

Published on Al-Islam.org (https://www.al-islam.org)

Home > Shiite Islam: Orthodoxy or Heterodoxy? > Genesis of the Work

## **Genesis of the Work**

As a result of the popularity of Shī ite Islīm: Orthodoxy or Heterodoxy, many readers have inquired about its genesis. In light of such interest, we decided that it would be worthwhile to contextualize the historical moment in which the work was created as well as its ultimate objective. As a close friend and colleague of the author, it is our privilege to share our inner knowledge of the works origin.

Although some rough drafts had been presented in the course of classes and conferences, it was not until 1994 that Luis Alberto Vittor felt the need to complete Sheite Islem: Orthodoxy or Heterodoxy. The author's desire to finish the work was motivated by two violent events: the explosions of the Israeli Embassy and the Asociación Mutal Israeli-Argentina or AMIA which occurred in Buenos, Aires, Argentina on March 17th and July 18th, 1994, terrorist attacks which were both attributed arbitrarily to Sheite Muslims.

Due to the circumstances in which it was written, the work was redacted rapidly in response to an urgent need to confront journalists, specialists, and international observers who joined together to label Shelite Islem as a "sect" which was "heterodox" with respect to "orthodox" Sunne Islem. The author was also responding to seditious attempts to separate the Sunne and Shelite schools of thought, labeling Shelites a minority of hard-core religious fanatics with a history of violence.

The enemies of Isl®m rallied around the tragic events in Argentina denouncing Sh®ites as "fundamentalists" and "terrorists." Their objective was clear: a callous attempt to isolate Sh®ite Muslims from the Isl®mic Ummah as an unorthodox faction composed of radical extremists.

In an unparalleled fashion, many Argentinean and American Orientalists, made *tabula rasa* with everything written about Shelite Islem from Corbin to the present, and started to echo the most hostile attitudes towards Islem expressed by early Orientalists and which had long been rejected. It was evident from the onset that certain academics were benefiting from the terrorist attacks in Argentina to launch an ideological assault against Shelite Muslims.

In their zeal to prove that Shelite Muslims had been the instigators or perpetrators of the most serious criminal attacks ever suffered by Argentineans, Argentinean and American academics stressed the

minority character of Shilite Muslims, characterizing them as a group of sectarian zealots who stood in clear contrast to the moderation and orthodoxy of the Sunni majority. Academic specialists, journalists, international observers, so-called "experts" on the Middle East, along with ex-intelligence officers, and military envoys, stressed the minority status of Shilites in order to accentuate their sectarianism.

Like cockroaches crawling from the under the wood–work in the dark hours of night, these "experts" on Islīm attempted to give the Shī ah Ithnī 'Asharī traits which belonged to other Shī ite schools like the Ismī iliyah or the Zaydiyyah. They associated Twelver Shī ites with Zaydī revolutionaries, and the Ismī ilī Hashashīn or Assassins, in order to establish that Shī ites were historically a group of extremist rebels who never hesitated to use radically violent methods against their enemies. The enemies of Islīm employed Iblīsī analogies to say that Shī ite Muslims were all murderers. They argued that since the Hashashīn or Assassins were Ismī islīs, and the Ismī is were Shī ites, then every Shī ite was a potential assassin.

Evidently, both the premises and the conclusion were false. Nevertheless, this syllogism had the expected effect. The press and the airwaves were soon speaking about Shelite terrorism, Shelite fundamentalism, Shelite extremism, as if they were all synonyms. It was imperative for someone to come forward to demonstrate that these terms were the result of false logic or a false logical construct whose sole objective was to demean Shelite Muslims.

In an attempt to give credence to accusations against Shelite Muslims, there are those who continue to insist that the terrorist attacks which took place in 1992 and 1994 in the city of Buenos Aires were the work of Shelite Muslims. In effect, the majority of encyclopedias continue to attribute these crimes to Hizbulleh or the Islemic Republic of Iran. Despite such stubbornness, nobody in Argentina believes in these accusations and Argentinean authorities are now exploring an Israeli trail. As a result, Washington is putting pressure on the Argentine government to put an end to its investigation which is starting to annoy the United States and Israel.

