurayz bin Othman was dying he mentioned Ali to end his life with this saying: "It was he, who violated the sanctum of the Prophet until it was about to collapse."²⁰ It was not strange of him after his saying: "The Prophet, when he was about to die, ordered that Ali's hand was to be cut."²¹

We do not know! Perhaps Ali was, according to Hurayz's opinion, one of the nightly thieves as the dissolute king al-Waleed bin Abdul Melik said when he mentioned Ali: "Allah may curse him. He was a thief and a son of a thief." The people became astonished at his grammatical mistakes and his ascribing thieving to Imam Ali (as) and said: "We don't know which of them is more astonishing."²²

And thus those people tried to diminish those high tops to the lowest slopes!

We may ask Hurayz about his thought of Abu Bakr, the first caliph of the Muslims after the Prophet (S), when he did not carry out the order of the Prophet to cut Ali's hand!

Mo'awiya kindled that war. He supplied its fuel with the monies of Islam and the Muslims. He extorted the monies from their possessors and gave them to others in return for a tradition they fabricated, a virtue they created and ascribed to so and so, a true virtue they hid or a Quranic verse they distorted (... to alter the words from their places...).

Besides this war, there was another war. It was the pursuit of everyone, whose heart had a bit of love to Ali or whose tongue murmured in praising him or mentioning him favorably. Whoever was found to be of those would be given the option to choose between the sword and the acquittance from Ali.

Hujr bin Adiy and his companions had showed the great example of sacrifice for the sake of the deep-rooted belief and the true faith, which would never be bent before the wind or be frightened by the assaulting sword.

Mo'awiya, who bought the rule of the Muslims and changed the caliphate into a hereditary monarchy, was not of that kind that his excessiveness of abusing Ali would be prevented by anything. He wanted it to be a lasting heresy recorded by the time every day with dark letters to be fixed in the history of this perfidious tyrant.

It was mentioned that some of the Umayyads advised Mo'awiya and said to him: "You have what you

want. Don't you stop cursing this man (Ali)?" He said: "No, by Allah, until the child grows and the adult becomes old with it and until no one will mention a virtue of him."²³

Mo'awiya was not satisfied with cursing Ali but he exceeded to degrade the sanctity of the Prophet and his prophecy.

Mutrif bin al-Mugheera bin Shu'ba said: "I came with my father to Mo'awiya. My father talked with Mo'awiya and then he came to tell about him. He became astonished about him. One night he came and refused to have his dinner. I found that he was very sad. I thought that something might have happened to us or to our business. I wait for a moment and then I asked him: Why are you unhappy tonight? He said, O my son! I came from the most malicious and the most unfaithful one. I said: what happened? He said, I said to him (Mo'awiya) when we were alone: "O amirul mo'mineen, you have achieved your aims. Why don't you do justice and good? You have become so old. You may pay attention to your brothers of the Hashemites and take care of them. By Allah, they have nothing today that you may fear!"

He said to me, "How far! The man of Taym²⁴ ruled, wronged, and did what he did. By Allah, as soon as he died, his mention died with him. People may remember him and just say Abu Bakr. Then the man of Adiy²⁵ ruled for ten years. As soon as he died, his mention died with him. People may remember him and say Omar. Then our brother Othman ruled. No one had lineage like him. He did what he did and people did to him what they did. As soon as he died, his mention and what happened to him died, with him. But the man of Hashem;²⁶ everyday his name is announced five times (I witness that Muhammad is the messenger of Allah). So which thing will last after this? May be buried their mention!"²⁷

Could we say anything after this saying of Mo'awiya, whom the mention of the great Prophet (S) on the minarets hurt him bitterly and pierced his mind like the arrow whereas he controlled the affairs of the Muslims and extorted their rights under the name of the Islamic caliphate, which he changed into unjust monarchy?

How could we be astonished at a man or a saying that made al-Mugheera, who was an adulterer and perfidious²⁸ so angry to a degree that his son noticed the signs of his anger as if something important happened to them or to their business although that nothing would affect al-Mugheera other than deposing him from a position or losing some money? But in spite of his wickedness he couldn't tolerate the blasphemy of Mo'awiya and his defaming the Prophet (S).

We do not have to waste the time in tracking Mo'awiya's sayings and doings, with which he resisted the Prophet (S) and contradicted him intendedly and that would make Mo'awiya out of the sphere of Islam. Islam is belief, saying, and doing. Mo'awiya contradicted the all without being satisfied with one side away from the others.

If we follow the pen to track everything, we will go far away from the subject but we think it is better to let the reader refer to al-Ghadeer vol.10, which has a wonderful conclusive discussion. It mentions many of Mo'awiya's breaches, which he committed intendedly and insistently with bitter challenge and sarcastic

mockery. The reasons behind that were latent spite, inherited polytheism, opportunist policy and barefaced enmity that he had inherited from the Umayyad house and from the polluted pre-Islamic environment against the honored Hashemite house with its great guiding leaders and chiefs.

That Dark Age passed to be, replaced with a darker one. An age came and cursing Ali became a rubric, which the fancies tried the best to make firm in the hearts. If once the public speaker forgot to curse Ali (as), he would be, taken from every side by shouting and crying of people: The Sunna! The Sunna! He would know then what a mistake he did and what a Sunna he left!

Mo'awiya had engraved in every heart of every Umayyad, whether in lineage or in tendency, this word, which would make the mountains crack and the heavens split, with which the speakers had to end their speeches of the Fridays: "O Allah, Abu Turab un-believed in Your religion and kept people away from Your way, so curse him with lethal curses and torture him with painful torture!"[29](#)

It was not removed from the hearts or forgotten by the mouths except during the reign of Omar bin Abdul Aziz, the ascetic caliph.

But between the two ages there were many shameful sins and crimes and dark events that left bad consequences, changed the history and darkened the bright face of rightfulness.

The age of the perfidious tyrant, al-Hajjaj—the student of Mo'awiya—would never be forgotten at all. It was full of incredible crimes and calamities. He supported the oppressive construction of Mo'awiya and added to it many bricks that raised it high. Al-Hajjaj let his sword exceed with the necks of the Shia. He killed so many people patiently. He killed people without any guilt but just for suspicion and accusation. He committed crimes that were like the legends!

It was but a pray of Imam Ali when he prayed to Allah against the people of Iraq.[30](#)

Al-Hajjaj was full of grudge against Imam Ali and he satisfied his filthy conscience, fury grudge, and serious spite by cursing Ali and ordering people to curse him as his teacher Mo'awiya did before.

One day a man met al-Hajjaj in his way and said to him, "O emir, my parents had wronged me when they named me Ali. I am poor and needy. I am in need of your help." This begging provoked al-Hajjaj's latent spite and the dregs of his mean soul. He changed the man's name and gave him a job.[31](#)

Al-Hajjaj wanted to reward Abdullah bin Hani for he had participated in his battles. He decided to marry him to the daughter of Asma' bin Kharija, the chief of the tribe of Fazara and to the daughter of Sa'eed bin Qayss al-Hamadani. He threatened the first with the whip and the second with the sword if they refused so they obeyed and married their daughters to Abdullah bin Hani unwillingly. What a legal marriage the emir of the Muslims performed!

After that al-Hajjaj began to remind Abdullah of what favors he did him. And suddenly this man stood up in front of al-Hajjaj to defend his favors by saying: "O emir! Do not say that. We also have virtues that no

one of the Arabs has.” Al-Hajjaj said, “What are they?” He said, “Amirul mo’mineen Abdul Melik was never abused among us at all.” Al-Hajjaj said, “By Allah, it is a virtue.” He said, “Seventy men of us participated with Mo’awiya in the battle of Siffeen and no one of us supported Ali except one and he was, as I know, a bad man.” Al-Hajjaj said, “By Allah, it is a virtue.” He said: “No one of us was asked to abuse and to curse Ali unless he did and added to Ali Hassan, Husayn and their mother Fatima.” Al-Hajjaj said, “By Allah, it is a virtue.” He said, “No one of the Arabs has beauty and prettiness like us.” But al-Hajjaj didn’t consider this as a virtue because the sayer had so ugly smallpox face, a swollen head, a slant mouth and a squint in his eye.³² This face was an opposite evidence for the virtue that al-Hajjaj stunted to offer. He laughed and said: “O Abu Hani, as for this, please let it aside!”³³

Mo’awiya reached what he had hoped. Abusing and cursing Ali continued as a heresy, with which the child grew up and the adult became old, but he could not distort the essence of the truth as he wished for.

Allah will perfect His light, though the unbelievers may be averse. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 61:8)

The sinful successors of those wicked ancestors came and diversified in creating heresies as their mean consciences wished.

Khalid bin Abdullah al-Qissri ascended the minbar in Iraq, when he was the emir during the reign of Hisham bin Abdul Melik, and cursed Ali by saying: “O Allah, curse Ali bin Abu Talib bin Abdul Muttalib bin Hashem, the son-in-law of the messenger of Allah and the father of Hassan and Husayn.” Then he came to people drunkenly, where he created a new heresy when he cursed Ali in a way that couldn’t be interpreted to refer to other than him because he used full names and he asked people: “Did I surnamed?”³⁴

Another time he repeated the same odious image of Mo’awiya when he dared to defame the great Prophet (S). He followed the same heresies of Mo’awiya, walked after his deviation and in that vicious soil, in which the cursed tree –the Umayyads– grew, he was brought up and was enslaved.

