

# How Ahlul Sunnah wal-Jama`a Contradict the Prophet's Sunnah

In this chapter, we have to unveil to the researcher, in general terms, how "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`ah" practically contradict most of the Prophet's traditions. In contrast, we will explain how only the Shi`as are the ones who uphold the Sunnah of the Prophet. This is why we justify our use of the title of this book as *The Shi`as are Ahlul Sunnah*.

In this chapter, we wish to discuss the main issues which clarify for the researchers, more convincingly, the fact that "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`ah" violated the teachings of Islam with regard to all what the Qur'an decrees and what the Messenger decided in his sacred Sunnah. This caused the misguidance of those of this nation and the setback that befell the Muslims leading, in the end, to their backwardness and suffering.

In my belief, the reason for the misguidance is rendered to one major factor: love for this world. Did not the Messenger of Allah say, "Loving this world tops every sin"? Loving this world is characterized by loving power and authority: for the sake of achieving political power, nations have been ruined, countries and lands have been reduced to rubble, rendering man more dangerous than wild beasts. It is the same meaning to which the Prophet refers when he said to his companions, "I do not fear for you that you will associate someone with Allah; rather, I fear for you that you dispute with one another."

This is why there is a need to study the subjects of caliphate and Imamate, or what we call nowadays the Islamic government system. It led to the worst calamity and catastrophe for Islam and its followers, bringing them peril and agony, misguidance and annihilation.

## 1) Islam's Government System

"Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" are of the view that the Messenger of Allah did not specify who to succeed him, leaving this issue subject to mutual consultation among people to choose whoever they wanted. This is their belief with regard to the issue of caliphate. They have insisted upon it since the day the

Prophet died till our time.

“Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” supposedly act upon this principle in which they believe and which they defend with all their might. But the research will reveal to us the fact that they did exactly the opposite. Regardless of the allegiance to Abu Bakr, which they themselves called a mistake the evil of which Allah spared them, it was Abu Bakr who invented the notion of the succession to the post of caliph, appointing, prior to his death, his friend Umar ibn al-Khattab as his successor.

At the time of his death, Umar ibn al-Khattab appointed Abd al-Rahman ibn Awf to choose one of five persons whom he recommended for the post of caliph, and to kill anyone who refused to accept the selected one.

When Mu`awiyah secured the post of caliph for himself, he put this principle of succession into practice, appointing his son Yazid ibn Mu`awiyah. Thus, the caliphate remained since that time being handed over from one promiscuous person to another, from one generation to another, each caliph appointing his son, brother, or relative, to succeed him.

So did the caliph since the inception of the Abbaside government till its dissolution. And so did the Ottoman caliphs from the time it was established till the period when the caliphate weakened and waned during the time of Kemal Ataturk in the present century.

“Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” represent such caliphate, or, say, those successive governments represented “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” in all parts of the world, and throughout the Islamic history. This is why you can now see in Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Jordan, and all Gulf states rulers who act upon the theory of succession which they inherited from their “good posterity” who all belong to “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a.”

Even if we suppose that the theory they uphold, the one saying that the Prophet left the issue for mutual consultation, and that the Qur'an endorses the concept of consultation, were accurate, they still opposed the Qur'an and the Sunnah. They turned the system of “democratic” consultation into a dictatorial monarchic hereditary system of succession.

But if we suppose that the Prophet had appointed Ali ibn Abu Talib to succeed him, as the Shi`as argue, “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” would then be in clear violation of many texts of the Sunnah and contradict the Qur'an. This is so because the Messenger of Allah never did anything without the permission of his Lord. For this reason, you find them aware of the fact that this issue of mutual consultation is erroneous because the early caliphs did not implement it, nor did they act upon it.

They also feel the inaccuracy of the theory of succession to the caliphate, so you find them justifying it through *ahadith* such as the one saying, “Caliphate after me shall last for thirty years followed by a government of oppression,” as if they want to convince others of their own conviction that government is for Allah to grant it to whomsoever He pleases, and that the kings and sultans were appointed by Allah,

the most Exalted One, to rule people; so, obedience to them is obligatory.

This is a lengthy topic which drags us to the issue of destiny and predestination which we discussed in our book *So Let us be with the Truthful*, a topic we do not wish now to return to. Suffices us here to bear in mind that “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” are also called “Qadaris,” believers in destiny, as they espouse.

The end result is that “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” believe in the system of succession which they regard as conducive with the Shari`a not because the Messenger of Allah mandated it, or because he appointed his own successor, for they very strongly deny any such things, but only because Abu Bakr appointed Umar, and Umar appointed six persons, then Mu`awiyah appointed Yazid, and so on.