The Argentinean people, however, want the guilty parties brought to justice as the events were not without deadly consequence for Argentine society. On the 17th of March of 1992, a violent explosion destroyed the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aries and seriously damaged the adjacent Catholic Church and school. Twenty-nine people were killed and 242 were injured. The deaths were gruesome. Argentine television broadcasted streets littered with human remains and rubble, pieces of mutilated corpses, like the leg of a woman with a sock and shoe which was severed from her body.

In the early days of the investigation, efforts were directed towards the Isl®mist trail. It was believed that the attack had been committed by a Palestinian suicide bomber who drove a mini–van full of explosives. It was suggested that he was a member of Isl®mic Jih®d who wanted to avenge the death of 'Abb®s al-M®saw®, the head of the Lebanese Hizbull®h, and his family. According to this version, the Buenos Aires operation had been prepared by a group of Pakistanis and coordinated by Mohsen Rabban®, the Cultural Attaché from the Iranian Embassy. This later was even detained, one year later, while he was in

Germany, only to be liberated later due to lack of evidence.

On July 18th, 1994, another explosion devastated the Buenos Aires building of the *Asociación Mutual Israelita–Argentina* (AMIA) resulting in 85 deaths and 300 injured. The investigation into this new terrorist bombing also attempted to uncover an Isl®mist trail. The attack was attributed to a so–called Isl®mic "kamikazi:" 29 year old Ibr®h®m Husein Berro who supposedly drove a vehicle full of explosives.

While it is true that Ibr hem Husein Berro existed, his brother demonstrated that he died in Lebanon several years before and not in the attack in Buenos Aires. Whoever drove the vehicle full of explosives, it could not have been Ibr hem Berro. Years later a warrant was released for the arrest of Imad Mughniyyah, a member of the Lebanese Hizbulleh. Later, the ex-Ambassador of Iran in Argentina, Hade Soleimanpur, was detained in the United Kingdom but had to be released due to lack of evidence.

All of these elements, which seem to be definitive conclusions, have been reflected for years in various encyclopedias, books, and journalistic articles, although nothing can confirm them. The most interesting thing is that with the passing of time some Argentinean investigative journalists have debunked the versions of events proposed by the Israelis and the Americans, developing their own hypothesis which is the exact opposite. According to investigations conducted in Argentina, the two attacks were committed by Israeli agents in order to counter the growing anti–Zionism of the Jewish community in Argentina. This discovery, however, took place after Vittor published his article in *Epimelia*.

At present, the supposed intellectual or material connection of Isl®mists to the Buenos Aires attacks has largely lost credibility. The Isl®mist trail is simply inconsistent with the facts and it for this reason that the American and Israeli government are pressuring the Argentineans to put an end to their investigation. While it is presently possible to speak about these events with hindsight and tranquility, the only individual who dared speak about such events, and defend Sh®ite Isl®m when it was being attacked by international public opinion, was Luis Alberto Vittor.

Like Prophet Yahy. Luis Alberto Vittor was a voice in the wilderness, exposing himself to criticism, threats, and physical danger. Unlike some of the official Islemic authorities who stood still, making themselves complicit through their silence, Vittor raised his voice and pen in defense of Shelite Islem at a time when doing so was associating oneself, explicitly or implicitly, to a Muslim minority of "extremists" and "terrorists."

Putting his trust in Almighty All®h and the solidarity of his fellow Muslims, all of whom were simple believers with no power or political influence, Vittor produced the present work which was viewed as a moral and intellectual duty. Surely, in this lies the greatest value of his work. Sh®ite Isl®m: Orthodoxy or Heterodoxy must be viewed as a work of service in defense of the followers of Ahlul Bayt. At the time it was written, there was not a single Orientalist, Arabist or Isl®mologist, in Argentina or abroad, who was willing or capable of defending Sh®ite Isl®m.