Another time, after cursing Ali in his speech to the people in one Friday and when he wasn’t satisfied with that unless he would prejudice the Prophet, he said: “By Allah, the Prophet employed him (Ali) and he knew well what kind of man he was but because he was his companion!”

Do you see how he dared to criticize the Prophet, the holiness of the mission and the infallibility of the prophecy? He considered the Prophet as an ordinary man acting according to his passion and fancy without caring for rightfulness and truthfulness. This was enough to drive the sayer out of the sphere of Islam. He defamed the Prophet (S) just like what Mo’awiya had done before. Sa’eed bin al-Mussayab, who was famous of his deviation from Ali, was present. He felt sleepy for a moment when Khalid said his saying. He opened his eyes and he was terrified. He asked, “Woe unto you! What did this malicious say? I saw the tomb split and the Prophet said: You are lying, o you the enemy of Allah!”³⁵

With these ignominious deeds and with this obscene style, which was far away from morals and humanity, they resisted the rightness, which they saw that it would prevent them from achieving their mean pleasures and would prevent them from the seats of the rule but definitely, they would hold the seats of Hell!

History is full of such shameful deeds and if one wants to track them, he will be tired. But it is painful when you find that the leaders of the ummah, who were called amirul mo'mineen³⁶ or the caliphs of the Prophet sometimes, were either, freed captives, hypocrites, stealers, adulterers, drunkard, deviator or dissolute... to the end of this empty circle of the corruption of those mean walis.

Mo'awiya the freed captive was amirul mo'mineen, Yazeed the drunkard was the caliph of the Prophet, Marwan the deviant and the son of the deviant was the caliph of the Muslims... until the turn of the tyrant Abdul Melik, Yazeed the deficient and Marwan the donkey.

Then we come back to find that these false sayings, fabricated traditions, distorted speeches, and biased interpretations come out from lips saying: (We heard the messenger of Allah saying...).

We searched for those of that falseness and fabrication and what a painful thing it was! We found that it was they, who were, called the Prophet's companions. This companionship was considered as an impregnable fence surrounding this falseness and guarding that fabrication and as a protector covering those bad deeds and denied doings!

Whoever tried to cross this fence or to remove that cover would be accused of trespassing the rightness, talking about the Prophet's companions with what was impermissible, being envious trying to deny their right of sacred companionship. Whereas the truth was that those people had lowered themselves to the level of the stupid beats and they demolished with their own hands that high structure, destroyed with their picks the fence, which was constructed to protect them. And tore with their fingers those ragged covers, behind which they had committed crimes and treasons away from the eyes thinking that the eyes were sleepy and inattentive.

They did whatever they could and received in return for their doings their fees from the wealth of the Muslims and the ummah. Didn't they know that their graves would be set to fire, their foreheads and sides would be branded, and their skins would be changed into others after being burnt?

They got that money, which was scattered by the rulers, who did not care but for their thrones. In order to save their thrones, they used every means and spent everything indifferently without paying any attention except to the results whatever the means was as long as the purpose would justify the means. But in spite of all that, they were considered as the leaders of the Muslims and the caliphs of the Prophet (S)!

In this way they brought the ummah to the abyss of deviation, finishing off the live conscience, mocking at the justice, opposing the rightness, devouring what was forbidden, listening to lying and caring for

nothing but their selfishness and greed. This one told lies, fabricated and distorted just to take in return for his (business) stolen gold or extorted silver as shameful bribes and that one paid openhandedly and it was not but a mean bait in order to control the rule and to humiliate the ummah with all kinds of torture, disgrace and punishment.

Between this and that there were shed bloods, extorted rights, violated dignities, spread injustice, open sins and extreme poverty. All that was an inevitable result of that unjust Dark Age.

They passed away after they had foisted into the religion what they liked, ravaged, and corrupted according to their mean fancies, obscene desires, and beastly greed.

They passed away but the people, who came after them, accepted what was left and considered it as true. But if they pondered a little and used their minds to search for the truth, they would discover the defects and the disadvantages of those ones, which might not trouble the clearness of the sphere and might not blacken the bright face of the religion.

They passed away after soiling the face of life and blackening the history. They passed away to be succeeded with others, who complicated the situation and added to the sins what firmed their structure. Among those successors were some, who weren't satisfied with that falsehood but they exceeded in error and fabrication for there was no deterrent of religion, no watch of conscience, no restrainer from violating the rightness and no fear from punishment.

I expected to find much many lies and fabrications against Imam Ali (as) since the age of Mo'awiya and throughout the ages of the kings of the cursed tree (the Umayyads) as it was called by the Quran. And the fabrications created by the mercenaries and those, who followed the Umayyads or held the same Umayyad tendency but I did never expect that as-Sayooti might tell of such a fabrication when he talked about the reason of the revelation of the following Quranic verse:

O you who believe! Do not go near prayer when you are intoxicated until you know (well) what you say (The Holy Quran, Shakir 4:43).

He mentioned this fabricated lie and he doubled his error by ascribing it to Imam Ali himself. He pretended that Imam Ali, Allah forbid, had said: "One day Abdur Rahman bin Ouff invited us. He served us some food and then he served us some wine. The wine affected our minds. When the time of the prayer came, they advanced me to lead them in offering the prayer. I recited (the sura wrongly): (Say: O unbelievers! I do not worship that which you worship and we worship what you worship) then Allah revealed:

O you who believe! Do not go near prayer when you are intoxicated until you know (well) what you say. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 4:43)"[37](#)

We don't want to argue with as-Sayooti about the source of the tradition he mentioned or about the

fabrication itself, which had contradiction in the different ways of the narration or about distorting the name of that who offered the prayer and inserting the name of Imam Ali in this shameful way in spite of that some of those, who mentioned the tradition, ignored the name and didn't mention Ali and some others mentioned names of other companions...

We do not want to argue about this fabrication in any way but we just want to refer to its apparent collapse and contradiction to the clear Quranic verses and prophetic traditions talking about Imam Ali.

Drinking wine was contradictory to the verse of purification

Allah only desires to keep away the uncleanness from you, O people of the House! and to purify you a (thorough) purifying. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 33:33)

Which there was no any doubt or suspicion that Imam Ali was included in; in fact, he was the first, to whom the verse was applied? Drinking wine was also contradictory to the verse of supplication.

Say: Come let us call our sons and your sons and our women and your women and our selves and your selves, then let us be earnest in prayer, and pray for the curse of Allah on the liars. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 3:61)

That made Imam Ali as the same as the Prophet himself.

On the other hand, it contradicted the certain facts of Imam Ali's conduct, which no two would disagree upon. He had never been a polytheist since he had come out to existence so how would it be possible that he distorted the verse by reciting (We worship what you worship) whereas it addressed the unbelievers?

We do not have to discuss such a shameful collapse with more than to point to it remotely because if we want to track and detail, it will not be possible to get to the aim through this book.

But we have to point out that someone mentioned the reason of the revelation of this verse and mentioned a person, who had offered the prayer with the drunken people but someone (!) came to hide the name of that great companion to insert instead of him the name of Ali without fearing the end of fabricating lies and without caring about what would harm the Prophet when it harmed Imam Ali because they were but one self—according to the Quranic verse.

Some of the interpreters said, when interpreting the verse, that the intoxication referred to by the verse was not the intoxication of wine but the intoxication of sleepiness.[38](#)

We track something of what these bad successors of those bad ancestors created to widen the abyss of separation and alienation among the Muslims. Their fabricated lies were not based upon any bit of truthfulness, rightfulness, or good will.

We track what they wrote unthinkingly to be astonished at al-Ghazali when he answered someone asking him about cursing Yazeed.

The asker said: “Is he, who curses Yazeed openly, to be considered as a transgressor against the religion? Is it permissible to pray to Allah to have mercy upon him (Yazeed)?”

Al-Ghazali answered: “Whoever curses him will be transgressor and disobedient because cursing a Muslim, even cursing the animals, is impermissible. It was mentioned that the Prophet (S) had forbidden that. The sanctity of the Muslim is greater than the sanctity of the Kaaba according to the saying of the Prophet (S). Yazeed was a good Muslim and his order of killing al-Husayn or his contentment about it was not true. As long as that was not certain, so it was impermissible to suspect him of it. Mistrusting a Muslim is haram. If the truth was not well-known, trusting the Muslim would be obligatory, besides that killing was not unbelieving but it was disobeying. Praying Allah to have mercy upon him was permissible and it was desirable because he was one of the believers according to our saying in the prayer: O Allah, forgive the believing men and the believing women!”[39](#)

Do you see the contradiction and the fraud behind it? Distrusting the Muslim was haram, killing al-Husayn was not unbelieving, and the sanctity of the Muslim was greater than the sanctity of the Kaaba according to the Prophet’s saying! Cursing Yazeed was haram but al-Husayn had no sanctity, there was no respect to his blood and no value of what the Prophet (S) had said about him! Killing al-Husayn would not affect the dignity of Yazeed: the caliph of the Prophet and amirul mo’mineen! It did not harm his faith! He was included in the saying of the prayer: (O Allah, forgive the believing men and the believing women)!