None of their scholars or Imams of the four sects ever claimed that the Umayyad or the Abbaside or the Ottoman government was in agreement with the Shari`a. Yet we find them rushing to swear their oath of allegiance, to support and brand their caliphs as “legitimate.” Even most of them went as far as claiming that caliphate is legitimate for anyone who attains it by force or oppression, and they are not concerned whether he is righteous, a sinner, or a promiscuous, or whether he is an Arab, a member of Quraysh, a Turk, or a Kurd.

Dr. Ahmad Mahmud Subhi says the following in this regard, “The stand adopted by Ahlul Sunnah with regard to the issue of caliphate is to accept the status quo without endorsing or opposing it.”<sup>1</sup> In reality, however, Ahlul Sunnah do support it. Abu Ya`li al-Farraa quotes Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal saying, “The caliphate is fixed by winning, or by force, and it does not lack a contract.”

According to Abdoos ibn Malik al-Attar, “If one wins by the sword and becomes caliph and is referred to as Commander of the Faithful, it is not legal for anyone who believes in Allah and the Last Day to spend his night without recognizing him as the Imam, be he a righteous man or a sinner.” He builds this view on a statement made by Abdullah ibn Umar saying, “We are with whoever wins.”

Thus, “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” become a pawn to this *bid`a*, the innovation of the issue of succession. They swear their allegiance to the winner and the oppressor regardless of the extent of his fear of Allah, piety, or knowledge, be he righteous or a sinner. This is proven by the fact that most *sahaba* who fought on the side of the Prophet against Mu`awiyah ibn Abu Sufyan in many battles ended up swearing allegiance to Mu`awiyah as the “commander of the faithful” after the Prophet's demise. They also accepted the caliphate of Marwan ibn al-Hakam whom the Messenger of Allah called *al-wazgh* (the shiner), and whom he banished from Medina saying, “He shall not reside where I reside, whether alive or dead.”

They even accepted the caliphate of Yazid son of Mu`awiyah to whom they swore the oath of allegiance and whom they called “commander of the faithful.” When al-Husayn, grandson of the Prophet, revolted against him, they killed al-Husayn and his Ahlul Bayt in order to solidify the foundations of Yazid's government and to label it as legal.

Their scholars went as far as saying that al-Husayn was killed by the sword of his grandfather. Some of them write, even in this time and age, books dealing with the “facts” relevant to “the commander of the faithful Yazid ibn Mu`awiyah.” All of this is done out of their support for Yazid's caliphate and as an indictment of al-Husayn who revolted against him.

If we know all of this, we have no choice except to admit that “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” contradicted the Sunnah which they attributed to the Prophet and which they say mandated leaving the issue [of caliphate] for discussion and consultation among the Muslims.

As for the Shi`as, these upheld the concept of Imamate with one single view which is: “Allah and His Messenger appoint the caliph.” Imamate according to them cannot be legitimate except through a text, and it cannot be legitimate except for one who is infallible, whose knowledge is the highest, who is the most pious, and who is the best.

They do not prefer one who is good over another who is better. This is why we find them first rejecting the caliphate of the *sahaba*, then rejecting the concept of the caliphate as envisioned by “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a.”

Since the texts which the Shi`as produce with regard to the issue of caliphate enjoy a practical presence and a true authenticity even in the *Sahih* books of “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a,” we have no choice except to admit that the Shi`as are the ones who actually upheld the authentic Sunnah of the Prophet.

Whether we say that the issue is to be resolved by mutual consultation (*shura*) or through texts referring to the issue of caliphate, only the Shi`as are right because the only person who stands out as the one who was appointed by such texts as well as by the *shura* is Ali ibn Abu Talib.

Nobody among the Muslims, be he a Shi`a or a Sunni, claims that the Messenger of Allah made any reference, even remotely, to the issue of hereditary succession. Nor does any Muslim, be he Sunni or Shi`a, claim that the Messenger of Allah said to his companions, “I have left your affair for *shura*; so, choose whoever you wish to succeed me.”

We call upon them to produce even one single such *hadith*. So if they cannot do so, and they most surely cannot, they must go back to the confirmed Sunnah of the Prophet and to accurate Islamic history to derive guidance therefrom.

Or do they claim that the Messenger of Allah neglected to deal with this very important issue and did not clarify its features so that his nation might enter into a never-ending struggle and a blind dissension that all tear its unity apart and disunite it and cause it to deviate from Allah's Straight Path? We see in our times how corrupt and oppressive rulers take into very serious consideration the fate of their peoples after their own authority is over, so they appoint their successors whenever there is a vacancy; what, then, would you say about the one whom Allah sent as mercy for the whole world?!