While the Shelite community was being attacked from all sides, some Sunne Muslims sought to separate

themselves from the Sh $\ ^{\circ}$  ites, echoing the arguments of the enemies of Isl $\ ^{\circ}$ m who claimed that the followers of *Ahlul Bayt* were sectarian extremists ( $ghul\ ^{\circ}t$ ).

As if that were not enough, Shelite convertswere accused of having links to so-called "Iranian-inspired Islemic terrorism." In order to divert attention from themselves, some sectors of the Sunne community insisted on proving the Orientalists thesis correct, accusing the Shelite community of committing the terrorist bombings when the real perpetrators of the atrocities were not even Muslims.

As a result of these actions, many Shelites, both Iranians and Latinos, suffered from severe social discrimination. Many *mu'min* [believers] lost their jobs. Many *mu'min* [believers] were forced out of university, including a group of Iranian medical students. Being both Shelite and Iranian was seen as synonymous with terrorism and criminality. Fear ran so high during those days that, out of the entire community, only six or seven brothers, two of them converts, dared to attend the sole Shelite mosque in the city.

Rather than coming to the rescue of Shelite Muslims who were falsely accused of being violent sectarian terrorists, Orientalists like Bernard Lewis came forth to add fuel to the fire, arguing that there was a historic continuity and an ideological bond between medieval Muslims assassins, who were Ismelies, and contemporary Shelite fundamentalists or extremists, who were Ja'fares. For those who dabble in academic dishonesty, they were one and the same: socially maladjusted minorities who resorted to violence and terrorism as their only means of expression.

When one reads *Shīte Islīm: Orthodoxy or Heterodoxy*, it is important to remember the context in which it was created. At a moment in which the enemies of Islīm were attempting to divide the Ummah, Luis Alberto Vittor pulled up his sleeves and pulled out his pen to demonstrate that Shītite Islīm, despite being a minority, was as orthodoxy as the majority Sunnī Islīm.

And not only that, the author demonstrated that Shelite Islem was the only group which remained faithful to the will of Alleh and the Prophet Muhammad: to hold fast to the Two Treasures, the Qur'en and the Household of the Prophet.

Besides presenting the Shelite position, the author's goal was to reestablish the balance between Sunnism and Shelitsm which some sectors were attempting to destabilize, labeling one group as orthodox and another as sectarian, heterodox, extremist, and heretical. It is for this reason that the author devotes so much time to explaining why it is improper to label Muslims as "fundamentalists."

Considering the context and extraordinary circumstances in which the book was written, completely changes one's critical appreciation of the work. Shelite Islem: Orthodoxy or Heterodoxy was a lone voice denouncing despots in the desert, a strident voice denouncing the indifference of academia and the vested interests of those who sought to define Shelite Islem as a radical, sectarian, heterodox form of Islem rather than a traditional expression of its orthodoxy and orthopraxis.

Although the author has accepted that his work to be annotated, he has always insisted that it remain intact as a reflection of the socio-historical context in which it was created. Attempting to modify certain concepts would undermine the very objective of the work, reducing it to a vain theoretical discussion. The author's goal, of course, was other: to demonstrate that the claims made by the detractors of She'ite Islem were false and illogical and that the fact that She'ite Islem has a minority status does not imply, from an Islemic point of view, that it represents a sect in the sense in the Western Christian sense of the term.

The events of 1992 and 1994 which occurred in the city of Buenos Aires are not a thing of the past. Attempts to support the allegations made against the Sh® ite Muslims of Argentina continue to be made, accusing them of implication in the terrorist bombings. Despite the fact that thirteen years have passed since this work was originally published, it continues to be current. The enemies of Isl®m never sleep and nor do we.

15th of Sha'b n / August 28, 2007

Dr. John A. Morrow, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Modern Languages

Northern State University

Aberdeen, South Dakota

## Source URL:

https://www.al-islam.org/shiite-islam-orthodoxy-or-heterodoxy-luis-alberto-vittor/genesis-work#comment-0