How odd saying and what a trespass against the truth it was! How warmly al-Ghazali believed in the faith of Yazeed and how zealously he defended Yazeed, the drunkard, the dissolute, the reveler, the reckless, the shameless...!

But killing al-Husayn (as) by Yazeed was the first motive of the disgraceful situation of al-Ghazali, who defended Yazeed so defiantly.

It seemed that al-Ghazali had many situations towards defending the imamate of Yazeed bin Mo’awiya. He repeated his situations according to the need or with no need. He said in another situation, “If it is said: Is it permissible to curse Yazeed because he killed al-Husayn or he ordered to kill him? We say: it was not proved at all, so it was impermissible to say that Yazeed killed al-Husayn or he ordered of killing him and the same was about cursing him because it was impermissible to ascribe a grave sin to a Muslim without inquiry.”[40](#)

Again, he uncovered what was hidden in his conscience. He was not satisfied with defending Yazeed by denying the true evidence, which no one would deny unless he was a reluctant stickler or an idiotic ignorant. Considering Yazeed as innocent of killing al-Husayn was not enough for him because he knew well how much misleading he committed as if he denied that the one was the half of the two.

He came back from another way to defend all of the killers of al-Husayn even if he thought that Yazeed was one of them. He said, "If it is said: Is it permissible to say: Allah may damn the killer of al-Husayn or Allah may damn him, who ordered of killing al-Husayn? We say: It is better to say: Allah may damn the killer of al-Husayn if he died before he repented because he might have died after repenting."⁴¹

He discussed the repenting of Wahshi⁴² as an evidence of impermissibility of damning in spite of that Wahshi had never got rid of his beastliness⁴³ for a day and he had ended his life with the wine until it overcome him completely that he couldn't sober up.⁴⁴

But al-Ghazali in this situation tried his best in order that no curse would reach an unbeliever and a transgressor like Wahshi, Yazeed and their likes. This man, who strove to defend Yazeed and Wahshi and in fact he defended their chief Iblis, curse be upon him, when he said, "It doesn't matter in not damning Iblis besides other than him".⁴⁵

This man with all these disgraceful situations, with which he did not want even Iblis and his grandsons to be cursed. Didn't feel shy when he said his second calamity, "Cursing has more special form like saying: Curse of Allah may be upon the Jews, the Christians, the magi, the fatalists, the kharijites, the Shia, the adulterers, the unjust and the usurers. All of that is permissible."⁴⁶

One might think that there was much contradiction between the two situations because here he permitted cursing all these groups while there he defended Yazeed and his band of killers of al-Husayn after he thought that it didn't matter not to curse their master Iblis! But with a little deliberation we find that there is no contradiction. In fact, there is a firm connection between the two situations. His permission of cursing the Shia united with his defending Yazeed at the same purpose and aim. Both were the inevitable result and the bitter fruit of the seed of the grudge against the pure family of the Prophet (S).

We were not surprised when he put the Shia, the followers of the Prophet's family, in one row with the fatalists and the Kharijites and permitted cursing the all because, according to his thought, the all were apostates and no good would be expected from them and no repentance would be accepted from them.

In fact, if he declared his inner dregs, he would prefer all the deviated and illegal sects and groups to the Shia just because they were the followers of Ali and his sons and this was unforgivable crime and unwashable dirt!

There was a great difference between the situation of al-Ghazali in defending the low Yazeed when he killed al-Husayn and the situation of aj-Jahidh about this very point. It would be better to quote something of what aj-Jahidh had said about the subject. The following passage came after the passage we quoted before, in which aj-Jahidh had talked about the lie of the year of the unity (aam aj-jama'a). He said: "...then what was committed by Yazeed and his governors and followers, then the invasion against Mecca, hitting the Kaaba by mangonels, violating Medina and killing al-Husayn (as) and most of his family, who were the lamps of darkness and the pillars of Islam, after al-Husayn promised them to

separate his followers and to go back to his country or to another place but they wanted either to kill him or that he was to submit to their rule.”[47](#)

Then he discussed some doings done by Yazeed that proved his unbelieving until he said, “... then see his poetry, which was full of polytheism and unfaithfulness.” And what about striking the front teeth of al-Husayn (as) with the bar, carrying the daughters of the messenger of Allah (S) bareheaded on intractable camels, uncovering the private parts of Ali bin al-Husayn when they hesitated about his adulthood; whether he had pubes or not in order to be killed or to be carried with the captives as the commander of the Islamic army did with the captives of the polytheists. And what do you say about the saying of Obeidillah bin Ziyad to his companions: “Let me kill him because he is the remainder of this progeny (the Hashemite progeny) to end this age, to get rid of this obstacle and to cut off this genealogy?”

Would you tell us what all that severity and rudeness did mean after they had quenched their thirst by killing them (al-Husayn, most of his family and his companions) and achieved what they liked? Did that show enmity, bad thinking, grudge, hatred, polytheism, abnormality and unbelieving or show faith and love to the Prophet (S), obedience and true-heartedness? If he (Yazeed) were as we described, he would be deviant and unfaithful. This is the simplest thing to be said about him. “The unbeliever is to be damned and he, who forbids cursing the damned, is to be damned.”[48](#)

We do not think that we need to comment on the saying of aj-Jahidh. It has a good answer to confute the disgraceful situation of al-Ghazali in his defending the band of injustice, sins, vices and the cursed tree as called in the holy Quran.

After we saw those shameful words that al-Ghazali, who was given the title of (Hijjatul Islam),[49](#) uttered without feeling shy or embarrassed, we wouldn't be surprised if we read his saying: “It is forbidden for the preacher and the others to narrate the story of the murder of al-Husayn and what happened of quarrel among the companions because it leads people to hate and fault the companions, who were the great figures of the religion. The quarrels happened between them were to be interpreted with good will. Perhaps it was a mistake in interpretation the verdicts and looking forward to the rule and the pleasures of this life.”[50](#)

It was clear why he defended Yazeed and his band with all that misleading and distortion. He forbade mentioning the disaster of al-Husayn. It was a disaster that the humanity had never faced the same and a tragedy that the human beings neither had seen before nor would see the same at all. He considered Yazeed and his band as the great figures of the religion, which would not be straightened up without them, and no one would criticize them save a doubtful or a liar.

Al-Ghazali here defended every unjust and oppressive one. He even defended Mo'awiya in his situation against Imam Ali (as) that it was not for the sake of the authority or the pleasures of the worldly life although Mo'awiya himself had denied that when he said to the people of Kuffa: “O people of Kuffa, do

you think that I fought you for the sake of prayer, zakat and hajj where I knew that you offered prayer, paid zakat and performed hajj? But I fought you to have the authority over you and Allah granted me that although you were unwilling. Know well that any money seized and any bloodshed in this sedition will be in vain and every condition I stipulated will be under my feet.”[51](#)

We do not have to stay long with every fabricated lie al-Ghazali said in his book *Ihya'ul Oloom*, which was full of foolishness, lies, deviation, and deceit. We just wanted, by showing these examples, to give a clear image about those men, with whom the Islamic umma was afflicted, whereas they were just traders of the worldly life trading under the name of the religion. If it was not so, ibnul Arabi wouldn't say: “Al-Husayn was killed by the verdict of his grandfather (Muhammad).”[52](#) He thought that Yazeed was the legal imam and al-Husayn revolted against him and hence killing al-Husayn was the legal punishment according to the Sharia of his grandfather!

Ibnul Arabi was different from al-Ghazali in his frankness. They agreed upon the thought and the aim but the second offered the poison mixed with what he thought as honey... and the other offered it barely, its appearance showing its inner malice and wickedness.

Ibn Khaldoun was not satisfied to defame one of the pure Prophet's family rather than the others so he released his thundering word: “Ahlul Bayt[53](#) deviated with beliefs they invented and jurisprudence they adopted by themselves... and all of that was invalid. The Kharijites also deviated with things like that but the public (they mean, when saying the public, the Sunni sects) did not pay any attention to their beliefs. In fact, they denied them and slandered them so widely. We do not know anything about their beliefs and we do not read their books, which are not available except in their countries. The books of the Shia are available in the west (Morocco), the east, and Yemen where their state was existing. The same is to be, said about the Kharijites. Each sect has its private books and odd thoughts of jurisprudence.”[54](#)

What a pride of ibn Khaldoun it was when he left aside the jurisprudence of Ahlul Bayt! The imams of Ahlul Bayt (as) had not invented any heresy. If their sayings led to heretical beliefs, as ibn Khaldoun said, they were but derived from the holy Quran, which purified them. So let the Quran be the source of the heresies of Ahlul Bayt!