## 2) To Call the “*Sahaba*” Equitable is to Contradict the Clear Sunnah

If we take a look at the way the Prophet dealt with his companion and what he said about them, we will find him giving credit where credit is due. He is angered when Allah is angered and is pleased when He is pleased. The Prophet dissociated himself from any companion who went against the commandments of Allah, Glory to Him, as was the case when Khalid ibn al-Waleed killed Banu Juthaymah.

He also became angry with Usamah when the latter came to him seeking favor on behalf of a high class lady who stole something. It was then when he made his famous statement, “Woe unto you! Do you intercede regarding the trespassing over one of the boundaries set by Allah? By Allah! Had Fatima daughter of Muhammad stolen, I would have cut off her hand. Nations before you were annihilated because whenever a dignitary among them stole, they left him alone, but when a simple person stole, they would carry out the appropriate penalty.”

We also find him sometimes blessing and seeking the Pleasure of Allah for some of his sincere companions, supplicating for them, seeking Allah's forgiveness for them. And we also find him cursing some of them, those who insisted not to carry out his orders or simply took them lightly. For example, he said once, “The curse of Allah be on all those who lag behind Usamah's army” when they cast doubts about his nomination of Usamah to be their leader and who refused to join his army because he was too young.

We also find him explaining to people and not leaving them to be dazzled by some of the fake *sahaba*, saying about one of them, “He has companions if one of you were to compare his prayers with theirs, he would find it inferior, and he would find his fast as well to be inferior to theirs; they recite the Qur'an which does not go beyond their throats.

They leave the creed as swiftly as the arrow leaves the bow.” He may even stop short of performing the funeral prayers for one of the *sahaba* who was martyred during the campaign of Khaybar on the side of the Muslims, revealing the truth about him and saying, “He fell short of discharging his responsibility in the cause of Allah.” When they searched the belongings of that person, [stolen] Jewish beads were found among his items.

Al-Maroodi narrates to us saying that the Prophet felt very thirsty once during the campaign of Tabuk, whereupon the hypocrites said, “Muhammad tells the news of the heavens but does not know the way to water!” It was then that Gabriel descended to tell him the names of those who said so. The Prophet named them to Sa`d ibn Abadah who said to him, “If you wish, you can have them killed.” The Prophet said, “I do not wish people to say that Muhammad kills his own companions. Rather, we will deal with them beautifully as long as they are in our company.”<sup>2</sup>

The Messenger of Allah dealt with them just as the Holy Qur'an tells us. Allah was pleased with the truthful among them and wrathful with the hypocrites, renegades, and those who violated their oaths. And the Almighty cursed them in many sacred verses. We have dealt with this subject in full detail in our

book *Ask Those Who Know* in a chapter titled “The Holy Qur'an Reveals Facts about some of the *Sahaba*.” If anyone wishes to research this subject further, he should refer to the said book.

We will be satisfied by producing one example of what some hypocritical companions had done and which was exposed by Allah Who shamed those involved. They were twelve *sahabis* who sought to be excused [from meeting with the Prophet] due to their living far away, saying that they had no time to meet with the Prophet.

They, therefore, built a mosque so that they could perform the prayers on time. Can you see sincerity and loyalty greater than that? A servant of Allah spends huge sums of money to build a mosque out of his concern for performing the prayers on time, and a group of brethren united together under the roof of one mosque?

But Allah, Glory to Him, from Whom nothing is hidden in the earth or in the heavens, and Who knows where the eyes trespass and what the chests conceal, knew their innermost thoughts and what they were hiding, so He inspired to His Messenger about them and acquainted him with their hypocrisy saying,

***“And those who built a mosque (only) to cause mischief, to promote unbelief, to cause dissension among the believers, and to lie in wait for whoever made war against Allah and His Prophet before; they will certainly swear: We did not desire aught but good, while Allah testifies that most surely they are liars.” (Holy Qur'an, 9: 107)***

Since Allah is not shy about the truth, nor is His Messenger who used to frankly tell his companions that they would fight one another for the attainment of the good things in this life. He told them that they would follow in their misguidance the customs of the Jews and the Christians, one span at a time, one yard at a time, and that they would go back on their heels and renege. He also told them that on the Day of Judgment, they would enter the fire of hell; none of them except a few would be spared, those the Prophet described to be “as few as lost camels.”