Another pride of ibn Khaldoun: he made Ahlul Bayt equal to the Kharijites, who deviated from the religion, to give a conclusion that Ahlul Bayt had deviated from Islam like the Kharijites according to the Prophet (S), who informed of the deviation of the Kharijites in his traditions.

A third pride of him: he denied and slandered the belief of Ahlul Bayt, which was the essence of Islam, so widely.

Some had exceeded in that until they contradicted the very Sunna, which they used to follow, just because the followers of Ahlul Bayt (the Shia) followed, in order not to imitate anything the Shia did.

Here we have to show some of those contradictions, which were committed intendedly just because the

Shia followed as a prophetic Sunna: the Sunna decided that the tomb must be level, as it was preferable by the Shafiites too, but there were some, who said: “Humping the tomb would be better because leveling the tomb became as a mark of the Shia.”[55](#)

Al-Ghazali and al-Mawardi said about that: “Leveling the tombs was the legal thing but when the Shia adopted it, we turned to humping.”[56](#)

The same was about the ring. According to the Sunnah, it was to be worn on the fingers of the right hand but there were some, who said: “It was traditional to wear the ring on the fingers of the right hand but when the Shia took it as a token, we began to wear it on the fingers of the left hand.”[57](#)

By this doing, they intended to contradict the Shia, who followed the true Sunna, and to follow Mo’awiya, who was the first one to wear it on the left hand.

Many often you find impudent statements like these: “... but it became as a token of the Shia and it must be avoided.”[58](#)

“... and it leads to be accused of Shiism.”[59](#)

“The believer doesn’t have to imitate Yazeed the cursed, the Shia and the Kharijites.”[60](#)

And many often we find that they justified leaving the Sunna aside because (it became as a token of the Shia)! “Leaving the Sunna aside is a part of the Sunna if it is taken as a token by the heretics, like wearing the ring on the right hand. Actually it was a part of the Sunna but when it became as a token of the unjust heretics, the Sunna imposed to wear the ring on the finger of the left hand in our time.”[61](#)

Thus contradicting the Shia became as a followed base of the Sunna and a heresy, with which the true Sunna was, contradicted and no one denied that! Some said when talking about imitating the Shia: “... and hence, some of the jurisprudents thought of leaving some of the preferable rituals, if they were tokens of them (the Shia). Even if leaving them (the rituals) was not obligatory, but performing them would lead to imitating the Shia and so, the Sunni would not be, distinguished from the Shia. The benefit of distinguishing from them in order to dissent and contradict them was greater than the benefit of that preferable ritual.”[62](#)

The questions are crowded and the question marks are many about these thoughts. Which contradict the Sunna, resist the Sharia and wrong a faithful sect, which has no guilt except following the principles of the true religion the orders of the holy Quran and the Sunna of the great Prophet (S) and submitting to the principles of the pure family of the prophet (as).

Was that contradiction a part of the Sunna? Would they contradict every doing done by anyone, who did not comply with their doings and sayings, it concerned the Shia only, or in another word, it concerned Ahlul Bayt, who was one of the two weighty things. The Prophet had left that whoever kept to would be guided, whoever stuck to would be saved and whoever opposed would be perished?

Was the Sunna of Muhammad (S) capable of being distorted, and changed?

Weren't what Muhammad (S) permitted lawful and what he forbidden unlawful until the Day of Resurrection?

What would be the answer to that who said, this thing was a part of the Prophet's Sunna but I forbade it in order that we are to be distinguished from the followers of Ahlul Bayt?

The Shia offers the prayers give the zakat and not only do the obligations but also they do many of the mustahabb⁶³ duties in order to obtain the contentment of Allah. So does whoever wants to contradict them have to leave all what they offer and do of the religious duties or does he—at least—have to do something opposite to the true Sunna in order not to imitate the Shia?

After we knew this bare confession of permissibility of contradicting the Sunna, we found that some had accused the Shia of the same thing! Such situations towards the followers of Ahlul Bayt were very usual.

Thus, the Islamic ummah was afflicted with such people, who did not use knowledge for the sake of rightfulness, to prosper the human beings but they used it as a pick to destroy everything good, and as a seed that would give a bitter fruit of separation. They did not direct their minds to clear the truth but they tried to distort it and all that was because of their greed for positions, ranks, and wealth.

If we wondered at those, who fabricated traditions and lies or at Mo'awiya and his likes, who bought the consciences, broke the promises, violated the covenants, gnawed the wealth of the Muslims like the camel when gnawing the plant of spring, overcame the umma and extorted its rights, we would wonder much more at these, who added fuel to the fire, and who considered those malicious doings as great deeds that could never be criticized and mentioned those fabricated lies as if they were true traditions said by the Prophet (S)... Allah forbid!

Our wonder at these people would not be, put at an end for they fabricated what they fabricated after they had sold their afterlife, their conscience, and their humanity and bought their worldly life. They received the low price; glowing gold and snow-white silver.

As for the buyer, he was a trader, who had nothing to do with virtues or morals. He didn't know except the low desires, after which he panted following every means whatever the price would be and whatever morals and values he would lose! According to his thought, the end justified the means even if the means would destroy the pillars of the religion and dagger it in the heart and would finish off the last spark of the human conscience to muffle the voice of justice and to perish its echoes.

The opportunist policy they followed was enough to extract all the values and concepts that might try to delay their progress towards their low aims.

The Abbasid king said near the tomb of the Prophet (S), "The rule is sterile! If he, who is in this tomb, disputes with me about it, I will strike his nose with this sword!" He said this while he was holding the

reigns of government, appropriating the rights of the ummah and threatening its dignity under the name of the Islamic caliphate. That caliphate, which the true Islamic religion was too far from and calling for jihad to do away with it in order to get it back to the one, who would be well qualified to undertake that important position.

This saying indeed explained the reality of his ancestors, caliphs even though it was not said by other than him but their hearts pulsed with it, and their doings confirmed it.

Your heart will be split with pain when you dive into the books, which were put to write the history of one of the ages or to gather the scattered traditions the narrators narrated from the Prophet (S) in order to save the heritage... When we refer to those books in order to research a subject we want to remove the dirt attached to or to see what fabrication adjoined it to distinguish the truth from the falsehood, we find ourselves like a drowner surrounded by the waves from every side and the darkness prevents every ray of light that he can't see any spark may give him a bit of hope in living. These books are full of lies, funny superstitions and fabricated traditions. The author knew the truth but he wrote his book for this king or for that vizier or to present it to that notable man in order to gain what satisfied his foolish desire or to satiate his mad greediness. He tried to fill his book with all what would satisfy the fancies of that, whom the book was written for, to get his wage in full. If he didn't satisfy that one, even if he would discontent Allah and the rightness, he wouldn't satisfy his greediness and wouldn't achieve his expectations.

This was the direct reason behind what happened of confusion and flounder. When we refer to a subject in a book, we will find the opposite in the other book until the researcher becomes unable to see his way.

Hence, we found that an author wrote down an idea in this book whereas he opposed and contradicted it so strongly in his other book. That was because each book was written according to the fancy of the one, whom the book was written for. When he wrote the other book for the other one, whose desire and fancy contradicted that one's fancy, the subject here would be different and the clear truth there would be falsehood here undoubtedly!

We do not want to show examples in order not to be far away from our subject, which we want to pass this threshold to get to.[64](#)

But here we present one example to show the confusion and the flounder existed just to satisfy the fancies and desires of some figures even if the truth would be distorted, the reality would be denied and the rightness would be violated.

No one would deny that the Prophet (S) had cursed al-Hakam bin Abul Aass and his progeny, and would a carrion produce but stinks. The Prophet (S) said when al-Hakam brought his son Marwan, who had just been born then: "He is the deviant and the son of the deviant. He is the damned and the son of the damned."[65](#)

Aa'isha (the Prophet's wife) said that the Prophet (S) had cursed al-Hakam while Marwan had been not born yet, so Marwan was a leftover of the curse of the Prophet (S).

The Prophet (S) had expelled al-Hakam from Medina. When the Prophet (S) went to the better world, Abu Bakr and then Omar became the caliphs. When someone came to them interceding for al-Hakam, they refused and scolded him severely. They said, "Do we safeguard whom the Prophet had expelled? Do we untie a knot that the Prophet had knotted?"⁶⁶

Omar said when Othman had interceded for al-Hakam: "The Prophet (S) had expelled him and you ask me to let him be back! By Allah, if I let him be back, people will say that Omar changes the age of the Prophet (S). By Allah, if I am split into two like the palm leaf, it will be better to me than to contradict an order of the Prophet! O ibn Affan,⁶⁷ beware of asking me for this again after this day!"⁶⁸

No one might think after all that that ash-Shihab al-Khafaji would come to talk about the repentance of al-Hakam and about his interior sincerity.⁶⁹

Then who, without the money of Mo'awiya, would talk about the faithfulness of Abu Sufyan, who was the bitter enemy of the Muslims and the Prophet of Islam and who didn't become a Muslim except when he was obliged to?

Al-Abbas brought Abu Sufyan to the Prophet (S) after insuring his life. The Prophet (S) said to him, "Woe unto you Abu Sufyan! When will you believe that there is no god but Allah?" Abu Sufyan said, "How merciful, patient, and generous you are! By Allah, I think if there was another god besides Allah, he would suffice me."

The Prophet (S) said, "Woe unto you Abu Sufyan! When will you believe that I am the messenger of Allah?"

Abu Sufyan said, "How merciful, patient, and generous you are! As for this, I still doubt about it."

Al-Abbas said to him, "Woe unto you! Declare the shahada or your head will be cut!"⁷⁰

This was the way that Abu Sufyan became a Muslim as the historians mentioned it. It was but surrender lest his head would be, cut. From time to time, he uncovered the dregs of polytheism and grudge deep-rooted inside his conscience and soul.

Once he saw the people walking behind the Prophet (S). He envied him and whispered to himself: "Would I gather my assistants against this man again!"

The Prophet hit him on his chest saying: "Allah may disgrace you!"

Then think of his answer, which showed what was hidden inside his soul: "I haven't believed that you are the messenger of Allah until this moment."⁷¹

But he even after this moment had never believed nor had faith known any way towards his heart. The bitter thing that hurt him was to hear a statement—showing acknowledgement of the prophecy of Muhammad (S). He said to al-Abbas when he saw the Prophet (S) among his great army surrounded by the battalions of the Ansar: “O Abul Fadhl (al-Abbas), by Allah the rule of your nephew has become so great today!”[72](#)

One day he looked at the Prophet in the mosque with a look full of what his heart had of meanness, grudge, hatred, intriguing and fatal regret that he couldn't defeat the Prophet to do away with his mission. He said to himself sornily and admonishingly, “Would I know with what he had defeated me!”

The Prophet (S) did not let him wait long when he patted on his shoulder answering: “With the support of Allah I had defeated you.” The Prophet (S) turned over Abu Sufyan's material account when he thought that muchness would lead to victory and littleness would cause defeat.

As soon as he heard that Othman became the caliph, he came to him asking, “Is there anyone not of your family among you?” When he became certain that the sphere was clear, he said, “It came to you after Taym and Adiy[73](#) so turn it like the ball and make the Umayyad's its pegs. By what Abu Sufyan swears,[74](#) I am still wishing it for you. Let it be the heritage of your boys. It is but the rule and I don't know what Paradise and Hell mean!”[75](#)

Then he went towards the tomb of Hamza (the Prophet's uncle) to put out a flame of hatred that was still burning inside him. He kicked the tomb and said spitefully, “O Abu Imara, the matter you forced us to with the sword became in our boys' hands. They play with it.”[76](#)

His soul was satisfied then with what he did more than the day of Wahshi and what the livers-eater had done.[77](#)

But while you are researching in the books of Hadith, you find a special chapter talking about the virtues of Abu Sufyan!

Those fabricators were not satisfied with the false virtues of Abu Sufyan, after his pretense of being a Muslim or being, ascribed to Islam by force, until they saw that he had a favor unto Islam! Perhaps this favor was because of his plots against Islam and his fighting against the Prophet (S) in bloody wars! They were not satisfied with all of that until they fabricated this bald lie, which was like the baldness of Abu Hurayra where he ascribed this wonder to the Prophet (S): “Who is like Abu Sufyan? He assisted even the religion before he became a Muslim and after he became a Muslim. Who is like Abu Sufyan? As soon as I came from Allah the Almighty, I met Abu Sufyan. He had a ruby cup. He said, O my beloved friend! Drink! I would be proud of Abu Sufyan. He would get contentment after contentment. May Allah have mercy upon him.”[78](#)

We give up commenting on this bare lie for the life of Abu Sufyan was full of what might confirm this lie...! The pages of history are full of such filths put to satiate the desires of the tyrants and we do not

have to bother ourselves commenting on them.

As you find this chapter inside the books, as you find that the books are crowded with praising the adulterer al-Mugheera bin Shu'ba, the cursed deviant Marwan bin al-Hakam, the two imams of deviation;⁷⁹ Amr bin al-Aass and Mo'awiya, the son of the liver-eater and the likes of the freed captives, the illegitimates and the prostitutes...

Ibn Hajar also wasn't satisfied with his book as-Sawa'iq al-Muhriqa, in which he tried to show that the caliphate of Mo'awiya was rightful until he wrote a book and gave it this big title: "Purifying the heart and the tongue from criticizing our master Mo'awiya bin Abu Sufyan."⁸⁰

What a frightening title! You have to purify your heart and tongue from mentioning anything may defame this purified man and the son of the purified people, the master of ibn Hajar and his likes of the traders, who traded under the pretense of knowledge!

But as for his (Mo'awiya's) wrongful war against Ali, shedding the Muslims' bloods, creating the heresy of cursing Ali, murdering Ammar bin Yassir, Hujr bin Adiy and his companions. Poisoning Imam Hassan, Malik al-Ashtar and others, acknowledging the brotherhood of Ziyad and much many of other malicious deeds... as for all these he was to be considered as a mujtahid, who would be rewarded for what he had done and he was the seventh trustee with the revelation or the third as in another tradition.⁸¹

As you read some lines in this book, your heart is about to be split painfully and jealously when you see that the truth is distorted and the rightness is despised and killed! You find in this book some traditions, in which the Prophet (S) had dispraised Mo'awiya but the author tried his best to interpret them, as he liked to change them into praises and virtues for Mo'awiya.

The book is full of fabricated traditions ascribed to the Prophet (S) and Imam Ali (as) to justify the situation, the war, and the cursing of Mo'awiya against Imam Ali.

But I excuse ibn Hajar since he had written his book according to the (insistent demand of Sultan Humayoun, the great sultan of India)!

If we find an excuse that may justify the doings of those traders, who has bought their consciences and distorted the truth and the reality in order to keep up with the false rule and the unjust rulers in return for wages and bribes extorted from the ummah and the weak people... and if we find someone excusing them that perhaps some of those authors said what they said and fabricated what they fabricated for fear of the policy of violence and torment with every means... and these, no doubt, are weak excuses that they neither defend them nor justify their shameful situations because they alone were responsible for that fabrication and distortion for it was them, who put the bases of that unjust structure and then it was occupied by the unjust extorter and was inherited by the learned and the ignorant, who widened it as they could during those dark ages... but what excuse may be given to that, who walks in the sinuous thorny way after the research and scrutiny have uncovered the distorted facts and the despised

rightness... what excuse may be given to that, who lives this age, which is called the age of light and freedom, but he still ruminates the cud of that distorted dark past without letting himself research, scrutinize and check?

If the corrupted policy at that time required that destroying situation, and rewarded whoever held the pick of destruction and separation, had a mercenary pen and used science and knowledge to establish the pillars of a tottering and collapsing structure. And if the kings of the Muslims, who were called caliphs but they weren't, preceded to use the policy of "divide and rule"... the age of today is not the same age of yesterday, the situation is not the same of yesterday and the Arab rulers are not the same of that age.

Today we are seriously in need of rapport and unity, tenacity, unified strives to confront the common enemy. Forgetting the inherited grudges and clearing the sphere, which some ones wanted to overcast with dark clouds, to let the sun shine to light the existence, then the water will be, cleared, and he who used to fish in the troubled water, will lose.

Whoever wants to get to the true reality and sift the heritage, which was, mixed with adventitious blemishes, has to be free from his fanaticism, inherited traditions, and has to work sincerely, honestly and patiently. His work must be for the sake of Allah alone. He is to look for the bright truth and the shiny rightness.

He, who does not have these qualities, has to forget the past. He is not to talk about what he doesn't know and not to accuse the others according to his fancy or furious passion without depending upon reason, science, perceiving and well-informedness otherwise he will crumble the tenacious unity and he will just serve the lurking enemy knowingly or unknowingly, intendedly or unintendedly. At the same time he will discontent his God and violate the rightness and the religion.

But, and we say it painfully, this age; the age of civilization and progress, the age of science and atom, the age of researching in the unknown and for the unknown, is afflicted with some people living in it with their bodies only while their minds still live in the darkness of the past. They ravage the ummah, deceive the simple people, and distort science and knowledge.

We don't try here to argue against them but we are to ask, what led ar-Rafi'ee (for example) when arguing against a non-Shia writer in his book "Under the Banner of the Quran" to defame the Shia and accuse them falsely unless there was something inside him?

And why did one like Dr. Ahmad Ameen insist upon defaming the Shia in some of his books, which he pretended that he had written to record the history of Islam! Whereas he distorted the history of Islam by ascribing lies and fabrications to the Shia in spite of that he had apologized to Imam Kashiful Ghita' justifying that he had never referred to any source nor depended upon any reference⁸² when criticizing the Shia. His excuse was worse than his offense. He promised to expiate that in his new writings but he doubled his cursing and abusing.