So how can “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`ah” convince us that all the *sahaba* were just and fair and that they all are in Paradise, that their injunctions are binding upon us, that their views and innovations have to be followed, and that anyone who discredits any of them abandons the creed and should be killed?!

It is a statement which even insane people reject, let alone the wise. It is a false statement, a calumny, something said to please the rulers, monarchs, by the evil and intruding scholars who follow them suit. As for us, we cannot accept such a statement at all so long as we have reason because that would be going against what Allah and His Messenger tell us. Anyone who does the opposite of what Allah and His Messenger decree is an apostate. It also clashes with reason and conscience.

We do not force “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`ah” to abandon or reject it, for they are free in believing whatever they want to believe, and they are the only ones who will be held responsible for the results

and terrible outcomes of so doing.

But they must not label as *kafir* those who follow the Qur'an and the Sunnah in as far as the justice of the *sahaba* is concerned. They should say to the *sahaba* who do good: "You have done well," and to the ones who fell into error, "You committed something wrong and made a mistake." They ought to befriend the friends of Allah and His Messenger and dissociate themselves from the enemies of Allah and His Messenger.

Thus does it become clear that "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`ah" violated clear Qur'anic texts as well as clear texts of the Sunnah and followed the dictates of the Umayyad and Abbaside governments, discarding all juristic and rational criteria.

### **3) The Prophet Orders the Muslims to Emulate His `Itrat While Sunnis Oppose Him**

In our past researches, we proved the authenticity of the Prophet's *hadith* known as *hadith al-thaqalain*, that is, *hadith* of the two weighty things. It states the following:

I am leaving with you *al-thaqalain*: so long as you uphold them, you shall never stray after me. They are: the Book of Allah and my *`itrat*, my Ahlul Bayt. The Most Munificent, the most Knowing, informed me that they shall never part from one another till they reach me at the Pool.

We proved that this *hadith* is authentic and is consecutively reported by the Shi`as as well as by "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" who record it in their *sahih* and *musnad* books. It is well known that "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" left Ahlul Bayt behind their backs and turned their faces towards the Imams of the four sects whose authority was forced on the public by oppressive governments, the governments which, in turn, were supported by "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" who swore to them their oath of allegiance.

If we wish to elaborate on this topic, we can say that "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" are the ones who, led by Umayyad and Abbaside rulers, fought the household of Prophethood. If you, therefore, sift through their beliefs and books of *hadith*, you will find no traces whatsoever for the *fiqh* of Ahlul Bayt. You will find all their *fiqh* and *ahadith* attributed to the Nasibis who were the enemies of Ahlul Bayt and who fought them, such as Abdullah ibn Umar, Ayesha, Abu Hurayra, and others.

They derive half of their creed from Ayesha, the lady with the reddish complexion<sup>3</sup>, while the major Sunni *faqih* is Abdullah son of Umar [ibn al-Khattab]. Islam's narrator, according to them, is Abu Hurayra, mentor of al-Mudeera, while the *taleeqs*<sup>4</sup> and their sons constituted their judges and the legislators of Allah's creed.

What proves this fact is that "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" were not identified as such but were, as a whole, opponents of Ahlul Bayt since the day of the *Saqeefa*, and they are the ones who conspired to usurp the caliphate from Ahlul Bayt and did their best to distance them from the nation's political stage.

The party known as "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" was then formed to counter the Shi`as who rallied

behind, supported, and followed the Imamate of Ahlul Bayt in obedience to the Qur'an and the Sunnah.

It is only natural that those who opposed the truth were the vast majority of the nation especially in the aftermath of dissensions and wars. Moreover, Ahlul Bayt could not rule the Muslims except for only four years, the period of Imam Ali's caliphate during which they distracted him with bloody wars.

As for "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" who opposed Ahlul Bayt, they ruled for hundreds of years, and their government and authority spread far and wide to the east and the west. They had their say, their gold and silver. "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a," hence, are the "winners" because they are the rulers. The Shi`as, led by Ahlul Bayt, became the vanquished because they are the subjects, the oppressed, the displaced, the murdered.

We do not wish to prolong the discussion of this subject beyond our desire to reveal the secrets of "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" who opposed the Prophet's will and legacy which guaranteed guidance and protected against straying, whereas the Shi`as upheld the will of the Prophet, followed in the footsteps of his pure Progeny and tolerated in so doing a great deal of hardship and pain.

The fact is that such dissension and rebellion from the part of "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" with regard to *al-thaqalain*, versus the acceptance of the Shi`as of the same and their adherence thereto, surfaced from that particular Thursday which came to be known as the Day of Infamy when the Messenger of Allah asked them to bring him some writing material to write them something that would protect them against misguidance.