For whose benefit Abdullah al-Qusseimi,⁸³ Muhammad Rasheed Ridha',⁸⁴ Muhibbuddeen al-Khateeb⁸⁵ and their likes of the mercenaries poured their deadly poison, deep-rooted hatred and burning spite on the Shia? It showed that their psychologies were full of complexities and educational and hereditary diseases either domestic or environmental. All that reflected inside them reactions, which they tried to relieve by writing books full of lies, fabrications and foists, by which they increased the disagreement and separation at the time that imposed upon every sincere person to do away with the causes of that disagreement and dispute.

Wouldn't it be better for them to be sincere to their religion and life if they did what they had to do and if they exploited their knowledge and abilities to content Allah, the people, their consciences, their religion and the rightness. Thus, they would come back to the pure source of religion, which flew with love and goodness, spread peace and called for cordiality and tenacity?

But unfortunately they followed a dubious desire and walked in a crooked way until they missed the straight way, deviated from the rightness and were lost in the mazes of separation and all that produced these bitter fruits, whose bitterness we suffer now.

In spite of all that, they thought that they had done the best of their duties, but if they pondered with a little of prudence, they would be shocked by the bitter reality and they would find themselves so far away from the pure religion.

By saying so, we do not deny those, who devoted themselves to purify the religion from the blemishes attached to it and to defend it against the doubts and distortions the biased fabricators tried to mix it with. Those devoted people did their duties in the best way for no personal desire or aim save the sake of Allah and the rightfulness. They announced the truth loudly, supported the unity of the Muslims, uncovered, as possible as they could, what those mercenaries had done to separate the Muslims into groups, to split their unity, to distort the truth, to change the realities and to reverse the events.

It was not of our subject to detail this side by talking about these great people, who presented their loyal efforts for the sake of Allah and His people.

This was a subject that we had to review as we were about to talk about Abu Talib. We had to know the matter of fabricating traditions since Abu Talib was one of their victims!

After we knew what Mo'awiya had done against Imam Ali and how he had fought him with the sword and the tongue, so it was definitely that, some of that flood of accusations would have reached Abu Talib.

If Abu Talib had not been Ali's father, he would not have been defamed nor been accused of anything but just because he had been Ali's father as our respected father said.

There was no wonder at all after we knew the causes and motives that led to hide the truth, which was about to be perished unless it was saved by the care of Allah. And there was no wonder when the

history took that hostile situation when facing the life of this hero and took that bad situation against him when he was dying and his soul was about to leave for the better world. His eye was delighted and his conscience was content with supporting the mission of the Heaven.

He would not pay any attention to the wrong he got from the history, which showed no interest in his mention except a little. The history ignored his great deeds, his bold situations and his defending the mission defiantly, paving the way for the hearts to receive that new belief, chanting with the mission of God and priding himself upon the Prophet's human exploits.

If the history sometime mentioned something of that, it would in many times contradict what it had mentioned. There was something in the inner between the history and this hero that he was the father of Ali! So its walk would be crooked and the straight ways would be curved due to a need that was to be satisfied.

But whatever the clouds cumulate, the sun must shine and send its rays through the clouds and the darkness never stays as long as the sun is in the sky.

So you find, in spite of the shameful situation of the history towards this wronged man, what clears his life on a pure page, in a bright line or in a shining letter.

I thought at the first that the task would be difficult and the burden would be heavy when I found that the sources were few or in fact when I saw the shameful situation of history.

But as I started some steps in my way, I met much of this man's history scattered in the books. I gathered it from the reliable books, upon which the firm writer, who looked for the pure truth, could depend upon.

Then I said: The rightfulness will not be bereaved of supporters and the false saying will not last long!

Allah will perfect His light, though the unbelievers may be averse. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 61:8)

Even if the cloud stays long, the wind must come to drive it away and even if the sky is covered with heavy clouds, clearness will come soon or late.

And with none but Allah is the direction of my affair to a right issue; on Him do I rely and to Him do I turn. (The Holy Quran, Shakir 11:88)

[1.](#) Mo'awiya was the first caliph of the Umayyads.

[2.](#) Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p. 15.

[3.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 3 p. 15.

[4.](#) Ibid

[5.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p. 16.

[6.](#) Ibid

[7.](#) In Arabic (bin) means (son of) and (abeeh) means (his father). Ziyad was called the son of his father because he was

illegitimate child. Later on he was ascribed to Abu Sufyan (Mo'awiya's father).

8. I did not expect to find a saying of a man of letters living in the twentieth century where he thought that he had got rid of the dregs of that odious Dark Age with all what it had of selling the conscience and distorting the truth like the saying of Hassan as-Sandoobi. It seems that there are many persons, who still live with the dregs of that dark history and try to spread its poisons among the people.

Hassan as-Sandoobi in his book *Sharh al-Bayan wet-Tebyeen*, vol. 1 p.204 when talking about Ziyad says this malicious and repugnant saying: "I don't blame Ziyad for leaving Ali and joining Mo'awiya and I don't think that it would defame his thinking, virtues and deeds... because Mo'awiya acknowledged that he was his brother from Abu Sufyan and nothing would be more important for man than to be certain about his lineage."

If we had time to comment on this false saying, we would uncover what destruction, misleading, fabrication and distortion of the principles of Islam and humanity these little words had. It objected the tradition of the Prophet (S) when saying, "The new-born baby is to be ascribed to the bed". (It means that the illegitimate baby is to be ascribed to its mother and it is prohibited to ascribe it to the adulterer). It encouraged joining the illegitimate child to the adulterer and it did not consider seceding from the legal imam as a sin or guilt...! Yes, all these bad doings proved the good thinking, the virtue and the excellent deeds of Ziyad... what disgrace!

What a difference between this Sandoobi and aj-Jahidh was when talking about the disgrace of ascribing Ziyad to Abu Sufyan as his father. This considered it as virtue and excellence of Ziyad and that excluded Mo'awiya, when he joined Ziyad to his father, from the dissolute to join him to the unbelievers depending upon true evidences in a word we will mention soon when discussing the lie of (Aam aj-Jama'a; the year of the unity).

My wonder and surprise about this repugnant saying of as-Sandoobi dwindled after steps of reading his explanation. I stopped surprisedly before his comment, which blackened seven lines in p. 183-184, vol.2. It was a black stain in his explanation when he defended the Abadites (a sect of the Kharijites) opposing all the true traditions mentioned in all of the Sahihs (the books of Hadith) and agreed upon by all the Muslims. The Prophet (S) said when referring to the Kharijites, "They renegade like the arrow going out of the game animal".

But this Sandoobi said about them: "They are the best of the Muslims. They detest the heresies, which are so far from the true religion and hence some of the Muslims accuse them of being inflexible and that they do not comply with the civilized progress. In fact they are accused of what they are free from." Do you see how this man accused all the Muslims falsely whereas they just followed what the Prophet (S) had said about those people, whom as-Sandoobi defended?

He was not satisfied with this. He added, "I was deceived by the sayings of their opponents about them and I used the same accusations in some of the footnotes in the first volume of my book but then the truth appeared. I knew that they (the Kharijites) were among the best of the Muslims, who depended -in all their worships and dealings- upon the Quran and the Sunna. Do not care for aj-Jahidh's opinion about them because they were, before, opponents of the Mu'tazilites (a sect of the Muslims). May Allah be pleased with all of the Muslims."

He prayed Allah to be pleased with those, who renegaded Islam and he considered them as being devoted to the Sunna. I do not know what he will say about what was mentioned in the Prophet's tradition, which was agreed upon among all the Muslims, about those people. How did he gather between this and his beseeching Allah to be pleased with all of the Muslims if the Kharijites, after they renegaded Islam, were among the Muslims? The Muslims, except those, who had the same thought of the Kharijites and those who contradicted the true Sunna, were certain of what the Prophet (S) had said about the Kharijites and they didn't consider them but as the Prophet (S) had considered them. They were but apostates.

Their prayers were but whistling and clapping. They read the Quran but it did not reach their clavicles as the Prophet (S) had described them. They were a great image of cunning religious hypocrisy, which deceived the naive like this inexperienced Sandoobi! I noticed a Kharijite tendency in him before I quoted his footnote here. Whenever he talked about one of the Kharijites, he filled his speech with praise, tribute and commendation but, on the contrary, when he wanted to

talk about someone having a Shiite tendency, he abridged—if he didn't ignore him or criticized him—as possible as he could whatever personality that one had except for what he was obliged to mention unwillingly.

The main cause behind his situation concerning Ziyad, the Kharijites, and the Shia was because there was something in his heart towards Imam Ali... It was not but a fruit from the seed of Mo'awiya to resist Imam Ali in order to control the Muslims' affairs.

[9.](#) It is the old name of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine.

[10.](#) It would be better to show the reader a simple account of some of the horrid crimes committed by Samra: Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal mentioned in his Musnad, vol. 1 p.25 a tradition narrated by ibn Abbas: it was said to Omar (may Allah be pleased with him) that Samra had sold wine. He said: "Allah may kill Samra. The Prophet (S) had said: Allah cursed the Jews; the furs were forbidden for them but they dissolved them and sold them." Samra had committed crimes that the hard rocks would feel ashamed and shy with. He killed from Basra, when Ziyad appointed him as his successor, eight thousand persons!

It was an incredible number. You can imagine the great destruction happened to the umma because of those oppressive rulers. Eight thousands of innocent people were killed by Samra while he was just a temporary emir! And he didn't feel ashamed or sorry about it. He answered Ziyad when asked him to know his innerness: "Don't you fear that you might have killed an innocent one?" He answered in a way that was so near to the very filthy innerness of Ziyad: "If I had killed as double as them, I wouldn't have feared."

He didn't think that the umma had any dignity or value. The umma, under a rule like this, was an insignificant thing. The killing of a man equaled nothing at all. It was enough for a procession of an emir like Samra, just when passing, to kill whomsoever without any guilt or sin. Samra passed by a man killed with a dagger by one of his knights. He saw him immersed in his blood but he did never feel sorry.

He said his saying that explained his complete indifference: "If you hear that we ride our horses, you have to avoid our arrowheads." He, with all his crimes and sins, was one of those, whose psychologies Mo'awiya had studied and found that they would satisfy his fancies and walk in his way. Samra himself acknowledged that when saying: "By Allah, if I obeyed Allah as I obeyed Mo'awiya, He would never punish me."

He obeyed Mo'awiya and disobeyed Allah, so what a torture he would face in Hell! This was a summary about some of Samra's crimes, which couldn't be included in this summary. Refer to at-Tabari's Tareekh, vol.4 p. 176, al-Kamil, vol.3 p.229 and al-Ghadeer, vol.11 p.29-30 to see more and more of this criminal's sins.

[11.](#) He was the man who assassinated Imam Ali in the mosque.

[12.](#) Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.361 and al-Ghadeer, vol.2p.101 and vol.11 p.30.

[13.](#) I wonder about those, who sanctify all the companions without criticizing or blaming any of them, who had committed sins! How do they gather between this and the verdicts of the Quran and the Sunna that contradict their thoughts? There are many Quranic verses and prophetic traditions talking about the hypocrisy spread among the Muslims during the reign of the Prophet (S).

If we supposed that there were neither Quranic verses nor prophetic traditions talking about the hypocrites among the Muslims, we wouldn't sanctify and purify all the companions and wouldn't trust in them all in all to depend upon their sayings and doings as undebatable evidences, whereas indeed the conducts of some of them destroyed the bases of Islam one after the other as Mo'awiya and his likes... so how about all the verses and traditions that exposed the hypocrites and warned the Muslims of them?

This did not mean that all the companions were so. Among them there were those great companions, who were the example of justice and righteousness and who were to be honored and glorified. But it became clear that Mo'awiya's attempt was the cornerstone of the continuous war declared against Imam Ali, who was the separative line between faith and hypocrisy as the Prophet (S) had described him in many of his traditions. In order to fight Imam Ali and defame him

they created this lie and it became the first brick of their unjust construction.

[14.](#) Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.358. We don't want to mention the details of the event of al-Mugheera's adultery for it had blackened some lines in history. Whoever wants to know about it –it was so famous in history– let refer to its sources.

[15.](#) Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.1 p.358.

[16.](#) Ibid p.318 and vol.3 p.11, Muslim's (Muslim here is a name of a man, who collected the prophetic traditions in a book called Sahih) Sahih, vol.1 p.136.

[17.](#) Thus some of the historians became pleased to call this year so whereas this name, indeed, did never express the reality of this year, in which Mo'awiya had seized the rule of the Islamic umma. In fact it was the year of separation, difference and dissension and had no anything of unity. After sometime of writing these lines it happened that I read the book Mo'awiya bin Abu Sufyan in the scales. I read the comments about the reason of calling this year with this name. I found in the book a good attempt to weigh the matter with justice in spite of that the book, in some of its points, wronged the scales and slipped times and times so clearly but this had nothing to do with our subject.

In p.66 the author said: "If the history criticized him (Mo'awiya) rightfully, it wouldn't describe him except as the separative of the unities. But it is the reader of history who will weigh the deeds and the men; where you find that some of the historians called the year when Mo'awiya seized the rule for himself alone as the year of the unity because he separated the umma into fighting groups that didn't know how to agree with each other if they tried to agree! Then he left the umma after his death to separate into more groups during the reign of each caliph."

The author gave many examples about the plans of this separation until he said in p.188: "No one is more deviate and more ignorant than the historians, who called the year forty-one of hijra as the year of the unity because it was the year when Mo'awiya appropriated the caliphate for himself without letting anyone participate with him for the first age of Islam didn't face any year, in which the umma separated as it separated in this year or dispersed as what happened in this year." He went on showing Mo'awiya's separative doings, which crumbled the tenacious Islamic unity and threatened its strong pillars. The Muslims still pick the bitter fruits of that Dark Age and still drink from its turbid water, in which those, who don't live except in the infected environment, fish and hold the pick of destruction and walk in the same devious way that Mo'awiya walked in.

Aj-Jahidh had a valuable word concerning this point, in which the mercenary pens had played their round widely. We think that we have to quote it here because it explains the subject with evidences. He said in his thesis about the Umayyads in p.293–294 after relating some of the events that paved the way for Mo'awiya to seize the caliphate of the great Islamic umma: "Then Mo'awiya sat firmly on the throne and overcame the rest of the shura and all the Muslims; the Muhajireen and the Ansar (Muhajireen: the first Muslims, who emigrated from Mecca to Medina. Ansar; are the people of Medina, who believed in the Prophet and assisted him and his companions), in the year, which they called as the year of the unity. It was not a year of unity but it was a year of separation, subdual, compulsion and surmounting. It was the year, in which the imamate was changed into hereditary rule and the caliphate into Caesarean position.

His conduct was a combination of deviation and debauchery. He kept on his sins until he denied the tradition of the Prophet openly and contradicted his verdict about the illegitimate child and what had to be decided about the adulteress in spite of the consensus of the umma that Sumayya (Ziyad's mother, whom Abu Sufyan committed adultery with) was not Abu Sufyan's wife and so Mo'awiya was to be considered as unbeliever rather than to be considered just as dissolute.

Killing Hujr bin Adiy, donating the revenue of Egypt to Amr bin al-Aass, the homage of the dissolute Yazeed (Mo'awiya's son), appropriating the booties, choosing the walis according to fancy and voiding the legal laws before intercession and relationship were all of that kind, which denied the certified verdicts and the legal laws of the Sharia. There was no difference whether the unbelievers denied the holy Quran or the Sunna if the Sunna was as famous as the verdict of the Quran but one of them was greater than the other... and the punishment in the afterlife would be greater.

This was the first unbelieving among the umma and it was committed by him, who pretended to be the imam and the caliph

of the umma. Many people of that age became unbelievers when they didn't declare his (Mo'awiya's) unbelieving. The juveniles of our time and the heresiarchs of our age exceeded by saying: "Don't abuse Mo'awiya because he had a companionship with the Prophet. Abusing him is a heresy. He, who hates him, contradicts the Sunna." They pretended that it was a part of the Sunna not to acquit from those, who denied the very Sunna!"

This is enough to show the reader a side of many bad sides of Mo'awiya. On the other side it shows the corruption of the values where the truth was distorted, the rightfulness was marred and the concepts and the criteria were changed. This saying got great importance because the sayer was aj-Jahidh.

[18.](#) This was an acknowledgement of Abu Hurayra imposed upon him by the association of ideas and the inner speech.

[19.](#) Ibn Abul Hadeed in his Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1p.360, after mentioning this lie denied (from Eer to Thour) and corrected it with (from Eer to Uhod). Eer, Thour and Uhod were names of places (mountains) in Medina.

[20.](#) Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.360. In al-Ghadeer by al-Ameen, vol.5 p.251 many of Hurayz's obscene deeds and impudent fabrications towards Imam Ali were mentioned. We don't wonder about all what Hurayz fabricated after we know that he was one of those, who cursed Imam Ali and that he wasn't satisfied until he cursed him seventy times. Al-Ghadeer, vol.5 p.250 and vol. 11 p.87. Al-Hakim confirmed Hurayz's enmity to Imam Ali (Al-Ghadeer, vol. 1 p.87) but in spite of all that and unfortunately al-Bukhari depended upon him in his Sahih as a trustworthy narrator of Hadith!

[21.](#) Ibid p.360.

[22.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.356 and al-Bayan wet-Tebyeen by aj-Jahidh, vol.2 p.209.

[23.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.256, al-Ghadeer, vol.2 p. 102. In al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.257-271 there is a simplified discussion about Mo'awiya's heresy of cursing Imam Ali and a wonderful comment about it.

[24.](#) It was the name of Abu Bakr's tribe.

[25.](#) The name of Omar's tribe.

[26.](#) The tribe of the Prophet (S). Hashem was the great grandfather of the Prophet.

[27.](#) Refer to Sulh al-Hassan p.225, Murooj ath-Thahab by al-Mass'oodi, vol.2 p.342, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.2 p.357, al-Hassan bin Ali p.212, al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.283-284 and ad-Da'wa by the father of the author of this book, vol. 1 p.273, 312.