It was then that Umar took his most serious stand and refused the Prophet's request claiming that the Book of Allah sufficed them, and that they had no need for his *`itrat*. It was as though the Prophet was saying, "Uphold both *thaqalain*: the Qur'an and the *`itrat*," whereas Umar answered him with, "We are satisfied with only one of them: the Qur'an, and we have no need for the other." This is exactly the meaning of Umar's statement: "The Book of Allah suffices us."

Umar's statement represented the stand adopted by "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" because prominent Qurayshi heads, represented by Abu Bakr, Uthman, Abd al-Rahman ibn Awf, Abu Ubaydah, Khalid ibn al-Waleed, Talhah ibn Ubaydullah, all stood up to support Umar's stand. Ibn Abbas said, "Some of them kept repeating what Umar said, while some others said, 'Bring writing material to the Prophet so that he may write you something.'"

It was only natural that Ali and his followers, since that day, upheld the Prophet's will even though it was not written down, acting upon both the Qur'an and the Sunnah simultaneously. Their enemies, on the other hand, did not act even upon the Qur'an which they agreed to do in the beginning and whose injunctions they idled when they attained power and authority, following their own views, leaving the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger behind their backs.

## 4) “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” and Love for Ahlul Bayt

No Muslim doubts that Allah, Glory and Exaltation to Him, has imposed love for Ahlul Bayt, peace be upon them, as a the dues the Muslims have to pay in return for granting them Muhammad's Message and the blessings such Message contains for them. He has said,

**“Say: I do not ask you for any reward for it except love for my kinsfolk” (Holy Qur'an, 42:23).**

This sacred verse was revealed to require the Muslims to love the purified `Itrat of the Prophet who are: Ali, Fatima, al-Hasan and al-Husayn, according to the testimony of more than thirty references all of which are authored by “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a,”<sup>5</sup> so much so that Imam al-Shafi`i composed the following in this regard:

O household of Allah's Messenger! Loving you is an obligation

Which Allah enjoined in the Qur'an, His Revelation.

Loving them is mandated by the Holy Qur'an; it is an obligation on all followers of Islam, as Imam al-Shafi`i admits. Loving them is the price we have to pay for receiving Muhammad's Message, as the text clearly indicates. Loving them is a form of worship whereby nearness to Allah, the Most Exalted One, is sought. Since the case is as such, why do not “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” have any regard for Ahlul Bayt ? Why do they respect them less than they respect the *sahaba*?<sup>6</sup>

We have the right to ask “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” this question. Rather, we challenge them to bring about one Qur'anic verse, or one *hadith*, making it compulsory on the Muslims to love Abu Bakr or Umar or Uthman or any other *sahabi*! No, they will never be able to do that. Never! On the contrary; the Qur'an contains numerous verses which point out to the lofty status preserved for Ahlul Bayt, thus preferring them over all other servants of Allah. And the Prophet's Sunnah contains many *ahadith* favoring Ahlul Bayt and placing them ahead of all other Muslims just as the leading Imam is preferred over those whom he leads, and just as a scholar is preferred over an ignorant person.

The Qur'an suffices us with this verse, the one mandating love for Ahlul Bayt discussed here, in addition to the Mubahala verse, the verse mandating the invoking of Allah's blessings unto the Prophet and his Progeny, the verse referring to the removal of all abomination from and the purification of Ahlul Bayt, the verse mandating their *wilayat* (mastership), the verse referring to their being chosen by Allah to receive His favors and to inherit the knowledge of the Book.

From the Prophet's Sunnah, we content ourselves with *hadith* al-thaqalain (tradition of the two weighty things), the *hadith* comparing Ahlul Bayt to the ark of salvation, the status *hadith*, the *hadith* referring to the complete prayers unto them, the *hadith* of the guiding stars, the *hadith* describing Imam Ali as the gate of knowledge, and the *hadith* numbering the Imams after the Prophet as twelve.

We do not wish to say that one third of the Qur'an was revealed in praise and counting the merits of Ahlul Bayt, as some companions, such as Ibn Abbas, say, nor do we claim that one third of the Prophet's Sunnah praises and lauds Ahlul Bayt and attracts the attention of people to their virtues and merits as Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal points out.

Suffices us from the Qur'an and the Sunnah what we have quoted from the *Sahih* books of "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" to prove the preference of Ahlul Bayt over all other people.