[28.](#) It was mentioned in Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.77 that al-Mugheera had said: "By Allah, I hadn't been sincere to him (Ali) before and I will never be sincere to him as long as I live." How fair and honest companion he was!!!

[29.](#) Refer to Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.356, al-Ghadeer, vol.2 p. 102, (al-Bayan wet-Tebyeen) by aj-Jahidh, vol. 10 p.290 and ad-Da'wa vol. 1 p. 155.

[30.](#) Imam Ali many times prayed to Allah against the people of Iraq like his saying: "O Allah, set up the man of Thaqeef (the tribe al-Hajjaj belonged to) to rule them and to make them drink the bitter sap of aloes." Imam Husayn also had prayed to Allah against the people of Iraq in the day of at-Taff (the day of Aashura' or the day of Kerbala', the day when he was martyred) especially his saying: "O Allah... and don't make the walis content with them at all..."

[31.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.356 and vol.3 p. 16.

[32.](#) Thus the history had described him. He might be of the family of monkeys or pigs!

[33.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.357 and ad-Da'wa, vol. 1 p.210.

[34.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol, 1 p.356, al-Kamil by al-Mubarrid, vol.2 p.677-678. He added: (...bin Abd Manaf, the cousin of the messenger of Allah and the husband of his daughter Fatima) the author found it too difficult to mention the curse so he said: (the (doing) of Allah be upon Ali).

[35.](#) A'yan ash-Shia, vol.35 p.78 and the Thesis of aj-Jahidh p. 15.

[36.](#) The commander of the believers.

[37.](#) Refer to Asbab an-Nuzool (by As-Sayooti) p.63.

[38.](#) Majma'ul Bayan, vol.5 p. 112 and al-Kashshaf, vol. 1 p.397.

[39.](#) As-Seera al-Halabiyya, vol. 1 p. 195.

[40.](#) Ihya'ul Oloom, vol.3 p. 121. Al-Ghazali had another opinion contradicting his previous one showing that he recovered his senses. It was mentioned in SIRRUL AALAMEEN p. 10. It seemed that his situations changed according to the motive of writing this book or that.

- [41.](#) Ihya'ul Oloom, vol.3 p. 122.
- [42.](#) Wahshi was the one, who assassinated Hamza, the Prophet's uncle, in the battle of Uhod. He was instigated by Hind, the wife of Abu Sufyan and the mother of Mo'awiya.
- [43.](#) Wahshi in Arabic means: beastly.
- [44.](#) Al-Istee'ab, vol.3 p.61.
- [45.](#) Ihya'ul Oloom, vol.3 p. 121.
- [46.](#) Ibid p. 120.
- [47.](#) The thesis of aj-Jahidh p.294.
- [48.](#) The Thesis of aj-Jahidh p.295.
- [49.](#) A scientific degree among the ulema.
- [50.](#) Al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.211 from Tafseer Roohul Bayan, vol.4 p. 142 by Isma'eel al-Buroossawi.
- [51.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.4 p.6 and al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.326.
- [52.](#) Muqaddimat ibn Khaldoon p.217.
- [53.](#) The Prophet's family.
- [54.](#) Muqaddimat ibn Khaldoon, p.446.
- [55.](#) Al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.209.
- [56.](#) Ibid p.210.
- [57.](#) Ibid
- [58.](#) Al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.210.
- [59.](#) Ibid
- [60.](#) Ibid
- [61.](#) Ibid
- [62.](#) Ibid
- [63.](#) Mustahabb refers to the optional religious duties.
- [64.](#) Refer to Ihya'ul Oloom and Sirrul Aalameen to see the two contradicted situations of al-Ghazali about Yazeed and the murder of al-Husayn (as).
- [65.](#) Refer to Yanabee'ul Mawadda p.256, an-Niza' wet-Takhassum p.5, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.55, Kashful Astar p.85, Abu Hurayra by Sharafuddeen al-Aamily p. 126, ad-Da'wa, vol. 1 p. 198, al-Ghadeer, vol.5 p. 130, 252, vol.8 p.266. The author of al-Ghadeer mentioned that al-Hakim had collected all the traditions related to this subject in his Mustadrak, vol.4 p.479-482.
- [66.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. p.66, al-Ghadeer, vol.8 p.250, 260, the Thesis of aj-Jahidh p.80.
- [67.](#) Othman.
- [68.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p.232.
- [69.](#) As-Seera an-Nabawiyya, vol. 1 p.229.
- [70.](#) Refer to al-Istee'ab, vol.4 p.86, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.4 p.208, al-Ghadeer, vol.3 p.223. Aj-Jahidh referred to that in his Thesis p.78 (the preferability of Hashem to Abd Shams) and he referred to Abu Sufyan's words of blasphemy after his being a Muslim.
- [71.](#) Al-Issaba, vol.2 p. 172, al-Ghadeer, vol.8 p.285, vol. 10 p.83.
- [72.](#) Imam Ali, the Voice of Justice p.207-208 (vol.4 p.771).
- [73.](#) He meant the caliphate. Taym was the tribe of Abu Bakr and Adiy was the tribe of Omar.
- [74.](#) The reader might not ignore what Abu Sufyan would swear by. The echo of his word in one of his wars against the Prophet was still roving. He said: "Glorify Hubal!" (Hubal was the name of an idol in the pre-Islamic age). The end of this saying of him has many and many evidences ...but!
- [75.](#) Refer to al-Istee'ab, vol.4 p.87-88, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol. 1 p. 130, Imam Ali, vol. 1 p.319, an-Niza' wet-Takhassum p.5,27, Mu'jamul Quboor, vol. 1 p. 193, Assl ash-Shia p.55-56, al-Ghadeer, vol.8 p.285,339, vol. 10 p.83 and Imam Ali, the Voice of Justice p.249.
- [76.](#) An-Niza' wet-Takhassum p.27, Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.4 p.51, Murooj ath-Thahab, vol.2 p.351, 353, Imam Ali, vol. 1 p.322, al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.83, in Imam Ali, the Voice of Justice p.209 (vo.4 p.772) there is another word somehow like it or

it may be more bitter: “Get up! The rule that you fought us for came to us.”

[77.](#) When Wahshi killed Hamza, Hind (Abu Sufyan’s wife) came to the field, split the chest of Hamza and ate his liver to put out her spite!

[78.](#) Al-Ghadeer, vol. 10 p.79–80.

[79.](#) Sharh Nahjul Balagha, vol.3 p. 15. Ibn Abul Hadeed concluded when explaining the speech of Imam Ali that these two were meant by imams of deviation.

[80.](#) This book was printed on the margins of his book as-Sawa’iq al-Muhriqa.

[81.](#) Among the fabricated traditions were the following: “The trustees are seven; the Tablet, the Pen, Israfael, Michael, Gabriel, Muhammad and Mo’awiya.” In some traditions the number became three: “Allah has entrusted Gabriel, me (Muhammad) and Mo’awiya with His revelation... and Mo’awiya was about to be sent as prophet because of his great knowledge and his being entrusted with the revelation of my God. Allah has forgiven Mo’awiya’s sins, rewarded him in full, taught him His book and has guided him well and made him as a guide for people.” Refer to al-Ghadeer, vol.5 262.

[82.](#) Refer to Asl ash-Shia p.50.

[83.](#) In his book (The dispute between Islam and the idolatry) he meant by Islam the Sunni and by idolatry the Shia. My father (Allah may have mercy upon him) answered him with a scientific answer hoping to firm the unity between the Muslims and to clear the sphere of every blemish besides refuting his lies and fabrications in an honest way and a good will where he didn’t intend but to show the truth and to get the Muslims to their real source of Islam, the religion of leniency, love and cordiality before the biased separators tried to pollute it as possible as they could and used every means to separate the umma and to split its unity.

But unfortunately the fate didn’t respite him to complete his book in order to get to his aim but what he had done was enough to answer al-Qusseimi, whose book with its two volumes was but a heap of repeated curses and abuses.

[84.](#) In his book (The Sunna and the Shia or the Wahabites and the Rafidha (deniers)) and other books. It sufficed him to have such a false, deviative and destructive book filled with intrigues, lies and abuses.

[85.](#) ...in much of what he wrote and commented like his poisonous shameful impudent comments, which was full of abuses, in his book (Mukhtassar Minhaj as-Sunna), in which he defamed many ulema and personalities of the Shia in a shameless dishonest way. All that was out of his latent hatred and poisonous passion.

What he writes in al-Azhar magazine is clear evidence showing his polluted psychology. Unfortunately this magazine is established by the university of al-Azhar; this great religious establishment, whose duty imposes upon it to firm and spread the true religion, to strive to remove the sectarianism, to unite all the Muslims and to purify the Muslim society from its enemies, who slips into it to separate the Muslims and split their unity.

Today the sheikh of al-Azhar Professor Shaloot has, after achieving his great decision of teaching the Shia jurisprudence in this university, to achieve another important step by silencing this cawing voice of al-Khateeb because the structure won’t be erected as long as there is someone demolishing the base with his pick.

Source URL:

<https://www.al-islam.org/abu-talib-faithful-quraysh-abdullah-al-khunayzi/threshold#comment-0>