After casting a quick look at the beliefs of "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a," at their books and behavior towards Ahlul Bayt throughout history, we will realize without any doubt that Sunnis opposed and antagonized Ahlul Bayt, that they unsheathed their swords to fight them, utilized their pens to belittle and abuse them. They have been doing so in order to raise the status of the enemies of Ahlul Bayt and of those who fought them.

One evidence should suffice to give us the convincing proof. As we have indicated above, "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" were not identified by this name except during the second Hijri century. That was their reaction to the Shi`as who became loyal to and who followed the line of Ahlul Bayt. There is no trace or clue whatsoever in Sunni *fiqh* or rituals or beliefs indicating that they make any reference at all to the Prophet's Sunnah as narrated by Ahlul Bayt.[7](#)

This happens despite the fact that the people of the house know best what their house contains, for they are the offspring and the progeny of the Prophet. Nobody could ever surpass them in their knowledge or deeds. For three centuries, they were present among the people. They held the reins of spiritual and religious leadership through their Twelve Imams who never differed in any issue with one another. Despite all of that, we find "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" adhering to the four sects which were not created except in the third Hijri century, the sects wherein each Imam contradicts that of the other. Despite that, they left Ahlul Bayt behind their backs, antagonized them and fought all those who followed them. And they are still fighting them even in our day and time...

If we need another proof, we only have to analyze the stand of "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" *vis-a-vis* the commemoration of the Day of Ashura, the ominous day when a corner of Islam was demolished, when the master of the youths of Paradise [and all the residents of Paradise are youths] and of the purified Progeny, offspring of the Prophet, and of the selected band of righteous from his believing companions were martyred:

**FIRST:** We will find them pleased with and supportive of those who killed al-Husayn. This must not surprise us, for all those who killed al-Husayn belonged to "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a." It is sufficient for us to know that the leader of the army appointed by Ibn Ziyad to kill Imam al-Husayn was none other than Umar ibn Sa'd ibn Abu Waqqas. "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a," therefore, invoke Allah to be pleased with all the *sahaba*, including those who killed and who were accomplices in the killing of Imam al-Husayn. They accept their *ahadith* which they label as "authentic." Nay! Some of them even consider

Imam Husayn as a Kharijite because he revolted against the authority of “the commander of the faithful Yazid ibn Mu`awiyah”!

We have already indicated that the *faqih* of “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” Abdullah ibn Umar had sworn his oath of allegiance to Yazid ibn Mu`awiyah and decreed disobedience to Yazid as *haram*. He said, “We are with whoever wins.”

**SECOND:** We find “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” throughout history, from the Day of Ashura till our time, celebrating the Day of Ashura and considering it as an Eid when they take out the *zakat* of their wealth to distribute to their children, regarding it as a day for blessings and mercy.

As if all this does not satisfy them, they now scandalize the Shi`as and criticize them for mourning al-Husayn. In some Muslim countries, they prohibit them from conducting the commemorative ceremonies of this tragic epic and attack them with their weapons, beating or killing some of them in the pretext of fighting innovations.

In reality, they do not fight innovations as much as they re-enact the roles played by Umayyad and Abbaside rulers who tried their best to obliterate the memory of Ashura and who went as far as desecrating and defacing the grave of Imam al-Husayn, prohibiting people from visiting it. They still want to put an end to that memory for fear people would come to know, and so would those who are ignorant, of the truth about Ahlul Bayt.

These would come to know what really happened, and the faults of these folks as well as of those of their masters and leaders would then be unveiled. People will then come to know the difference between right and wrong, between a believer and a sinner.

Thus do we once again come to know that the Shi`as are, indeed, the ones who actually adhere to the Prophet's Sunnah because they have followed the Sunnah of the Prophet even with regard to grieving for and mourning the father of Abdullah, Imam Husayn. Confirmed traditions testify that the Prophet of Islam himself wept over the martyrdom of his grandson al-Husayn before it happened when Gabriel told him of al-Husayn's future martyrdom at Karbala. That was exactly fifty years before its occurrence.

We also clearly come to know that “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” celebrate the Day of Ashura because they followed the “sunnah” of Yazid ibn Mu`awiyah and of Banu Umayyah who used to celebrate that day as the day when they achieved “victory” over al-Husayn. They celebrate putting out Imam al-Husayn's revolution which threatened their very existence. They regarded their “victory” as putting an end to anarchy, as they claim.

History tells us that Yazid and Banu Umayyah celebrated that day with a great deal of festivities when the severed head of al-Husayn and those of Ahlul Bayt who were taken captives reached them. They rejoiced and cursed the family of the Messenger of Allah and composed poetry.

The evil scholars among “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” sought to please them, so they fabricated for them a number of “traditions” praising that Day. They told them that Ashura was the day when Allah accepted Adam's repentance, when the ark of Noah landed on the Jodi mountain, when the fire turned cool and peaceful unto Abraham, when Joseph was released from prison and when Jacob recovered his vision, when Moses obtained victory over Pharaoh, when a table of viands descended upon Jesus..., etc.!!!

All these are fabricated “traditions” which “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” and their scholars and Imams have been repeating from the pulpits even in our day and time on the occasion of Ashura. All these are “traditions” which were manufactured by swindlers who put on the garb of scholars and tried to please their rulers by all means, selling their hereafter for the price of this short life, so their trade did not earn them any profit, and they shall be in the hereafter among the losers.

They went to extremes in telling lies, claiming that the Prophet migrated to Medina, and it so happened that the day when he reached it was the tenth of Muharram (Ashura). He found the Jews of Medina fasting, so he asked them why.

They said, “This is the day when Moses won victory over Pharaoh,” whereupon the Prophet, according to this fabrication, said, “We are more worthy of Moses than you.” Then he supposedly ordered the Muslims to fast the ninth and the tenth of Muharram. This is nothing but a flagrant lie. The Jews live among us<sup>8</sup> and we never heard that they have an Eid during which they fast and which they call Ashura!

We may even wonder why our Lord made that day a blessed Eid for all His prophets and messengers, from Adam to Moses, with the exception of Muhammad for whom it was a day of tragedy, a day of mourning, a day of bad omen, a day when his offspring, his Progeny, were slaughtered as animals are slaughtered, when his daughters were taken captive... The answer is:

***“He is not asked about what He does, while they shall be asked” (Holy Qur'an, 21:23).***

***“But whoever disputes with you in this matter, after the knowledge that has come to you, say: Come: let us call our sons and your sons, our women and your women, and ourselves and yourselves, then let us earnestly pray, invoking Allah to curse the liars.” (Holy Qur'an, 3:61)***

## **5) “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” and the Curtailed Prayer**

In a previous chapter, we quoted a verse referring to invoking Allah's prayers unto the Prophet and his progeny, and we also quoted its explanation as provided by the Prophet himself and how he taught people how to make a complete invocation, prohibiting them from using the curtailed one which Allah, the most Exalted One, rejects.

Yet we find a great deal of stubbornness from the side of “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” who insist on eliminating any reference to Muhammad's Progeny from such an invocation. If they do reluctantly mention them, they include with them (in the invocation) the *sahaba* all of them. If you say before any of

them: *Salla Allahu alaihi wa aalih* (Allah blesses him and his progeny), he will immediately understand that you are a Shi`a. This is so due to the fact that the complete invocation unto Muhammad and the progeny of Muhammad has become the identifying mark of only the Shi`as.

This is a fact which cannot be refuted. I employed it at the inception of my research, identifying each writer as a Shi`a whenever I find him saying *Salla Allahu alaihi wa alihi wa sallam* (Allah blesses him and his progeny and greets them all) after making a reference to Muhammad.

In its absence, I conclude that the writer is a Sunni. I also conclude that a certain writer is a Shi`a when he says: *Ali alaihis-salam* "Ali, peace be upon him," rather than *Ali karrama Allahu wajhah*, as is the case with Sunni writers.

From the complete invocation, I see how the Shi`as have followed the sacred Prophet's Sunnah *versus* "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" who disobeyed the orders of the Prophet and did not honor them in the least. You find them all uttering the curtailed invocation, and when they feel obligated to add to it the reference to Muhammad's Progeny, they add to them the companions all of them without any exception so that they do not leave any merit or exclusive feat for Ahlul Bayt whatsoever.

All this has resulted from the stand adopted by the Umayyads *versus* Ahlul Bayt and to the enmity which they had against them, the one that in the end caused them to substitute the invocation to Allah to bless Ahlul Bayt with one invoking Him to curse them. They kept doing so even from the pulpits, forcing people to do so by all means.

But "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a" did not follow the Umayyads' custom of cursing Ahlul Bayt. Had they done so, the truth about them would have been revealed to the Muslims, and they would have been known as they are, and people would have dissociated themselves from them.

So they abandoned the custom of cursing and abusing Ahlul Bayt, keeping to themselves the animosity and hatred towards Ahlul Bayt. They tried their best to put their light out by raising the status of their enemies from the *sahaba*. For the latter they invented imaginary feats which have no relevance at all to the truth.

What proves this fact is that you can find "Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a," even in our time, refraining from saying anything against Mu`awiyah and the *sahaba* who cursed Ahlul Bayt for eighty years. Rather, they invoke Allah to be pleased with all of them. At the same time, they label as *kafir* any Muslim who discredits any of the *sahaba*, issuing *fatawa* permitting his murder...

Some fabricators tried to add something else to the complete invocation, the one which the Messenger of Allah taught to his companions, another part, thinking that it would further undermine the status of Ahlul Bayt. One narrator quoted the Prophet saying, "Say: O Allah! Bless Muhammad, the Progeny of Muhammad, his wives and offspring." The researcher is of the view that this part was added in order to include Ayesha among Ahlul Bayt.

We say to them: If we, for the sake of argument, suppose that this “tradition” is authentic and that it implies the inclusion of the mothers of the faithful, the *sahaba* still have nothing to do with Ahlul Bayt! I personally challenge any Muslim to produce one proof from the Qur'an or from the Sunnah backing his view, for surely the heaven are more within his reach than that.

Both the Qur'an and the Sunnah have mandated all the companions as well as all other Muslims who follow those *sahaba* till the Day of Judgment to send blessings unto Muhammad and the Progeny of Muhammad. This by itself is a great status compared to which any other status falls short, and compared to which nothing else comes close.

Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and all the companions of the Prophet, as well as all the Muslims of the world who are counted by the billions, do, indeed, invoke Allah to bless Muhammad and his Progeny whenever they make their *tashahhud*; otherwise, their prayers will be rejected by Allah, Glory to Him.

This is exactly the meaning of a verse of poetry Imam al-Shafi'i composed and the rough translation of which is as follows:

Suffices you (O Ahlul Bayt!) of a great import,

Whoever does not bless you, his prayer is void.

Al-Shafi'i was accused of the “crime” of being a Shi'a because of having said so. Henchmen of the Umayyads and the Abbasides accuse anyone of being a Shi'a if he blesses Muhammad and the Progeny of Muhammad or who praises them in a verse of poetry or points out to one of their feats.

At any rate, researching this subject is quite exhaustive, and it may be dealt with repeatedly in many books. There is no harm in repetition so long as it benefits the reader.

What is important is that we have come to know from this chapter that the Shi'as are the ones who follow the Prophet's Sunnah and that their prayers are complete and accepted even according to the views of those who oppose them. “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a,” on the other hand, have violated in this regard the clear Sunnah of the Prophet, and their prayers are curtailed and are not accepted even according to the views of their own Imams and scholars.

***“Or do they envy the people for what Allah has granted them of His grace? Indeed We have given Abraham's children the Book and wisdom, and We have given them a great kingdom.” (Holy Qur'an, 4:54)***

1. He says so on p. 23 of his book Al-Imama.

2. His statement , “I do not wish people to say that Muhammad kills his companions. Rather, we will deal with them beautifully, etc.” contains an evident proof that the hypocrites were, indeed, among the *sahaba*. The claim put forth by “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`ah” that the hypocrites were not among the *sahaba* is rejected because this claim is contradicted by the statement of the Messenger of Allah who refers to them as his companions.

3. In Arabic, she is called al-humayraa which means: the woman the color of whose complexion is slightly red. \_\_\_ Tr.

4. These were the Meccans who remained heathen till the conquest of Mecca.
5. Refer to the book Ma`a al-Sadiqeen (With the Truthful) by the same author.
6. This is so because all “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” favor Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman over Ali ibn Abu Talib . Since the latter is the master of the `Itrat and the best of Ahlul Bayt after the Prophet , “Ahlul Sunnah wal Jama`a” place Ahlul Bayt in the second place in their esteem. They prefer over them the first sahaba to whom they refer as the “righteous caliphs.”
7. Nowadays, they claim saying, “We are more worthy of Ali and Ahlul Bayt from the Shi`as.” If so, why did their scholars and the Imams of their sects abandon the fiqh of Ahlul Bayt and forgot it completely? They, instead, followed sects which they invented and for which Allah sent no proof. The Most Exalted One has said, “The most worthy among people of Ibrahim are those who followed him.” As for those who did not follow him, they clearly are not worthy of him.
8. The author is from Tunisia where a good number of Jews have been living for centuries. \_\_ Tr.

---

**Source URL:**

<https://www.al-islam.org/shiah-are-real-ahlul-sunnah-muhammad-al-tijani-al-samawi/how-ahlul-sunnah-wal-jamaa-contradict#comment-0>